balance in the special fund known as the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6321. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 6322. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 6323. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 6324. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of adopting the plan, known as the West Virginia plan, for the construction and financing of low-cost housing facilities for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the executive branch of the United States Government recognize the Hebrew Republic of Palestine and extend certain aid thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. Res. 547. Resolution requesting the President of the United States not to proclaim rates of duty listed in schedule XX of the general agreement on tariffs and trade signed at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 30, 1947, with the country of Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 6325. A bill for the relief of John Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6326. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to bestow the Silver Star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 6327. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6328. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to lease to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., that portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., which was previously occupied by the Temple Methodist Church; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 6329. A bill for the relief of the Olympic Hotel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 6330. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Espada Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6331. A bill for the relief of José Antonio Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6332. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to lease to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., that portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., which was previously occupied by the Temple Methodist Church; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1811. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Ray C. Herschlec, Mobridge, S. Dak., and 25 others, urging enactment of H. R. 5759, to increase the retirement of beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1812. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting in Paterson, N. J., April 2, 1948, honoring Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former president of the Polish Peasant Party, calling for aid to the beleaguered people of Poland and other subjugated nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1813. By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN: Petition of the United States Army and Navy Retired Association, of San Juan, P. R., urging approval of H. R. 5043; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1814. Also, petition of Puerto Rican veterans, urging support of the universal military training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1815. Also, petition of the International Longshoremen's Association of Mayagüez, P. R., urging support of H. R. 5739 and H. R. 5653; to the Commitee on Education and Labor.

1816. By Mr. TAYLOR: Petition of Avis Fleischer and 16 other residents of Troy, N. Y., in opposition to univeral military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1817. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Kenneth W. Bellows, Elgin, Ill., consisting of 40 signatures, in support of H. R. 5213; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1818. Also, petition of Paul H. Traub, Elgin, Ill., consisting of 43 signatures, in support of H. R. 5213; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1819. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter Marlow, Brooklyn, N. Y., and others petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the amputee bill, which would provide automobiles at no expense to veteran amputees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1820. Also, petition of the board of managers and members of the Pennsylvania Society of Sons of the American Revolution petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of universal military training; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

1821. Also, petition of Mrs. B. W. Kellogg, St. Cloud, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1822. Also, petition of William Chandler, Orlovista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1823. Also, petition of T. M. Nuzum, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1824. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1825. Also, petition of Orlando Townsend Club, No. 2, Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1826. Also, petition of John A. Davies, Orlovista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1827. Also, petition of Miss Maggie Ellis, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1828. Also, petition of Miss Gertrude Hoschma, Geneva, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1829. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting removal of restrictions on evictions of excess-income families residing in permanent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1830. Also, petition of Ray Jerome Gross, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the preservation and general welfare of the Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 22, 1948)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

It is not our brothers or our friends, but it is we, O Lord, who are standing in the need of prayer. Much as we would like to see this great company engaged in fervent supplication, we remember that Thou hast promised: "If any two are agreed, I will do it."

Let us not be staggered by statistics but rather by the implications of the prayers here uttered by a few. When they really move us, they can move our Nation. Let us not be the stumbling-blocks. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 22, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 24, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 2038. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken;

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate, immediately upon the convening of the Senate the calendar is to be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 1155, House bill 4571. Senators can be recognized after the first bill is called. The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

Aiken	Green	Murray
Ball	Gurney	Myers
Barkley	Hatch	O'Connor
Brewster	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brooks	Hoey	Reed
Buck	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Jenner	Russell
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capper	Kem	Stennis
Chavez	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	Langer	Thye
Cordon	Lucas	Tobey
Donnell	McCarthy	Tydings
Downey	McClellan	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McFarland	Watkins
Eastland	McGrath	Wherry
Ecton	McKellar	White
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Wilson
George	Millikin	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 22d instant,

The following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted on April 23, 1948:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 5524. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1167).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 5607. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1166).

By Mr. KNOWLAND, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 5728. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1165).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6055. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1164).

MINORITY VIEWS SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 22d instant,

Mr. BRIDGES, on April 23, 1948, submitted the views of the minority of the Committee on Appropriations on the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1167.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE FILED DURING RECESS—AMENDMENTS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 22d instant,

Mr. GURNEY, on April 23, 1948, submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 10, line 7, after the word "dam" and before the period, insert the following: *Provided further*, That the authority contained in section 6 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 approved July 24, 1946 (Public, 526), is hereby extended to include the projects known as Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak., Pine Flat Reservoir, Calif., Isabella Reservoir, Calif., and Folsom Reservoir, Calif."

Mr. GURNEY also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5524, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

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

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 22d instant,

Mr. BALL, on April 23, 1948, submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5607) making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page —, line —, after the figures "$1,844,000" insert: "*Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the main (CAF–4), senior (CAF–5), or principal (CAF–6) clerical grade, or assistant (CAF–7), or associate (CAF–8) administrative grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the junior (P–1), assistant (P–2), associate (P–3), full (P–4), or senior (P–5) professional grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed $6,500 per annum, except in the case of the senior circuit judge of each circuit and senior district judge of each district having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed $7,500."

Mr. BALL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5607, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 150)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to $1,079,610, in the form of amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

STATUE OF GEN. JOSE GERVASIO ARTIGAS

A letter from Charles E. Bohlen, counselor for the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes (with

an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

CANCELLATION OF DRAINAGE CHARGES AGAINST CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN UINTAH INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, UTAH

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of an order of October 15, 1943, canceling, subject to approval by Congress, the sum of $23,090.62 expended for drainage works to serve non-Indian-owned land under the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; together with a draft of proposed legislation to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred as indicated.

A resolution adopted by the city council of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for removal of restrictions on evictions of excess-income families residing in public housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of Kern County (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1988, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Claire B. Geller, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 984, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITIONS AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference six petitions which I have received from Mrs. Grant Baker, 14 Terrace Park, Louisville, Ky., director of Christian citizenship of the south-end union of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of that city, endorsing Senate bill 265, "To prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes. These petitions are signed by numerous residents of Louisville, including members of the South Louisville Christian Church, the Larchmont Church of God, the Oakdale Methodist Church, and the Victory Memorial Baptist Church.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GENERAL EDWARD LAWRENCE LOGAN AIRPORT—RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive council, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the General Edward Lawrence Logan Airport.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, APRIL 14, 1948

Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has invested approximately $50,000,000 in the General Edward Lawrence Logan Airport, which is operating at an annual deficiency of about $75,000 and should, as promptly as possible, be placed on a self-supporting basis; and

Whereas to accomplish this purpose the department of public works, which is the operating agency, has been directed by act of the legislature to establish a schedule of charges at the airport on items including the sale of gasoline or other aviation fuels, oils, or other articles and supplies; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Administration has allocated $600,000 from Federal funds to Logan Airport under the terms of the Federal Airport Act, which amount is urgently needed to assist in meeting the cost of large expenditures required to complete the development of the airport, but has refused to allow the Commonwealth to receive said sum unless the Commonwealth binds itself for 20 years not to impose any fee on supplies delivered at the airport for operation of aircraft other than a charge for the cost of services rendered by the airport in connection therewith; and

Whereas such interference by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the operation by the Commonwealth of Logan Airport as the price of receiving Federal funds, which represent only a small fraction of the money paid by citizens of the Commonwealth to the Federal Government, is without congressional warrant, would require violation of the Massachusetts statutes and would seriously interfere with, if not make impossible, the operation of the airport on a self-supporting basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive council unanimously opposes such unwarranted interference by a Federal administrative agency; and be it further

Resolved, That each Member of the Massachusetts delegation to the Congress of the United States be sent a copy of this resolution and be required to take immediate action to protect the Commonwealth from such abuse of authority by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 26, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles E. Milliken; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

PERMISSION TO REPORT CONVENTION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be waived and that the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to report during the recess a claims convention with Norway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

NOMINATION OF W. AVERELL HARRIMAN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to give notice to the Senate that in the course of the day he will request an executive session to consider the nomination of W. Averell Harriman to be Ambassador to the European recovery group.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 2550. A bill for the relief of William H. Howe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2551. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECTON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 2552. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2553. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.; and

S. 2554. A bill to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2555. A bill for the relief of Azy Ajderian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 2556. A bill for the relief of Alexy W. Katyll and Ioana Katyll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2557. A bill for the relief of William Adam Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2558. A bill for the relief of William A. Davis; and

S. 2559. A bill to extend the benefits of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Air Corps," approved June 16, 1936, as amended, to certain former officers in the Army Air Forces who were erroneously commissioned in the Army of the United States rather than in the Air Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2560. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to lease to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., that portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., which was previously occupied by the Temple

Methodist Church; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 2561. A bill to provide for the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States as a nonquota immigrant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—AMENDMENT RELATING TO UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY IN REARMAMENT PROGRAM

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment I shall propose to Senate bill 651, to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training.

I shall propose the same amendment to any selective-service bill which may reach the floor of the Senate ahead of the universal military training bill. The amendment provides for the utilization of the industry of the United States in the rearmament program. I request unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment submitted by Mr. RUSSELL, was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. RUSSELL to the bill (S. 651) to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training, viz: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

"UTILIZATION OF INDUSTRY

"SEC. 21. (a) Whenever the President determines that it is in the interest of the national security for the Government to obtain prompt delivery of any articles or materials the procurement of which has been authorized by the Congress, he is authorized, through the head of any Government agency, to place with any person operating a plant, mine, or other facility capable of producing such articles or materials an order for such quantity of such articles or materials as the President deems appropriate. Any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be advised that such order is placed pursuant to the provisions of this section.

"(b) It shall be the duty of any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a), (1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may prescribe, and (2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible.

"(c) In case any person with whom an order is placed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) refuses or fails—

"(1) to give such order such precedence with respect to all other orders (Government or private) theretofore or thereafter placed with such person as the President may have prescribed;

"(2) to fill such order within the period of time prescribed by the President or as soon thereafter as possible as determined by the President;

"(3) to produce the kind or quality of articles or materials ordered; or

"(4) to furnish the quantity, kind, and quality of articles or materials ordered at a reasonable price as determined by the President;

the President is authorized to take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or other facility of such person and to operate it, through any Government agency, for the production of such articles or materials as may be required by the Government. The President is authorized to direct the Secretary of Defense to furnish any assistance by the National Military Establishment, or any personnel thereof, which may be required in the operation of any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken.

"(d) Fair and just compensation shall be paid by the United States (1) for any articles or materials furnished pursuant to an order placed under subsection (a), or (2) as rental for any plant, mine, or other facility of which possession is taken under subsection (c).

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to render inapplicable to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession is taken pursuant to subsection (c) any State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, or employment standards of employees.

"(f) Any person, or any officer of any person as defined in this section, who willfully fails or refuses to carry out any duty imposed upon him by subsection (b) of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or by a fine of not more than $50,000, or by both such imprisonment and fine.

"(g) (1) As used in this section—

"(A) The term 'person' means any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or other form of business organization.

"(B) The term 'Government agency' means any department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation in the executive branch of the United States Government.

"(2) For the purposes of this section, a plant, mine, or other facility shall be deemed capable of producing any articles or materials if it is then producing or furnishing such articles or materials or if the President determines that it can be readily converted to the production or furnishing of such articles or materials."

NOTICE OF HEARING BY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD ALLEN TAMM

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, notice is hereby given that on Wednesday, April 28, 1948, at 9:30 a. m., there will begin, in room 424, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., further public hearing with respect to the nomination of Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which subcommittee is composed of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

THOMAS JEFFERSON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Columbia University, New York City, April 21, 1948, at a meeting to honor Prof. Dumas Malone, author of the book Jefferson, the Virginian, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONEY AND HOW TO FINANCE THE MARSHALL PLAN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Money and How To Finance the Marshall Plan, delivered by him April 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON STILL LIVES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Jefferson Still Lives," delivered by Senator BARKLEY on April 25, 1948, at Cape Henry, Va., on the three hundred and forty-first anniversary of the landing of English settlers at that point in 1607, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAMES GRAVES SCRUGHAM

[Mr. McCARRAN, in accordance with the terms of Senate Resolution 212, agreed to April 1, 1948, submitted a statement prepared by him on the life, character, and public service of James Graves Scrugham, late a Senator from the State of Nevada, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN PARTY RISKS DEFICIT FINANCING—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Republican Party Risks Deficit Financing," issued by him on April 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF INDEPENDENT BANKERS—ADDRESS BY L. B. McBRIDE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by L. B. McBride at a dinner held by the executive council of the Independent Bankers' Association at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 24, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT THE WORLD WANTS MOST—ADDRESS BY DR. RALPH W. SOCKMAN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "What the World Wants Most," delivered by Dr. Ralph W. Sockman on April 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALLEGED DISCLOSURE OF RADAR SECRETS—REPLY BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY TO DREW PEARSON

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum issued on April 21, 1948, by the Department of the Army replying to allegations by Drew Pearson of disclosure of radar secrets, which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS OF SENATOR MORSE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper editorial describing a speech delivered by Senator MORSE, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to sit and hold hearings on the armed services appropriation bill during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the China and Italian treaties may meet this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. JENNER asked and obtained permission for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to call the bills on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1155.

ESTATE OF CARL R. NALL

The bill (H. R. 4571) for the relief of the estate of Carl R. Nall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES B. WALSH

The bill (S. 1281) for the relief of James B. Walsh was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $21,899.67, to James B. Walsh, an individual doing business as M. J. Walsh & Sons, of Holyoke, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for work performed in connection with the construction of defense housing project Mass-19023, at Springfield, Mass., in January and February 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JAMES HAROLD NESBITT, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 334) for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES C. SMITH AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4399) for the relief of James C. Smith, Stephen A. Bodkin, Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JUDICIAL SALARIES IN HAWAII

The bill (S. 1052) to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following salaries shall be paid to the several justices and judges hereinafter mentioned, namely:

To the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, $15,500 per year and to each of the associate justices thereof, $15,000 per year.

To each of the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, $12,500.

SEC. 2. All of said salaries shall be paid in equal monthly installments.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first month next following its approval.

JESSE L. PURDY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3550) for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy, which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$55.47" and insert "$41.12."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SYLVESTER T. STARLING

The bill (H. R. 344) for the relief of Sylvester T. Starling was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARGARET LEE NOVICK AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1747) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACK O'DONNELL GRAVES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1206) for the relief of Jack O'Donnell Graves, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$460.62" and insert "$453.76", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jack O'Donnell Graves, formerly a captain, Signal Corps, Army of the United States (ASN O1633899), the sum of $453.76, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for mileage for travel performed by him by private conveyance from Fort Dix, N. J., to Nevada City, Calif., and return pursuant to Army orders dated July 16, 1946, which orders were revoked without his knowledge after his departure from Fort Dix, N. J.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JOSEPH W. BEYER

The bill (H. R. 2399) for the relief of Joseph W. Beyer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 191) giving the consent of Congress to the compact on regional education entered into between the Southern States at Tallahassee, Fla., on February 8, 1948, was announced as next in order.

Mr. IVES. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

BOUNDARY COMPACT BETWEEN MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, AND WISCONSIN

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 206) consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the following interstate boundary compact by and between the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, and the State of Wisconsin:

"A COMPACT

"Entered into by and between the State of Michigan, the State of Minnesota, and the State of Wisconsin, states signatory hereto.

"The contracting states solemnly agree:

"1. That the boundary between the State of Michigan and the State of Wisconsin in the center of Lake Michigan be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked A–B–C–D–E–F–G on the map, Exhibit A, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

"Starting at Point A, a point equidistant from either shore on the line which is the eastward continuation of the boundary line between Wisconsin and Illinois or latitude 42°29'37" North;

"Thence to Point B, a point equidistant from either shore on the line drawn through the Port Washington Fog Signal and Storm Signal and the White Lake Storm Signal, on a true azimuth of 354°12'00" a distance of 61.55 statute miles;

"Thence to Point C, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Sheboygan Coast Guard Storm Signal, Fog Signal, Radio Beacon, and Little Sable Point Light, on a true azimuth of 03°01'15", a distance of 22.18 statute miles;

"Thence to Point D, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Twin River Point Light and Fog Signal and Big Sable Fog and Light Signal, on a true azimuth of 10°04'30", a distance of 30.33 statute miles;

"Thence to Point E, a point equidistant from either shore on a line from Bailey's Harbor Inland Light and Point Betsie Fog Signal, Radio Beacon, and Distance Finding Station, on a true azimuth of 17°09'55", a distance of 54.20 statute miles;

"Thence to Point F, a point equidistant from either shore on a line drawn through the Pilot Island Light and Fog Signal and Sleeping Bear Point Light, on a true azimuth of 33°29'10", a distance of 17.24 statute miles;

"Thence to Point G, the point determined by the United States Supreme Court decree of March 12, 1936, which is a point 45,600 meters from the center of Rock Island Passage on a bearing of South 60° East, on a true azimuth of 49°34'10", a distance of 15.66 statute miles.

"The latitude and longitude of the named control points is as follows:

"Point A—Latitude 42°29'37", longitude 87°01'15".

"Point B—Latitude 43°22'50", Longitude 87°08'50".

"Point C—Latitude 43°42'00", Longitude 87°07'20".

"Point D—Latitude 44°07'55", Longitude 87°00'45".

"Point E—Latitude 44°52'50", Longitude 86°41'10".

"Point F—Latitude 45°05'20", Longitude 86°29'30".

"Point G—Latitude 45°14'10", Longitude 86°14'55".

"2. That the western boundary of the State of Michigan in the waters of Lake Superior and the eastern boundary in the waters of Lake Superior of the State of Minnesota and Wisconsin be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked M–N on the map, Exhibit B, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

"Starting at Point M, the point where the line through the middle of the main channel of the Montreal River enters Lake Superior,

"Thence in a direct line to Point N, the point where a line drawn through the most easterly point of Pigeon Point and the most southerly point of Pine Point intersects the international boundary, on a true azimuth of 23°27'24" and a distance of 108.86 statute miles.

"The latitude and longitude of the named control points is:

"Point M—Latitude 46°34'05", Longitude 90°25'05".

"Point N—Latitude 48°00'50", Longitude 89°29'00".

"3. That the boundary between the State of Minnesota and the State of Wisconsin in the center of Lake Superior be and it hereby is finally fixed and established as the line marked A–B–C–D on the map, Exhibit B, annexed hereto, which line is more particularly described as follows:

"Starting at Point A, which is the midpoint on the line M–N described in paragraph 2, supra;

"Thence to Point B, the midpoint in a direct line between the mouth of Cross River, Minnesota, and the Lighthouse on Outer Island in Wisconsin, on a true azimuth of 272°17'10", a distance of 33.15 statute miles;

"Thence to Point C, the midpoint in a direct line between the Lighthouse on shore at Two Harbors, Minnesota, and the light on the lakeward end of the Government east pier at Port Wing, Wisconsin, on a true azimuth of 235°27'40", a distance of 49.60 statute miles;

"Thence to Point D, the midpoint in a direct line at right angles to the central axis of the Superior entry between the tops of the eastern ends of the pierheads at the lakeward ends of the United States Government breakwaters at the Superior entry to Duluth Superior Harbor, on a true azimuth of 239°50'20", a distance of 26.43 statute miles.

"The latitude and longitude of the named control points is as follows:

"Point A—Latitude 47°17'30", Longitude 89°50'00".

"Point B—Latitude 47°18'35", Longitude 90°39'15".

"Point C—Latitude 46°54'10", Longitude 91°31'25".

"Point D—Latitude 46°42'39.875", Longitude 92°00'24.571".

"4. All azimuths are measured clockwise from true north.

"5. That this compact shall become operative immediately upon its ratification by any state as between it and the other state or states so ratifying. Ratification shall be made by act of the legislature of the ratifying state.

"6. That immediately upon ratification of this compact by all three states, each state will appoint two members to a Joint Survey Commission to survey and mark the boundaries defined in this compact by establishing and perpetuating monuments at the reference points on shore by means of which the control points of said boundaries are located. The expense of marking the Lake Michigan Boundary shall be borne jointly by the states of Michigan and Wisconsin; the expense of marking the boundary line described in paragraph 2 above shall be borne equally by the states of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The expense of marking the Lake Superior boundary between Minnesota and Wisconsin shall be borne jointly by the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

"STATE OF MICHIGAN

"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

"In witness whereof:

"I, Kim Sigler, Governor of the State of Michigan, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Governor, and pursuant to the provisions of act No. 267, of the public acts of 1947, approved June 27, 1947, which ratifies paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 of the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Michigan and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Michigan.

"Done at the city of Lansing, in the State of Michigan, this 3d day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1948.

"[SEAL] (S) KIM SIGLER,
"(S) F. W. ALGERE,
"Secretary of State.

"STATE OF MINNESOTA

"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

"In witness whereof:

"I, Luther W. Youngdahl, Governor of the State of Minnesota, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Governor and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 589, Laws of Minnesota for the year 1947, approved April 26, 1947, which ratifies the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Minnesota, and have caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Minnesota.

"Done at the city of St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota, this 30th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1947.

"[SEAL] (S) LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
"Governor.
"(S) MIKE HOHN,
"Secretary of State.

"STATE OF WISCONSIN

"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

"In witness whereof:

"I, Oscar Rennebohm, Acting Governor of the State of Wisconsin, by virtue of the power vested in me as such Acting Governor, and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 222, Laws of Wisconsin for the year 1947, approved June 12, 1947, which ratifies the foregoing compact, have hereunto set my hand for and on behalf of the State of Wisconsin and have cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Wisconsin.

"Done at the city of Madison in the State of Wisconsin, this 22d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1947.

"[SEAL] (S) OSCAR RENNEBOHM,
"Acting Governor.
"(S) ROBERT C. ZIMMERMAN,
"Assistant Secretary of State."

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or in any manner affect any right of the United States.

RECIPROCAL EXEMPTION OF FOREIGN AIRCRAFT EARNINGS—BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The bill (H. R. 5448) to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code was announced as next in order.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana asks for an explanation of the bill. The bill was reported from the Committee on Finance by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Finance should make explanation of the bill. He is expected to be present momentarily. I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over until the completion of the call of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5275) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ESTATE OF ANTHONY D. CHAMBERLAIN

The bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of the estate of Anthony D. Chamberlain, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DUDLEY TARVER

The bill (H. R. 762) for the relief of Dudley Tarver was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DARWIN SLUMP

The bill (H. R. 2728) for the relief of Darwin Slump was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BESSIE B. BLACKNALL

The bill (H. R. 3113) for the relief of Bessie B. Blacknall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. RUSSELL COULTER

The bill (H. R. 3328) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Coulter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIZZIE REYNOLDS, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 550) for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The bill (S. 2518) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization was announced as next in order.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska asks for an explanation of the bill. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair will make the explanation from the Chair.

This is a bill to increase the official representation of the United States at the seat of the United Nations. At the present time the official representation consists of one ambassador and a deputy. The work has so heavily increased that it is impossible for one ambassa-

dor and his deputy, particularly if one of them happens to be ill, to carry the responsibility involved. The bill would add one additional deputy and would also authorize the deputizing of any other Government official who has been confirmed by the Senate, to act in a special capacity.

The bill also places the salary and emoluments of the first American representative, the Chief Ambassador, Mr. Austin, on the basis of class 1 ambassadorial rank.

The bill is unanimously reported from the committee and is seriously essential for the sake of our adequate representation.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

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

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

Be it enacted etc., That the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 be amended to read:

"SEC. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a respresentative of the United States and a deputy representative to the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. The representative shall receive compensation at the rate of $25,000 per annum and the deputy representative shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. Such representative and deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as United States representative on any organ, commission, or body of the United Nations, other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may from time to time direct.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an additional deputy representative of the United States in the Security Council who shall receive annual compensation of $12,000, and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the event of the absence or disability of the representative or deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations.

"(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. One of the representatives shall be designated as the senior representative. Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period as the President may specify, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under this subsection as a representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

"(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations at such salaries, not to exceed $12,000 each per annum, as he shall determine, but the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such council (A) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representative and deputy representatives appointed under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter. The advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative.

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall preclude the President or the Secretary of State, at the direction of the President, from representing the United States at any meeting or session of any organ or agency of the United Nations.

"SEC. 3. The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the respective organs and agencies of the United Nations, shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President transmitted by the Secretary of State unless other means of transmission is directed by the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Charter of the United Nations.

"SEC. 4. The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. He shall make special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and on the participation therein under his instructions, of the representative of the United States.

"SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Charter, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under said Charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates or evades or attempts to violate or evade any order, rule, or regulation issued by the President pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or, if a natural person, be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation or evasion shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, or vehicle, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

"SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said Charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and without regard to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933, as amended, and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, travel expenses of families and transportation of effects of United States representatives and other personnel in going to and returning from their post of duty, allowance for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a); cost of living allowances for personnel stationed abroad under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; communication services; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services, by contract; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; rent of offices; printing and binding, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); official entertainment and representation; the lease or rental (for periods not exceeding 10 years) of living quarters for the use of the representative of the United States to the United Nations, the cost of installation and use of telephones in the same manner as telephone service is provided for use of the Foreign Service pursuant to the act of August 23, 1912, as amended (31 U. S. C. 679), and the allotment of funds, similar to the allotment authorized by section 902 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, for unusual expenses incident to the operation and maintenance

of such living quarters, to be accounted for in accordance with section 903 of said act; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5)."

ESTATE OF T. L. MORRIS

The bill (H. R. 1667) for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

H. C. BIERING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1308) for the relief of H. C. Biering, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out the word "acting" and insert "for his own account and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 8, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$11,212.05" and insert "$7,057.96."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 10, after the name "Biering", to strike out "against the United States arising out of losses of interest, by reasons of the erroneous issuance of the Alien Property Custodian on October 11, 1943, of vesting order No. 2392, which resulted in the seizure of $67,066.55 from H. C. Biering, acting as attorney in fact" and insert "and said E. A. M. Biering against the United States for expenses necessarily incurred in contesting the erroneous issuance by the Alien Property Custodian on October 11, 1943, of vesting order No. 2392, which resulted in the seizure of $67,066.55 from said H. C. Biering, acting as attorney in fact for said E. A. M. Biering, and in securing the return of the sum so seized."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EMANCIPATION OF CERTAIN INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1113) to emancipate United States Indians in certain cases, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That any Indian who is a citizen of the United States and who wishes to be freed of the disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians may, upon reaching the age of 21, apply to any naturalization court for the area in which he resides for a "decree or judgment of competency." The court shall set a hearing date not less than 30 days nor more than 60 days from the day it receives the application; and under regulations adopted by the court notify the head of the local, county, or parish governmental unit; the local welfare department of State, county, and city government; the superintendent of the applicant's tribe; and the head of the tribal council or other governing body, if a member of a tribe, or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and any other persons the court considers appropriate.

SEC. 2. At the hearing the court shall examine the applicant and may require the persons who appear before the court to give testimony in the matter of the applicant's competency to the court in determining the applicant's competency. The United States attorney of the district and the attorney for the county or parish in which such court is situated shall be given an opportunity to appear at such hearing and to participate in the examination of the applicant and other witnesses. In determining competency, the court shall consider significant factors bearing upon the applicant's moral and intellectual qualifications and his ability to manage his own affairs. If the court finds the applicant competent, it shall issue a "decree or judgment of competency," freeing him of all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians; and the recipient shall no longer be entitled to share any of the benefits or gratuitous service extended to Indians as such by the United States, except as to such services as are required under the provisions of this act. In the event the court denies a "decree or judgment of competency," the applicant may file a new application 1 year following the date of denial. Upon the entry of a decree or judgment of competency to any applicant, such applicant shall file a certified copy thereof with the Secretary of the Interior, who shall maintain such copy as a public record.

The form of a decree or judgment of competency under this act shall be substantially as follows:

"DECREE OF COMPETENCY

"Whereas _____, a member of
(name of applicant)
the _____ Tribe of Indians, has made
(name of tribe)
application to the _____ for
(designation of court)
a decree of competency under the provisions of the act of Congress approved _____
_____:
(date of enactment)

"Now, therefore, this court, upon consideration of such application and the evidence submitted in support thereof, finds and hereby declares the said _____ to be
(name of applicant)
fully competent and capable of transacting _____ own business and caring for
(his or her)
_____ own individual affairs.
(his or her)

"Done in open court this _____ day of _____.

"_____
(Name of judge)

"Attest: _____."
(Clerk of court)

SEC. 3. When presented with a "decree or judgment of competency," the Secretary of the Interior shall within 90 days give the applicant full ownership and control of the money and property held in trust for him as an individual Indian by the Secretary; issuing, in the case of land, appropriate patents in fee, provided the Secretary may make such provisions as he deems necessary to insure repayment of money loaned to the applicant by the Federal Government or by the tribe: *Provided*, That where the Secretary finds that with respect to inherited interests in lands held jointly or in common with other heirs by reason of the number of such heirs or size of such interest that it is impracticable to divide same according to their inherited interests, he shall sell the interest or interests of the individual Indian applicant who has been adjudged competent and pay to him or her the net proceeds of such sale.

SEC. 4. After receiving a "decree or judgment of competency," the applicant, if a member of a tribe, shall continue on the tribal rolls as a member of the tribe. Any Indian who has been adjudged competent as herein provided shall in no manner be deprived of his or her tribal rights or treaty benefits; and in no way shall he or she be alienated from any benefits or payments of funds which may accrue to the tribe, band, group, or ward of the Federal Government through settlement of claims as provided in section 12, Public Law 726, approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049). In case of the death of any member, his or her share shall descend to the heirs in accordance with the inheritance laws of the State wherein the tribe is located.

SEC. 5. Any Indian born after the date of the enactment of this act, who is a citizen of the United States, and any child of parents, either of whom has been issued "a decree or judgment of competency" shall, upon reaching the age of 21 years, be free of all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, before proceeding with the next bill, I should like to revert to Calendar 1178, House bill 1113, which was passed. I have now been advised that the Bureau wishes another week to study the bill, and I suggest that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which House bill 1113 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill will be returned to the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4725) to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, with respect to House bill 4725, Calendar 1179; Senate bill 1686, Calendar 1180; and Senate bill 1687, Calendar 1181, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has asked permission to look into the bills, and I ask that they go over for that reason.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be passed over.

The bills passed over are as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4725) to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations.

A bill (S. 1686) to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York.

A bill (S. 1687) to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS TO BROCKTON SCHOOL DISTRICT, MONTANA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1933) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "convey", insert "with the consent of the executive board of the Fork Peck Tribe"; and on page 2, line 8, after the name "United States", to insert "in trust for the Fort Peck Tribe", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey with the consent of the executive board of the Fort Peck Tribe by quitclaim deed to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont., the following-described lands located

in Brockton, Roosevelt County, Mont.: Lots 3 through 14 of block 16; lots 1 through 4 of block 9; and lots 13 through 16 of block 9.

SEC. 2. The lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be used by the grantee for school purposes, including the use as a site for housing furnished to Indian families during the school term. The conveyance of such lands shall contain the express condition that if the grantee shall fail or cease to use such lands for such purposes, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such lands, title thereto shall revert to the United States, in trust for the Fort Peck Tribe.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the typographical error on page 1, line 4, in the spelling of the word "convey" will be corrected.

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

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO JOHN F. COMPTON

The bill (S. 1941) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, a patent in fee to certain land was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, Rosebud Sioux allottee, a patent in fee to the southeast quarter of section 32, township 36 north, range 26 west, sixth principal meridian, South Dakota, containing one hundred and sixty acres.

LOANS TO CERTAIN INDIANS

The bill (H. R. 2622) to authorize loans for Indians and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSISSIPPI CENTRAL RAILROAD CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3089) for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "for", to insert "payment made in settlement and satisfaction of liability to which said Mississippi Central Railroad Co. was subjected by."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2385) to promote the progress of science to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare to secure the national defense and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MINING OF POTASH ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

The bill (S. 1050) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of potash on the public domain," approved February 7, 1927, so as to provide for the disposition of the rentals and royalties from leases issued or renewed under the act entitled "An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of potassium," approved October 2, 1917, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of potash on the public domain," approved February 7, 1927, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"All money received from royalties and rentals from any lease issued or renewed under the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to authorize exploration for and disposition of potassium,' approved October 2, 1917, shall be paid into, reserved, and appropriated as follows: 52½ percent to the reclamation fund, 10 percent to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, and 37½ percent shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury, after the expiration of each fiscal year, to the State within the boundaries of which the leased lands or deposits are or were located, such money to be used by such State or subdivision thereof for the construction and maintenance of public roads or for the support of schools or other public educational institutions, as the legislature of the State may direct."

TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS IN JEFFERSON COUNTY, ILL.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 242) to confirm title in fee simple in Joshua Britton to certain lands in Jefferson County, Ill., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE AND LEASE OF CERTAIN LANDS AND BUILDINGS IN BOULDER CITY, NEV.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1448) directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "house" to insert "including the furniture, fixtures, and appurtenances"; on page 1, line 7, after the word "the", to insert "lessee"; on page 1, line 8, after the word "house", to strike out "at" and insert "for a period of at least 90 days prior to"; and on page 3, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "(not including such proceeds as may be attributable to the lease of lands upon which such houses and apartments may be situated) shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts" and insert "shall be deposited in the Treasury and credited to the Colorado River Dam fund established by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell each house, including the furniture, fixtures, and appurtenances, acquired from the Defense Homes Corporation and situated on land in Boulder City, Nev., to the lessee occupant thereof, if such occupant (1) occupied the house for a period of at least 90 days prior to the time it was acquired from the Defense Homes Corporation and occupies it at the time of sale, (2) is at the time of sale an employee of the United States Government or person regularly employed or conducting a business or profession in Boulder City, and (3) desires to purchase the house and to lease the land upon which it is situated. The offer of sale to any such occupant shall be made within 180 days after enactment of this act and the sale shall be completed within a reasonable time after such offer. The sale price shall not exceed the amount at which the house was carried on the books of the Defense Homes Corporation at the date of transfer to the Secretary. The sale contract and documents of title shall contain (1) a provision prohibiting resale within 3 years at a price exceeding the price paid the Secretary and (2) a provision prohibiting resale on any terms during such period unless resale on such terms shall first have been offered to, and refused by, the Secretary. The Secretary is authorized and directed to lease the lot on which each house so sold is situated to the purchaser of such house in accordance with the provisions set out under the heading "Boulder Canyon Project" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 406, 437).

The Secretary is authorized to lease all apartments acquired from Defense Homes Corporation and all houses so acquired and not sold pursuant to this act, together with the lands upon which situated, upon such terms and conditions as he may see fit in accordance with existing law.

All proceeds from the sale and lease of houses and apartments by the Secretary pursuant to this act shall be deposited in the Treasury and credited to the Colorado River Dam fund established by section 2 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057).

The amendments were agreed to.

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

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO CITY OF PIERRE, S. DAK.

The bill (S. 1925) to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Pierre, S. Dak., all of the rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described as all of blocks 1, 2, 3, and 4, Yaple's addition to the town, now city of Pierre, and lots 5 to 12 of block 23 and all of block 34, Ash's second addition to the town, now city of Pierre, S. Dak.

MRS. CHRISTINE WEST AND MRS. JESSE WEST

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1062) for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the name "Montana", to strike out "in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States, the sum of $2,500, representing the fair value of her house which was razed in 1939 by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps, Indian Division, of the Fort Peck Agency, in connection with a project for the restoration of grazing ranges on submarginal lands, and (2) Mrs. Jesse West, of Wolf Point, Mont., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States, the sum of $300, representing the fair value of certain buildings, owned by her late deceased husband, which were seized and removed in 1939 by such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps in connection with such project" and insert "the sum of $1,000 representing compensation for her outstanding right, title and interest in 340 acres of land and all improvements thereon, tract 215B, Roosevelt County,

State of Montana, adverse to the title of the United States under deed from Christ Christofferson dated on December 2, 1936, recorded in the land records of the said county on December 12, 1936, in volume 62 on page 190, and for any and all damages to a dwelling formerly located thereon, which was destroyed by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1939, upon submission of evidence satisfactory to the Attorney General of a right, title or interest adverse to the record title of the United States, and, upon delivery of a quitclaim deed conveying such right, title or interest to the United States, together with a release to the United States of any and all claims for damages resulting from the possession or use of the land by the United States prior to the transfer of title, and (2) to Mrs. Jesse West, of Wolf Point, Mont., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States, the sum of $250, representing the fair value of certain buildings owned by her late deceased husband, upon proof of title, right or interest by Christine West to the lands on which they were situated when seized and destroyed in 1939 by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Mrs. Christine West, of Poplar, Mont., the sum of $1,000 representing compensation for her outstanding right, title, and interest in 340 acres of land and all improvements thereon, tract 215B, Roosevelt County, State of Montana, adverse to the title of the United States under deed from Christ Christofferson dated on December 2, 1936, recorded in the land records of the said county on December 12, 1936, in volume 62 on page 190, and for any and all damages to a dwelling formerly located thereon, which was destroyed by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1939, upon submission of evidence satisfactory to the Attorney General of a right, title, or interest adverse to the record title of the United States, and, upon delivery of a quitclaim deed conveying such right, title, or interest to the United States, together with a release to the United States of any and all claims for damages resulting from the possession or use of the land by the United States prior to the transfer of title; and

(2) to Mrs. Jesse West, of Wolf Point, Mont., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States, the sum of $250, representing the fair value of certain buildings owned by her late deceased husband, upon proof of title, right, or interest by Christine West to the lands on which they were situated when seized and destroyed in 1939 by enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ALLIED AVIATION CORP.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp. was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator who made the objection withhold it for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. I shall be glad to withhold it temporarily.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say that the process leading up to the bill which is now before the Senate arises out of a war contract. In order that the committee of the Senate which considered the matter might not have any conflict in testimony, the Navy Department, through its general counsel, and the claimant agreed on a set of facts. In other words, there is no dispute about the facts involved in this claim. When the facts were submitted to the committee, the committee unanimously agreed that the claim was just. The Navy entered into that conclusion. So there is no dispute either on the part of the Navy or the claimant as to what the facts are or as to the justice of the claim. The Senator from Kentucky can correct me if I make any misstatements in that respect. He was chairman of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator explain the amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to do so. When the facts were presented to the committee, the committee not only reached the conclusion that the amount as carried in the bill as it passed the House was fair, but that the claimant was entitled to more money than the amount which had been allowed on the former consideration.

Mr. HATCH. Had that set of facts been submitted to the House of Representatives?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think as complete a set of facts had been submitted to the House of Representatives. I am not sure about this statement, but my recollection is that the complete set of facts was submitted to the Senate, but not a complete set of facts was submitted to the House.

I hope the Senator from North Dakota will not object, in view of the fact that now the Government is in complete accord with the facts as presented by the claimant, and the claim seems to be approved by all the parties concerned.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is with the deepest regret that I am forced to object to the present consideration of the bill, the reason for my doing so being that I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, which had this matter under consideration, but unfortunately I could not attend a certain meeting of the committee, because I was busy on the work of the Committee on Civil Service.

But I shall be glad to look into this bill, so as to be prepared to agree to its consideration at the next call of the calendar.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is perfectly satsfactory. I did not know the Senator had not had an opportunity to look into the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to state, for the benefit of the Senator from North Dakota, that the statement the Senator from Maryland has made with respect to the consideration of this bill by the subcommittee is a correct statement, and at the proper time I shall elaborate on it for the guidance of the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

CREDIT FOR SERVICE AS CADET, MIDSHIPMAN, OR AVIATION CADET

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 657) to provide that service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet shall be credited for pay purposes, and that service as a cadet or midshipman shall be credited for retirement purposes, in the case of military and naval personnel, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 3A of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Insert after the word "appointments" in line 6 of the said section as it appears in section 1 of the act of September 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 729), the words "as cadets, as midshipmen, as aviation or flying cadets, or".

(b) Insert after the words "Regular Army Reserve," in line 8 of the said section as it appears in section 1 of the act of September 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 729), the words "the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army,".

(c) Strike out the period at the end of the first sentence of the said section, substitute a comma therefore, and insert after the comma the following: "and for all periods of service as a contract surgeon serving full time.".

SEC. 2. The amendment to section 3A of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, made by this act, shall be applicable to the active-duty pay and to the retired, retirement, or retainer pay of all persons heretofore or hereafter separated from the active list, whose pay is affected by that section, but the service authorized to be credited therein for pay purposes shall not be credited for purposes of establishing eligibility for voluntary retirement.

SEC. 3. This act shall be applicable to personnel of the Air Force of the United States to the same extent as applicable to personnel of the other armed forces of the United States.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first month following its enactment, and no back pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize crediting of service as a cadet, mid-

shipman, or aviation cadet for pay purposes, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1561) to protect the national security of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over, under objection.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS, NURSE CORPS OF THE ARMY AND THE NAVY

The bill (H. R. 4090) to equalize retirement benefits among members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDUSTRIAL AND OTHER SCHOOLS FOR ARMY ENLISTED MEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 295) to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C., Supp. V, 535), is further amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to detail personnel of the Army of the United States, without regard to component, as students at such technical, professional, and other civilian educational institutions, or as students, observers, or investigators at such industrial plants, hospitals, and other places as shall be best suited to enable such personnel to acquire knowledge or experience in the specialties in which it is deemed necessary that such personnel shall perfect themselves, and any officer or warrant officer who receives such instruction shall, immediately upon termination thereof, be ordered to active duty for a period at least equal to the duration of his period of instruction but not greater than 4 years, except that where the duration of such training is 90 days or less, such subsequent active duty may be at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That no member of the National Guard or the Organized Reserve Corps shall be detailed as a student, observer, or investigator pursuant to the provisions of this act nor be ordered to active duty as herein provided except with his own consent, and, in the case of a member of the National Guard of the United States, with the approval of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, whichever is concerned: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army may require that an enlisted man, prior to his detail pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph, shall be discharged and reenlisted in his component for a period of not less than 3 years; and the total length of detail of an enlisted man pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent of his enlistment period: *And provided further*, That at no time shall more than 8 percent of the authorized commissioned officer strength, 8 percent of the authorized warrant officer strength, or 2 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Regular Army, or more than 8 percent of the actual commissioned officer strength, 8 percent of the actual warrant officer strength, or 2 percent of the actual enlisted strength of all Reserve components of the Army (including in the computation of the actual strength of each such class of Reserve personnel persons in active or inactive duty status), be detailed as students pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph."

SEC. 2. All expenditures incident to the detail of personnel as students at such technical, professional, and other civilian educational institutions, or as students, observers, or investigators at such industrial plants, hospitals, and other places, as provided herein, shall be paid from any appropriated Department of the Army funds.

SEC. 3. The provisions of the foregoing section shall be equally applicable to the Department of the Air Force: *Provided*, That all reference therein to the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, the Regular Army, the National Guard of the United States, and the Army of the United States shall, insofar as they apply to the Department of the Air Force, be construed for the purpose of this section as referring to the Secretary of the Air Force, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force of the United States, respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes, under the rule.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure I shall not us that much time.

This bill authorizes the sending of enlisted men of the three services to industrial schools.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that all the bill does?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no objection to that.

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

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

NAVAL SALVAGE FACILITIES

The bill (H. R. 4490) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the present time on the east coast and the west coast there are insufficient salvage facilities for offshore ship protection and ship salvage.

This bill would permit the Navy to use up to $3,000,000 to help finance salvage companies, to enable them to carry on offshore salvage operations, particularly on the west coast. At first there were objections from some persons on the west coast. The objections have been satisfied, and I believe the bill now is entirely agreeable to all the salvage companies that are equipped for deep-sea salvage operations on both the east coast and the west coast.

If a bill of this character is not enacted so as to help the Navy, we may well lose some our very valuable ships because of the inability to salvage them if anything happens to them while they are at sea.

Mr. AIKEN. This bill provides, does it not, for giving the companies $3,000,000 to enlarge their salvage facilities?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill authorizes the Navy to put up to $3,000,000 into salvage operations. The Navy hopes to get it back in the form of successful salvage operations. The bill does not permit the use of more than $3,000,000 for this purpose.

This character of work was done all during the war, and it is necessary to carry it on now. The enactment of this bill is necessary because of the lack of profit in the carrying on of this business by private contractors.

I believe there is no objection to the bill in its present form. All companies that are engaged in these operations are agreeable to the bill as it is now constituted.

Mr. AIKEN. Three million dollars is a rather small sum for the Navy to ask permission to give away, it seems to me, in comparison with what the Navy has been giving away. Perhaps the smallness of the sum arouses my suspicions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection.

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

MEDICAL TREATMENT OF PERSONS IN THE NAVAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 1275) to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes; and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MIDSHIPMEN FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2034) to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BYRD. The bill applies to the District of Columbia, and it increases the number of midshipmen from the District of Columbia at the Naval Academy from 5 to 15, in proportion to the increase given to the States which have relatively the same population as the District of Columbia. The increase is made on the basis of that allowed for the State of Vermont, which has approximately the same population as the District of Columbia. The bill simply permits District of Columbia representation to that extent at the Naval Academy.

The following bill on the calendar does the same thing with respect to the Military Academy.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to inquire who makes the appointments from the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRD. The appointments are made on the basis of an examination, by the Commissioners.

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

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that the following bill, calendar 404, Senate bill 2033, provides for an increase in the number of cadets from the District of Columbia at the United States Military Academy. Is the increase provided in Senate bill 2034 in the same proportion as the increase provided in Senate bill 2033?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. In Senate bill 2033 the number is increased from 6 to 12, which is in the same proportion.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2034) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy," approved December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the words "and five for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and fifteen for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. The increase in appointments provided in this act shall be accomplished by the appointment of not more than five during each of the years 1948 and 1949.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The bill (S. 2033) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306), was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the principle of this bill is the same as that of the preceding bill. In this case the bill applies to the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy. It increases the number of cadets allotted to the District of Columbia, and does so on the basis of providing equality with States having relatively the same population as that of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANGER. How many cadets will be permitted to be appointed from the District of Columbia, if the bill is passed?

Mr. BYRD. The bill provides for an increase in the number of cadets coming from the District of Columbia from 6 to 12.

Mr. LANGER. If the population of the District of Columbia decreases, will the number of cadets be decreased?

Mr. BYRD. The point is that at the present time the number of cadets coming from the District of Columbia is on a different ratio to population, as compared with the number of cadets coming from the States. The bill will make the ratio for the District of Columbia, as compared to its population, the same as that with respect to the States.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306), be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the word "six" preceding the words "District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twelve."

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF AVIATION CADETS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1599) to prescribe the pay and allowances of aviation cadets in the Air Corps, Regular Army, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, in line 9, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Air Force"; and on page 2, in line 6, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Air Force"; in line 12, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Air Force"; and in line 18, after the words "of the", to strike out "Army" and insert "Air Force", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 239), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The base pay of an aviation cadet shall be the same as that now or hereafter provided by law for a cadet undergoing instruction at the United States Military Academy. In addition, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force, aviation cadets shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their base pay when, as a part of their course of instruction, they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and pursuant to such requirement they do participate in regular and frequent aerial flights. Aviation cadets shall be paid, in addition, a money allowance for subsistence at such rates as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe and shall, while undergoing training, be furnished quarters, medical care, and hospitalization and shall be issued uniforms, clothing, and equipment at Government expense. No aviation cadet shall be entitled to receive longevity pay. While traveling under orders, they shall, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe, receive transportation and reimbursement for necessary expenses incurred which are incident to such travel, or cash in lieu thereof. When traveling by air under competent orders, they shall receive the same allowances for traveling expenses as are now or may hereafter be authorized by law for officers of the Air Force."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prescribe the pay and allowances of aviation cadets in the United States Air Force, and for other purposes."

ENLISTED PERSONNEL IN AVIATION TACTICAL UNITS

The bill (S. 1216) to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the statute which this bill seeks to repeal was enacted in 1926 during the period of expansion of the Army and Navy Air Force components. Since the statute applies only in times of peace, the provisions have not been in effect since 1939. During the war years, with few exceptions, most combat pilots were commissioned officers. Both the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force indicate that it is impractical to train sufficient enlisted pilots to meet the requirement that 20 percent of pilots in aviation tactical units shall be enlisted pilots. The pending bill would repeal the provision of law that in peacetime enlisted men should compose 20 percent of the pilot strength of the Army and Navy Air Forces. The plan followed now of course is to send the enlisted men to officers' candidate schools, and as soon as they graduate and become pilots, to give them officers' commissions.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That paragraph 8 of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended by the act of June 30, 1932 (ch. 326, 47 Stat. 451), and so much of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended by the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 781) reading "On and after July 1, 1929, and in time of peace, not less than 20 percent of the total number of pilots employed in tactical units of the Air Corps shall be enlisted men, except when the Secretary of War shall determine that it is impractical to secure that number of enlisted pilots.", are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the status of enlisted personnel of the armed services, including the Reserve components thereof, designated as aviation or enlisted pilots or engaged in training relating to or leading to such designation.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended by the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 781), relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and for other purposes."

RECIPROCAL EXEMPTION OF FOREIGN AIRCRAFT EARNINGS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next four bills on the calendar are appropriation bills, which will be passed over.

The clerk will state the bill which was passed over until the completion of the call of the calendar, namely, Order No. 1167, House bill 5448. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Colorado to this bill, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5448) to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] wanted an explanation of the bill. I have discussed the matter with the Senator, and he has authorized me to say that he withdraws his objection.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5448) to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 3, line 2, to strike out "1947" and insert "1945".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JURISDICTION OF PUBLIC LANDS IN OREGON

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on a previous occasion when Calendar 1144, Senate bill 580, was called, objection was made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will read the bill by its title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 580) relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I have discussed the matter with him. The objection had been made at the request of one of the departments to enable it to make certain representations. I am now advised by the senior Senator from Utah that adequate time for that purpose has elapsed, and that the Senator has no further objection to the passage of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered at this time.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my attention has just been called to something in connection with the bill, and I should like a few moments in order that I may look into it. I will confer with the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over for the time being.

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on a previous occasion I objected to calendar No. 183, Senate bill 309, on the ground that the measure was in my opinion only an idle gesture toward the Indians of America. In reality, I was using that expression, not in any spirit of contempt, but to express my deep sense that the Government is under a genuine obligation to the Indians. I know, Mr. President, that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is very much interested in the passage of this particular bill. I do not see how it can do any harm, and it might conceivably do some good. I think my own purpose has been served. Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to withdraw the objections I made previously. I am now willing that the bill be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered at this time?

Mr. HATCH. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 309) designating American Indian Day, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "requested" and to insert "authorized", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth Saturday in September of each year is hereby designated and shall hereafter be known as American Indian Day.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on such day and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies as a memorial to the aborigines of this Nation and their contributions to the establishment and maintenance of this Nation.

SEC. 3. The President is also requested to communicate this declaration, by proclamation or otherwise, to the governors of the several States, and request them to take such action as they may deem advisable in order to bring about observance of such day.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

FORT SUMTER—A NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on March 31, 1947, I introduced a bill which would establish Fort Sumter as a national monument in South Carolina. The bill was reported favorably by the committee, and on July 16, 1947, it was passed by the Senate.

Last week the House of Representatives passed Senate Joint Resolution 94 authorizing the Department of the Army to transfer Fort Sumter, without consideration, to the Director of the National Park Service under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to all, both in the Senate and in the House, for their support in passing this resolution. It will mean much, not only to the people of South Carolina but to all the people of our country who may some day have the privilege of paying a visit to this historic spot.

An article appeared yesterday in newspapers all over the country telling something of the story of Fort Sumter. I ask that this article be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this time.

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

FORT SUMTER

(By A. Lee Parsons)

A historic site has been saved from a fate worse than Yankee cannon fire. Such valiant names as Beauregard, Wigfall, Rhett, Pringle, Ashley, and numerous others will now be forever enshrined in the great national monument now assured at Fort Sumter.

Any South Carolina school child, at no more provocation than the drop of a magnolia, will instantly recall that Fort Sumter is a big chunk of brick and masonry located on a minute spit of sand commanding the entrance into Charleston Harbor. It was against these walls, the child will remind you, that Confederate cannon fire was directed during the dark morning hours of April 12, 1861. That first hurtling arc of sparks across Charleston Harbor was preceded by a flash of fire and smoke from James Island and followed by a rending report from Fort Sumter. The long-smoldering fuse had burned down to dry powder. The first shot of the War Between the States had been fired.

Up until this week Fort Sumter was on a Department of the Army list to be declared surplus property. But there were proud South Carolinians who had other ideas. United States Senator BURNET RHETT MAYBANK, himself bearing the name of one of the illustrious defenders of Fort Sumter, had long been an advocate of a national shrine at the old fort. He had introduced a bill in the Senate which would establish Fort Sumter as a national monument to be administered by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior. That bill was passed by the Senate last year. When it went to the House of Representatives it immediately received the whole-hearted support of the first district's Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS. This week the bill passed the House and with the President's approval Fort Sumter was saved from the ignominious shame of being declared surplus property.

Fort Sumter has a distinguished history. Standing out, as it does, in the entrance of Charleston Harbor, it was a lonely citadel for Maj. Robert Anderson's garrison of Union forces when he moved from Fort Moultrie, on Sullivan's Island, to Fort Sumter where he believed he would be in a better position for defense in the event of hostilities. He made the move on the night of December 26, 1860, following passage of the Ordinance of Secession by South Carolina.

President Buchanan, whose term of office would expire on March 4, 1861, avoided the momentous decision of whether to recall Anderson or send an expedition to reinforce him at the risk of provoking war. The isssue was met by Abraham Lincoln who, immediately upon assuming office, dispatched a fleet to relieve the fort.

President Lincoln probably had not reckoned with the Confederate government's new commander of military forces at Charleston. Perhaps he did not know that President Davis had elected a direct descendant of Jacques Toutant-Beauregard and Francois Marie Chevalier de Reggio. General Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard, hero of Chapultepec, Cerro Gordo and Vera Cruz, and late commander of the Military Academy at West Point, was a gentleman, a diplomat and certainly a soldier by heritage, training and deed.

With President Lincoln's relief-carrying-fleet expected at any moment, General Beauregard offered Major Anderson an opportunity to evacuate the fort. The offer was not accepted, and at 4:30 on the morning of April 12, 1861, the Confederate batteries on James Island opened fire on Fort Sumter. On April 13, after a bombardment of 34 hours, Anderson surrendered, and the War Between the States had begun.

The announcement of Congressional and Presidential approval of the transfer of Fort Sumter to the Department of the Interior brought smiles to a soft spot in the hearts of Senator MAYBANK and Congressman RIVERS and to all men who have a tender feeling for the historic fort.

Losing no time, the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior called Senator MAYBANK and informed him that their representatives would visit Charleston within the next few days to make an inspection of Fort Sumter. The Department is already setting the machinery in motion for putting its technical staffs to work on the elements of a master plan for the long-term preservation of the fort and for its exhibition and interpretation to the tens of thousands of Americans who will undoubtedly visit it when opened to the public.

Although unable to commit themselves to a definite plan at this time, officials of the Department of the Interior report that this new national monument will be recreated from original maps of the old fort. Guide and interpretation services will be provided. Comfort stations will be built. Transportation arrangements will be made for getting visitors out to the island.

The unbowed pride of the confederacy, the grand old fort which never surrendered under the Confederate flag, stands ready to rise now to even greater heights in the eyes of men who will come across miles and miles of plains, mountains, and oceans to visit her in her glorious new role as a national shrine.

WOMEN'S CORPS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes, together with a message from the House insisting upon its amendments and requesting a conference with the Senate thereon:

On page 1, line 4, to strike out "Integration Act of 1947" and insert "Reserve Act of 1948."

On page 1, strike out all after line 5 over to and including line 15 on page 11.

On page 11, after line 15, insert:

"ARMY"

On page 11, line 16, strike out "109" and insert "101."

On page 12, lines 6 and 7, to strike out "Women's Army Corps" and insert "such female persons."

On page 12, line 20, to strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

On page 12, line 23, strike out all after "371)," down to and including "title", in line 24.

On page 13, line 4, to strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

On page 13, line 6, to strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

On page 13, line 13, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

On page 13, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 102. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2a of the act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 239, 80th Cong.), neither (1) the act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), nor (2) the act of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728, ch. 414), as amended, insofar as it pertains to officers of the Women's Army Corps heretofore appointed thereunder, shall be repealed until that date which is 12 months after the date of enactment of this act."

On page 13, to strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 2 on page 28.

On page 28, after line 2, insert:

"NAVY AND MARINE CORPS"

On page 28, line 3, strike out "212" and insert "201."

On page 28, line 5, after the word "out", to insert "the present caption and."

On page 28, after line 6, insert:

"TITLE V

"WOMEN IN THE NAVAL RESERVE"

On page 28, lines 9 and 10, to strike out "ratings, grades, or ranks" and insert "ratings or grades."

On page 28, line 18, after "assigned" insert "*Provided*, That they shall not be assigned to duty in aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions nor shall they be assigned to duty on vessels of the Navy except hospital ships and naval transports."

On page 29, line 17, to strike out "ratings, grades, or ranks" and insert "ratings or grades."

On page 29, line 19, strike out all after "of" down to and including "Reserve" in line 22, and insert "the Women's Armed Services Reserve Act of 1948, and such transfer of enlisted personnel shall be for a period to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy."

On page 29, line 23, to strike out "213" and insert "202."

On page 29, line 24, to strike out "Regular."

On page 29, line 24, after "Corps" insert "Reserve."

On page 30 line 3, to strike out "Regular."

On page 30, line 3, after "Corps" insert "Reserve."

On page 30, line 4, to strike out "Regular Navy" and insert "Naval Reserve."

On page 30, strike out lines 5 to 25 inclusive, and lines 1 to 15 inclusive on page 31, and insert:

"TITLE III

"AIR FORCE

"SEC. 301. (a) Effective on the date of enactment of this title, the appointment and enlistment of women in the Officers' and Enlisted Section of the Air Force Reserve shall be authorized.

"(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now applicable to male commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall be applicable respectively, to female commissioned officers and former commissioned officers, to enlisted women and former enlisted women, of the Air Force Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to such female persons: *Provided*, That the husbands of such female persons shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such female persons shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mothers for their chief support.

"(c) Appointments of women to commissioned grade in the Air Force Reserve may be made by the President alone in grades from lieutenant colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force: *Provided*, That any person who has served satisfactorily in the temporary grade of colonel in the Women's Army Corps established by act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed in the grade of colonel in the Air Force Reserve.

"(d) Enlistments of women in the Air Force Reserve may be accepted under the provisions of law now applicable to enlistments of male persons in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, under such regulations, in such grades, or ratings, and for such periods of time as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force.

"(e) The President may form any or all such female persons of the Air Force Reserve into such organizations and units as he may prescribe.

"(f) The Secretary of the Air Force shall prescribe the military authority which any female person in the Air Force Reserve may exercise, and the kind of military duty to which such female persons may be assigned: *Provided*, That female persons of the Air Force shall not be assigned to aircraft while such aircraft are engaged in combat missions."

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes."

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House; agree to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has completed the call of the calendar under the order of the Senate. There is nothing officially before the Senate at the moment.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1210, House bill 6055.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1079, House bill 3433.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is already a motion pending to proceed to the consideration of House bill 6055.

Mr. BUCK. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is a motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6055.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and

that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1080, House bill 3998.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1080, House bill 3998? The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3998) to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this goes back to the old bills on the calendar.

Mr. CAIN. That is quite correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The understanding was, when the unanimous-consent order was made last Thursday, that the calendar would be called for the consideration of unobjected-to bills, commencing with order No. 1155. I have no objection to the consideration of House bill 3998, because it is a District of Columbia bill, but I want to make it plain that if we go back beyond the unanimous-consent agreement there might be Senators who would like to be heard and will not have an opportunity to be heard. I shall not object in this particular case, because I think the bill is probably not of particular interest to a great many Senators, but I do feel that we should keep faith with the unanimous-consent order passed last Thursday.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is entitled to a reason for the consideration of this bill. It is my understanding that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] objected to consideration of the bill on the last call of the calendar, for the reason that the junior Senator from Washington, who had represented him within the committee was absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3998) to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the problem covered by House bill 3998 arises by reason of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on June 5, 1944, in the case of *United States* v. *Southeastern Underwriters Association, et al.* (322 U. S. 533, 88 L. ed. 1440), which held that the business of insurance was commerce, and that when it was conducted across State lines it became interstate commerce, and, therefore, subject to the Sherman Antitrust Act. Following the decision, Congress, by Public Law 15, provided a moratorium, giving the right to the several States to enact local regulations or to become subject to the antitrust laws. This moratorium will expire on June 30, 1948.

In a word, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the regulation of insurance rates in the District of Columbia. It is not intended that it shall become a model for any other State. Its passage has been strongly recommended by the Commissioners and by the Insurance Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 22, after the word "reinsurance", to insert "other than joint reinsurance to the extent provided in this act,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 2, after the word "title", to insert the word "insurance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendments were, in section 3, on page 3, line 19, after the word "by", to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "upon", to insert the word "the"; in line 4, after the word "experience", to strike out "purpose of insurance"; in line 6, after the words "reasonable considerations", to insert "attributable to such risks"; in line 13, after the words "contract of", to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies"; in line 15, after the word "by", to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies"; in line 17, after the word "may", to strike out "be made" and to insert "become"; at the beginning of line 18, to insert "upon filing"; in line 23, after the word "Act", insert "Rates for contracts or policies described in the last sentence of subsection (c) of section 4 of this act may become effective when made and filing thereof shall be made promptly thereafter"; and on page 5, after line 2, to insert:

(g) No company, agent, or broker shall make, issue, or deliver, or knowingly permit the making, issuance, or delivery of any policy of insurance within the scope of this act contrary to pertinent filings which are in effect for the company as provided in this act, except that upon the written application of the insured stating his reasons therefor, filed with and approved by the Superintendent, a rate in excess of that provided by a filing otherwise applicable may be used on any specific risk.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 2, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(g) No company, agent, or broker shall make, issue, or deliver, or knowingly permit the making, issuance, or delivery of any policy of insurance within the scope of this act contrary to pertinent filings which are in effect for the company as provided in this act, except that upon the written application of the insured stating his reasons therefor, filed with and approved by the Superintendent, a rate in excess of that provided by a filing otherwise applicable may be used on any specific risk.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 13, to strike out "January 1, 1948" and insert "July 1, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 2, after the words "are not", to strike out "being made."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 1, after the word "policy", to insert "other than one of workmen's compensation or automobile liability insurance," and on line 3, after the words "authority, or", to insert "a contract or policy of any type."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 17, after the word "more", to strike out "admitted insurers" and insert "companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 20, after the word "No", to strike "insurer" and insert "company."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 2, after the words "furnishing to", to strike out "admitted insurers" and insert "companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when permission was asked for the consideration of the bill, the request referred to Calendar No. 1079, and the bill now being amended is Calendar No. 1080, House bill 3998.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request was subsequently altered. The Senator from Delaware was in error in his original request and subsequently changed the request to apply to Calendar No. 1080.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. I notice the bill proposes to provide a complete system of insurance regulations for the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is precisely correct.

Mr. LANGER. Does it provide regulations similar to those in the States?

Mr. CAIN. It differs in degree from what is done in various States. There is no uniform procedure being followed in the several States under Public Law 15.

Mr. LANGER. Has the insurance commissioner in the State of Washington the right and authority to fix the rates, as he is being given authority in the pending bill?

Mr. CAIN. Public Law 15 gave the States throughout the land the authority and right to regulate rates as they thought proper.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 6, after the words "fleet of", to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 14, to strike out:

(e) as any other type of group, association, or organization, for such purposes, other than those heretofore described in this section, as the Superintendent may, after investigation, approve as being in the interest of the insuring public of the District.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 24, after the words "organization of",

to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 10, after the word "No", to strike out "such."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 21, after the words "Furnished by", to strike out "Insurers" and insert "Companies," and on line 23, after the word "every", to strike out "insurer" and insert "company."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 4, after the word "every", to strike out "insurer" and insert "company"; on line 9, after the words "request to", to strike out "review" and insert "revise"; on line 11, after the words "organization or", to strike out "insurer" and insert "company"; on line 15, after the words "or such", to strike out "insurer" and insert "company"; on line 20, before the word "may", to strike out "insurer" and insert "company."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 14, after the word "act" and the period, to insert "The expense of such examination shall be paid by the company or rating organization examined. In lieu of such examination the Superintendent may, in his discretion, accept a report of examination made by any other insurance supervisory authority."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 2, after the words "organization of", to strike out "insurers" and insert "companies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 4, to strike out:

The Superintendent shall have no authority at any hearing to compel the attendance of witnesses or to require adherence to formal rules of pleading or evidence. At the request of a party or parties in interest at any hearing, he shall administer oath and shall make a record of the hearing, and upon request of such party or parties he shall make and certify a transcript of the record, the cost of such record and transcript to be paid by the party or parties requesting same.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 12, to insert a new subsection as follows:

(d) The Superintendent may designate one or more rating organizations or other agencies to assist him in gathering statistical data and in making such compilations thereof as may be necessary for the proper administration of this act. Such compilations shall be made available, subject to reasonable rules promulgated by the Superintendent, to companies and rating organizations.

The Superintendent shall have no authority at any hearing to compel the attendance of witnesses and he shall not be required to adhere to formal rules of pleading or evidence. At the request of a party or parties in interest made prior to any hearing, he shall administer oaths to witnesses and shall permit such party or parties, at the cost and expense of one who so requests, to have made a record of the hearing, which record upon request of such party or parties the Superintendent shall certify.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 17, line 6, after the word "shall", to strike out "take effect October 1, 1947" and insert "become effective 30 days after approval."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington explain what is meant by lines 10, 11, and 12 on page 9, which provide:

No group, association, or organization shall engage in any unfair or unreasonable practice in the conduct of its business.

Is there a definition anywhere in the bill of what is an "unfair or unreasonable practice"?

Mr. CAIN. Not so far as I know. I dare say the insurance commissioner of the District of Columbia would be guided by the rules and regulations and directives which have been in operation in the past in defining what is or is not unfair competition or an unreasonable practice. The term is not otherwise defined in the bill, to my knowledge.

I should like to say to the Senator from North Dakota that this particular provision was among the other provisions very carefully examined by the Insurance Commissioner of the District of Columbia, whom Congress holds responsible, and it had his strong support and approval.

Mr. LANGER. What bothers me about the bill is whether the insurance companies can get together and fix prices they are to charge for all the different forms of insurance which are listed. I should like to know about that aspect.

Mr. CAIN. Their ability to do so is subject to review by the Commissioner and approval by him, and in that sense the operation would be no different in the District of Columbia, which is construed to be a State, than in any of the 48 States.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator before him the public law he mentioned a moment ago?

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if I might see it?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to hand it to the Senator. The reason why we are pressing for action is that Public Law 15 will expire on the 30th day of June this year.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill was taken up unexpectedly, and I had no opportunity to look into it. I should like to have just a moment. I may ask the Senator from Washington whether it sets aside the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Mr. CAIN. I refer the Senator to section 3, subdivision (b), of the law, reading as follows:

Nothing contained in this act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

If the bill now before the Senate, or a similar measure, shall not be passed by June 30, 1948, the Sherman Antitrust Act and other Federal regulations will apply as to business being done within the District of Columbia, because the District is construed to be a State.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator very much.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 3998) was read the third time and passed.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Legislative branch," on page 2, after line 1, to insert:

SENATE

Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For an amount necessary ($3,150) to pay the basic salaries from May 1 to June 30, 1948, inclusive, of the following positions: Clerks—one at $2,500; one at $2,400; four at $1,980 each; one at $1,950: *Provided*, That one position of clerk in folding room at $1,740 per annum be abolished after April 30, 1948; in all, $3,150; and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1948 hereby is amended accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, as authorized by Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, including per diem and subsistence expenses without regard to the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, approved June 3, 1926, as amended, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 18, to insert:

Furniture and repairs: For an additional amount for materials for furniture and repairs of same, exclusive of labor, and for the purchase of furniture, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery of $200 for each Senator and the President of the Senate, for the second session of the Eightieth Congress, $19,400, to remain available until December 31, 1948.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

For stationery for committees and offices of the Senate, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 3, after line 3, to insert:

For payment to Adah H. Zimmerman, widow of Orville Zimmerman, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 5, to insert:

TEMPORARY CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board created by the act to establish a National Aviation Council, and for other purposes (Public Law 287, 80th Cong.), to be available until June 30, 1948, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman, $5,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be made in accordance with the laws applicable to inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—Federal Security Agency," on page 7, after line 22, to insert:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Public-health services, Philippine Islands: The maximum price limitations on the purchase of passenger motor vehicles established by or pursuant to section 202 of the act of May 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 106, 131), or section 5 (c) (1) of the act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U. S. C. 78), shall not be construed to be applicable to passenger motor vehicles purchased in the Philippine Islands, during the calendar year 1946, by the Public Health Service for public-health work in such islands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 7, to insert:

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Such sums as may be necessary are hereby appropriated for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949 payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4): *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for such purpose under the authority of this paragraph shall be charged to the appropriation therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1949: *Provided further*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1948 in accordance with such Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 8, after line 21, to insert:

Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: For an additional amount for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration," $1,850,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 2, after the word "seamen", to strike out "$840,000" and insert "$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency", on page 9, after line 8, to insert:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

Plans for elimination of structural and fire hazards, Executive Mansion: For preparation of plans for the elimination of structural and fire hazards in the Executive Mansion, including a survey of the structural condition of the building; the preparation of drawings and specifications for replacement of the existing wooden second-floor structure by a fire-resistant type of construction and for the installation of equipment, devices, and means for modernization of the building; and the making of a report to the Congress of the scope and estimated cost of work required to execute such plans; $50,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 3, to insert:

HOUSING EXPEDITER

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Housing Expediter (Housing and Rent Act of 1948): For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 (Public Law 464, approved March 30, 1948), $2,000,000; and the unexpended balances of the appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Housing Expediter," in the Government Corporation's Appropriation Act, 1948, and "Salaries and expenses, Office of Rent Control," in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, are hereby consolidated with and made a part of this appropriation, the total thereof to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall be available for all of the objects and purposes of said appropriations (except as such purposes may be limited by the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 or other law), and for a health-service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150): *Provided*, That the provision of the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Housing Expediter," in the Government Corporation's Appropriation Act, 1948, making $1,908,000 available exclusively for terminal leave, is hereby repealed: *Provided further*, That the limitation under the head "Salaries and expenses, Office of Rent Control," in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for deposit in the Treasury for penalty mail is increased from "$175,000" to "$245,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 3, to insert:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Arbitration and emergency boards: For an additional amount for "Arbitration and emergency boards," $48,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 6, to insert:

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses: The limitation under this head in the National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for compensation and expenses of referees, is increased from "$65,000" to "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 11, to insert:

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Salaries and expenses: The limitation imposed by section 105 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for travel expenses under this head, is increased from "$20,000" to "$24,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia," on page 14, after line 6, to insert:

REGULATORY AGENCIES

Office of Administrator of Rent Control: For an additional amount for "Office of Administrator of Rent Control," $10,210.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Guard," on page 14, line 16, after "National Guard", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$17,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 15, after line 5, to insert:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for "Printing and binding," $39,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 17, after "Bureau of the Budget);", to strike out "$750,000 of which" and insert "$375,000: *Provided*, That the authorization granted the Secretary of Commerce in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to utilization of funds for export controls and for allocation and inventory controls or voluntary agreements relating thereto, is extended from March 31 to June 30, 1948: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available herein not to exceed $300,000"; in line 24, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$225,000" and insert "$300,000"; on page 16, line 2, after the word "and", to strike out "of which," and in line 3, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 16, to insert:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1948, for the furnishing of emergency medical services to employees in Alaska and other areas outside the United States on a reimbursable basis, the appropriations for "Salaries and expenses" of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, "Salaries and expenses" of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and "Salaries and expenses" of the Weather Bureau, shall be available in an amount not to exceed $10,000 during the fiscal year 1948 for furnishing such services without charge when authorized or approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Bonneville Power Administration," on page 17, line 15, after the word "system", to strike out "$625,000" and insert "$665,000"; and in line 24, after the word "to", to strike out "$2,600,000" and insert "$2,640,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Land Management," on page 18, after line 21, to insert:

Management, protection, and disposal of public lands: The limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for the administration of district land offices, is increased from "$310,000" to "$325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 19, line 21, after the numerals "1949", to insert "of which amount not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for loans to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes, members or association of members thereof for the purchase of milk animals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Reclamation—Construction," on page 21, after line 8, to insert:

GENERAL FUND, CONSTRUCTION

General fund, construction: For additional amounts for continuation of construction of

the following projects, to remain available until expended, and to be subject to such limitations and restrictions as may be applicable to appropriations for such purposes in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1948, or other law, as follows:

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado;

Central Valley project, California, irrigation facilities, $1,274,281.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River Dam Fund," on page 22, after line 7, to insert:

Boulder Canyon project: For payment to the Boulder City School District in accordance with the provisions of S. 1985, $39,000, payable from the Colorado River Dam fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 15, to insert:

BUREAU OF MINES

Synthetic liquid fuels: For an additional amount for "Synthetic liquid fuels," $4,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the payment of obligations incurred under the contract authorization under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Park Service," on page 23, line 2, after the word "for", to insert "fighting forest fires."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration," on page 24, after line 13, to insert:

Fees of witnesses: The limitation under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for such compensation and expenses of witnesses or informants as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his administrative assistant is increased from "$25,000" to "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Labor," on page 25, after line 2, to insert:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

General administration: For an additional amount for "general administration," $40,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 5, to insert:

Grants to States for public employment offices: For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public employment offices," $2,560,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Military Establishment—Department of the Army—Civil Functions—Government and Relief in Occupied Areas," on page 26, line 18, after the figures "$143,000,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Pay of the Army, 1948"."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Department of the Navy—Naval Establishment — Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa.," on page 27, line 18, after the name "Pennsylvania", to strike out "$3,800" and insert "$9,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department—Field Service, Post Office Department—Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General," on page 29, line 5, after the figures "$1,000,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriations 'Clerks, first- and second-class post offices, 1947,' $300,000, and 'City delivery carriers, 1947,' $700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General," on page 29, line 17, after the word "service", to strike out "$765,000" and insert "$665,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 23, after the figures "$224,500", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Railway Mail Service, 1947'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 3, after the figures "$42,000", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Powerboat service, 1946'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General," on page 30, line 23, after the word "old", to strike out "$321,000" and insert "$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 31, line 10, after the word "supplies", to strike out "$305,200" and insert "$89,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public buildings, maintenance and operation," on page 31, line 14, after the figures "$465,000", to insert "of which $100,000 is to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Operating force, public buildings, 1948'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—international obligations and activities," on page 32, line 9, after "January 27, 1948)", to insert "and to administer the program authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1641 (b))"; on page 33, line 21, after the word "That", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$1,600,000"; in line 23, after "Revised Statutes", to insert "for transfer to the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army"; on page 34, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$570,000" and insert "$100,000"; and in line 18, after the word "That", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department—Fiscal Service—Bureau of Accounts," on page 36, after line 3, to insert:

Refund of moneys erroneously received and covered: For an additional amount for "Refund of moneys erroneously received and covered," $300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Refunds under Renegotiation Act, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 10, after the word "claims", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Refunds under Renegotiation Act, 1948'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Public Debt," on page 36, line 16, after the figures "$361,000," to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Administering the Public Debt, 1948.' "

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 17, to insert:

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Collecting the revenue from customs: Funds appropriated under this head for the fiscal year 1948 are hereby made available for the payment to bridge, tunnel, and ferry companies, of claims for refund of reimbursements of extra compensation for customs officers and employees for inspectional services in connection with traffic over highways, toll bridges, toll tunnels, or ferries, as required by section 2 of the act of June 3, 1944 (19 U. S. C. 1451a).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 2, to insert:

Refunds and draw-backs: For an additional amount, for "Refunds and drawbacks," $4,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 4, to insert:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Salaries and expenses: The limitation under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for printing and binding, is increased from "$2,530,000" to "$2,670,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 9, to insert:

Refunding internal revenue collections: For an additional amount for "Refunding internal revenue collections," $568,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

FICTITIOUS "ECONOMY" CUT RESTORED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to the appropriation on page 37, line 12, $568,000,000 for refunding internal revenue collections. Does this amount cover the budget which was before the House for $300,000,000, as well as the supplemental budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; it takes in everything. As the Senator from Wyoming knows, we wrote off about $268,000,000, but we decided that inasmuch as we were considering the subject of refunds we would clear the whole item up at the present time, because those funds are drawing interest at 6 percent. So in order to run up the obligation of the country to the least degree we inserted the full amount.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So it was the desire of the committee to make certain that the Treasury shall have on hand the full sum with which to refund these overpaid taxes?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from New Hampshire will recall that a year ago a cut of some $800,000,000 was made in this item. At that time the Senator from Wyoming and some others pointed out that it would only mean the payment

of 6 percent interest upon refunds that were not paid. Now we are obviating that difficulty, are we not?

Mr. BRIDGES. We are.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And we are making an appropriation for the $800,000,000 that was cut out last year, and an additional estimate of $568,000,000? Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; $268,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, including the $300,000,000 which was before the House?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Wiggins, which appears at pages 316 and 317 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1948.

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

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 16, 1948.

HON. JOHN TABER,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TABER: Under date of April 14 the President transmitted a supplemental estimate of $268,000,000 for refunding internal-revenue collections in the fiscal year 1948. This is in addition to the amount of $300,000,000 requested in the supplemental estimate submitted under date of January 22, 1948, but which has not been acted upon. Therefore, the total amount which should be appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 for refunding internal-revenue collections is $2,299,000,000. As of this date only $1,731,000,000 has been made available, leaving a balance of $568,000,000 to be appropriated.

As of yesterday, April 15, 1948, the total refunds scheduled to the disburing officers for payment aggregated $1,758,279,324, or $27,279,324 in excess of the total available for refunds. Since there is a period of approximately 10 days between the scheduling operations and the preparation of the checks by the disbursing officers the actual exhaustion of the funds previously appropriated will not occur until on or about May 1. Unless the additional funds of $568,000,000 are made available on or before May 1 the refunding operations will be brought to a close, leaving 2 months of this fiscal year remaining in which no refunds will be made and in which interest on $568,000,000 will accumulate unnecessarily.

More important than the interest element is the fact that close to 10,000,000 taxpayers, primarily in the low-income groups, from whom tax has been withheld from their wages in excess of the tax which they owe, will be deprived of their refunds during this period.

I am sure that you will agree that this is a contingency that should be avoided if it is at all possible to do so.

In view of these circumstances, I feel it my duty to urge that you give early consideration to the supplemental appropriation request referred to herein.

I am today addressing a similar letter to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. M. WIGGINS,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask for the printing of this letter in order that it may be quite clear that, at last, even though with some reluctance we are doing what President Truman has recommended through his budget messages and the so-called economy cut of last year has been completely restored.

The pay-as-you-go tax law of several years ago with its provision for advance estimates by taxpayers of their tax liability and its provision for tax withholding by employers from the wages and salaries of employees made huge tax refunds absolutely essential.

In his budget message to the first session of this Congress, President Truman asked for an appropriation of $2,031,000,000 to make these refunds during the fiscal year 1948. The Republican leadership insisted on reducing this appropriation by $800,000,000 for the purpose of economy; so last year in the law approved July 1, 1947, we appropriated one billion two hundred and thirty-one million. At the time I said this was a wholly fictitious cut which would have to be restored.

In House Joint Resolution 355, approved March 31, 1948, we restored $500,000,000 of the cut and now we have restored the other $300,000,000 and provided $268,000,000 additional. This we have done all because without the appropriation we would have to pay 6-percent interest, as the Senator from New Hampshire properly says, on the refunds which were not made. Thus the postponement of the payment of our $800,000,000 obligation which we decreed last year served no purpose except to allow certain Members to claim that they had reduced Government spending.

Mr. BRIDGES. At this point, Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. MILLIKIN] is present in the Senate, I might say that the Appropriations Committee instructed me to bring to the attention of the Finance Committee and to the Senate the desirability of reviewing the payment of 6 percent interest on overpayments to the Treasury so far as tax refunds are concerned. We recognize the fact that there is a penalty of 6 percent on underpayments, or on the payments that have not been made. That is, however, more or less in the relation of a penalty. There is a feeling that today, with money bearing only 1 or 2 percent interest, an opportunity which many persons may be taking advantage of is to overpay their tax, and thus have the United States as their debtor, and receive 6 percent interest on the amount overpaid. While we make no specific recommendations, we would appreciate it if the Finance Committee would review the subject with the possibility of taking some action.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am sure that the Finance Committee will appreciate the suggestion and the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, and the chairman of the Finance Committee will charge himself with bringing the matter to the attention of that committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I inquire whether the report to which the Senator from New Hampshire has just referred in his colloquy with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], chairman of the Finance Committee, has been printed?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. We took the action in the committee as a whole in asking that the matter be called to the attention of the Finance Committee. There is no printed report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am referring to the report that was prepared by the staff of the joint tax committee. There was a report which was prepared, as I understand, by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dealing with this very subject.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know. It was not printed so far as we are concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel that it ought to be printed. However, that question can be deferred for future consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Engraving and Printing", on page 37, line 15, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$1,650,000" and insert "$1,250,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Administering the Public Debt, 1948.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Secret Service Division," on page 37, line 23, after the figures "$10,800", to insert "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, guard force, Treasury Department, 1948.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Claims for Damages, Judgments, and Audited Claims," on page 38, line 9, after the word "in" to insert "Senate Document No. 132, and", and in line 11, after "Eightieth Congress", to strike out "$14,221,369.83" and insert "$16,047,956.34."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Reduction in Appropriation—Department of the Army—Military Functions," on page 39, line 17, after "Pay of the Army", to strike out "$175,300,000" and insert "$32,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 6055) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. 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. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. HAYDEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MYERS subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee, at my request, has restored the full budget amount of $9,100 for the United States Naval Home at Philadelphia to the first deficiency appropriation bill. The House had reduced this item to $3,800, a cut of $5,300.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as part of the proceedings on that bill, my statement to the Appropriations Committee explaining the need for this modest sum.

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

APRIL 15, 1948.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, SUBMITTED TO DEFICIENCY SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE IN REGARD TO DEFICIENCY REQUEST FOR THE NAVAL HOME AT PHILADELPHIA IN H. R. 6055, THE FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE 1948 FISCAL YEAR

It may be somewhat incongruous for me to make an issue over a sum of $5,300 in a bill which totaled $324,107,782.50 when it passed the House April 1, particularly since the bill involves many thousands of persons and a variety of Government agencies and functions, whereas the item of $5,300 which I am asking be added to the fund for the Naval Home at Philadelphia affects just a handful of old sailors. Nevertheless, I am impelled to call this item to the attention of this busy and overworked subcommittee because it involves the honor of the United States.

The fact that the item is small, therefore, takes nothing from its importance.

The Naval Home at Philadelphia is one of the oldest establishments of the Federal Government. It grew out of the prize, or bounty act of March 2, 1799, which provided that any surplus in the funds from the sale of prizes of war remaining after the payment of pensions to Navy personnel shall be applied, as Congress may direct, toward provisions for the comfort of disabled officers, seamen, and mariners.

The home was subsequently established in 1811. Up to 1936 it was maintained and supported entirely out of this prize money which accumulated from the early wars up to the Spanish-American War. During much of this period, the Naval Home was maintained merely from the interest, or part of it, on this prize funds, which amounted to something like $15,000,000 at the time it was captured into the Treasury.

Since that fund was taken over by the Treasury, the Naval Home has had to depend upon annual appropriations from Congress. The Congress, I might add, has not been overly generous. Last year, for instance, it cut the budget request for the Naval Home for the current fiscal year by nearly $28,000. That forced the dismissal of many full-time employees and also reduced considerably the number of beneficiaries of the home who could earn modest wages of perhaps $200 or $300 a year by working around the home.

The home cut its staff as fast as it felt it could safely do so, but it soon became obvious, as a result of a required increase in the per diem wages of employees, handed down by a wage board, that it would need additional funds. Rather than reduce their force temporarily, pending a deficiency appropriation, the officials of the home proceeded to make what cuts they could in operation—and the only things they could cut were the rations of the men.

As a result, the tobacco ration was eliminated, I understand, last October. Next, the milk rations were cut out for all the men except those who required milk under doctors' orders.

Subsequently, the Navy went before the House Appropriations Committee to seek a deficiency appropriation of $9,100, which would pay the increased per diem wages for the employees for the rest of the year and release funds now being used for that purpose to be used, instead, for the restoration of the milk and tobacco rations, and to meet increases in food costs.

The House, however, with no explanation, allowed only $3,800. No one seems to know the reason for the cut. It may be the Navy failed to make clear to the House committee exactly how the money was to be used, or it may be that the House believed the $9,100 was to cover a much longer period and that the smaller amount was all that was needed for the remainder of this fiscal year. The Navy says that would not be the case. Admiral Randall Jacobs, the Governor of the Naval Home, discussed this matter with me recently and he is completely in the dark as to the reason for the cut.

If this cut is maintained, I am informed that the milk ration may have to be cut out entirely, meat may be served no oftener than about once a week, and further reductions would be necessary among employees. This would be most cruel and undeserving treatment, I believe, for old sailors who had looked to the home for shelter and protection and fair treatment in their declining years.

Most of them have no other place to go.

Although the population of the home is small, being less than 300, the home has lived and continued all these years as an important morale builder for the older men still on active service who know it is there, should they ever need its shelter.

In reducing the item from $9,100 to $3,800, the House committee provided that the smaller amount shall be transferred from the item of "Officer candidate training, 1948." I am satisfied this transfer procedure is proper and I am further assured there is ample room in the above item for the transfer of the full budget amount of $9,100, and so I ask that the full amount be granted.

How the Congress of the United States can, in any conscience, deny milk to disabled and decrepit old sailors, deny them tobacco, cut them down to an occasional taste of meat, and still consider that we are doing right by these old fellows, is something of which I cannot conceive.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5728, Calendar 1209, the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5728) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, Members of the Senate have before them the committee report on this appropriation bill, which deals with the Labor and Federal security functions of the Government. The amount of the bill as passed by the House was $905,405,250. The amount of the decrease recommended by the Senate committee to the Senate is $14,653,810, or a total amount, as reported to the Senate, of $890,751,440. This is under the estimates for 1949 by $40,787,729, and is under the 1948 appropriations by $21,206,357.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 5, after the word "Secretary," to strike out "and for the performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Public Law 101, approved June 23, 1947)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 18, after "District of Columbia", to strike out $1,000,000" and insert "$1,031,555."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 20, after the word "industrial", to strike out "health and"; in line 22, after the word "industry", to insert "and for the performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Public Law 101, approved June 23, 1947), and the functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act transferred under and pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946 pertaining to research, formulation of standards, and youth employment problems," and on page 3, line 9, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 13, after "(39 U. S. C. 321d)", to strike out "$105,000" and insert "$130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 13, to insert:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended, and, under the act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1472), of persons who have performed service in the merchant marine, including personal services in the District of Columbia, $415,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics", on page 4, line 14, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$4,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Women's Bureau," on page 4, line 20, after the word "exhibits," to strike out "$274,200" and insert "$326,735."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Wage and Hour Division," on page 5, line 3, after the words "for the" to insert "enforcement", and in line 11, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$4,887,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Bureau of Employees' Compensation," on page 7, line 1, before the word "for" to strike out "$36,000" and insert $41,000", and in line 2, after the word "Appeals", to strike out "$1,371,200" and insert "$1,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subsead "Office of Education," on page 13, line 11, after the word "same", to strike out "$1,796,700" and insert "$2,000,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to st ike out the comma and "of which not less than $487,400 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Vocational Rehabilitation," on page 14, line 25, after the numerals "1950", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 10, after the word "films", to strike out "$622,700" and insert "$675,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 18, line 7, after the word "amended", to strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000", and in line 10, after the words "basis of", to strike out $75,000,000 and insert "$65,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—National Labor Relations Board," on page 29, line 5, after "(28 U. S. C. 921);", to strike out "$7,200,000" and insert "$9,400,000", and in line 10, after the numerals "1949", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 459), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Public Law 101, approved June 23, 1947), and as defined in section 3 (f) of the act of June 25, 1948 (52 Stat. 1060)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VI—Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service," on page 33, line 19, after "(28 U. S. C. 921);", to strike out "$2,540,000" and insert "$2,940,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 2, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VII—Reductions in Appropriations—Federal Security Agency," on page 35, line 14, after the word "Agency", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 5728) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from California how the appropriations in this bill, in the aggregate, compare with the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apparently the Senator was not in the Chamber when I made the explanation. The amount of the appropriations as the bill has now passed the Senate, and as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, is $14,653,810 less than the amount of the bill as it came over from the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEM. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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. KNOWLAND, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5607, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5607) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State—Department Service," on page 3, line 9, after the word "State", to strike out "$17,168,000" and insert "$21,101,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 19, after the word "for", to strike out "$532,000" and insert "$582,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 2, to insert:

North Atlantic fisheries: For necessary expenses of surveys, discussions, and other activities incident to the participation of the United States in an international agreement relating to conservation of the North Atlantic fisheries, including personal services in the District of Columbia; temporary employment of persons without regard to civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the furtherance of the purpose hereof, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign Service," on page 6, line 18, after the word "amended", to strike out "$42,500,000" and insert "$44,665,830", and in line 25, after the word "Revised", to strike out "Statutes" and insert "Statutes,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 16, after "(22 U. S. C. 1131)", to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$7,301,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 20, after "(22 U. S. C. 1131)", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 3, after the word "for", to strike out "$170,000" and insert "$175,485."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 20, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$9,250,000" and insert "$10,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Activities," on page 9, line 11, after "(22 U. S. C. 276, 276a", to insert a semicolon and "Public Law 409, approved February 6, 1948)", and in line 12, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$30,000, of which $15,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group, shall be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the executive secretary of the American group."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 18, to insert:

Caribbean Commission (Public Law 431, approved March 4, 1948), $135,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 4, to strike out:

Inter-American Economic and Social Council (57 Stat. 159), $21,810.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "Pan American" and insert "Pan-American", and at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$347,143" and insert "$1,536,352."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 19, to insert:

South Pacific Commission (Public Law 403, approved January 28, 1948), $20,000;.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 7, after the words "In all", to strike out "$23,208,863" and insert "$24,541,262."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 16, after the word "and", to insert "without regard to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under", and in line 24, after "(44 U. S. C. 111)", to strike out "not to exceed $75,000 for entertainment and representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the act of August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131); $3,600,000" and insert "$4,000,000, of which not to exceed a total of $100,000 may be expended for representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the act of August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for entertainment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 17, after the word "Revised", to strike out "Statutes" and insert "Statutes,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 6, after the word "be", to strike out "necessary" and insert "necessary,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 18, to strike out:

International information and educational activities: For expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out international information and educational activities as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, approved January 27, 1948), including personal services in the District of Columbia; employment, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $50,000) and aliens within the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), except title VII and title VIII; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed $6,000); rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase, rental, operation, and maintenance of printing and binding machines, equipment, and devices abroad; ice, and drinking water for office purposes; acquisition production, and free distribution of information materials for use in connection with the operation, independently or through individuals, including aliens, or public or private agencies (foreign or domestic), and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of information and educational activities outside of the continental United States, including the purchase of radio time (except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee), and the maintenance and operation of facilities for radio transmission and reception; purchase and presentation of various objects of a cultural nature suitable for presentation (through diplomatic and consular offices) to foreign governments, schools, or other cultural or patriotic organizations, and the purchase, rental, distribution, and operation of motion-picture projection equipment and supplies, including rental of halls, hire of motion-picture projector operators, and all other necessary services by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; $28,000,000, of which not to exceed $2,500,000 may be transferred to the appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Department of State" "Printing and binding, Department of State", "Salaries and expenses, Foreign Service", "Living and quarters allowances, Foreign Service", and "Printing and binding, Foreign Service", under this title: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of the international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of leasehold interests (which may be for one or more years) payments may be made in advance for the entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That $4,400,000 of this appropriation shall be available exclusively for the purchase, construction, and improvement of buildings and facilities and the purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio transmission and reception, including the acquisition of land and interest in land (by purchase, lease, rental, or otherwise) necessary therefor, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

International information and educational activities: For expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out international information and educational activities as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, approved January 27, 1948), and to administer the program authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. app. 1641 (b)), including personal services in the District of Columbia; employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $50,000) and aliens within the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), except title VII and title VIII; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed $6,000); printing and binding; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration and script-writing, by contract or otherwise, acquisition of printed materials, purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations, and information and educational activities outside the continental United States, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; $27,000,000, of which not to exceed $2,600,000 may be transferred to other appropriations of the Department of State: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of the international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of lease-hold interests payments may be made in advance for the entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That $2,400,000 of this appropriation shall be available, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes for transfer to the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, exclusively for the purchase, construction, and improvement of buildings and facilities, purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio transmission and reception, and the acquisition of land and interest in land outside the continental United States by purchase, lease, rental, or otherwise, without regard to section 355 of the Revised Statutes, but title to any land so acquired shall be approved by the Secretary of State; and, in addition, the Corps of Engineers is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes specified in this proviso, and under the same conditions, in an amount not to exceed $2,000,000: *Provided further*, That funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000", and on page 28, line 6, after the word "boats", to strike out "$3,900,000" and insert "$4,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 1, after the words "provisions of", to strike out "title" and insert "titles."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration," on page 34, line 22, after "For the Tax Division", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$875,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, in line 24, after the word "bailiffs", to strike out "criers."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Minnesota that the word "and", after the word "bailiffs", should also be stricken out.

Mr. BALL. Yes; the "and" should also be stricken out, and I offer that change as an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "immigration and Naturalization Service," on page 42, line 22, after the word "thereto", to insert "and for all necessary expenses incident to the maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and their wives and dependent children, including transportation and other expenses in the return of such persons to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General;" and on page 43, line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$26,900,000" and insert "$27,150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 49, line 11, after "(not exceeding $1,000)", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert $1,050,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 19, after "(44, U. S. C. 111, 220)", to strike out "$1,100,000" and insert "$1,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 19, to insert:

Technical and scientific services: For necessary expenses in the performance of activities and services relating to the collection, compilation, and dissemination of technological information as an aid to business in the development of foreign and domestic commerce, including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and not to exceed $20,000 for printing and binding, $200,000, of which $8,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" under the Office of the Secretary: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized, upon request of any public or private organization or individual, to reproduce by appropriate process, independently or through any other agency of the Government, any scientific or technical report, document, or descriptive material, foreign or domestic, which has been released for public dissemination, and to sell such reproductions at a price not less than the estimated total cost of reproducing and disseminating same as may be determined by the Secretary, the moneys received from such sale to be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, such account to be available for reimbursing any appropriation which may have borne the expense of such reproduction and dissemination and making refunds to organizations and individuals when entitled thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census," on page 51, line 24, after the word "paper", to strike out "$3,889,000" and insert "$5,623,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 15, after the word "paper", to strike out "$635,000" and insert "$785,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration," on page 53, line 9, after the word "witnesses," to insert "examination of estimates of appropriations in the field;" and in line 24, after the word "towers", to strike out "*Provided further*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as successor to Defense Plant Corporation and acting by and through the War Assets Administrator, is authorized and directed to transfer to the United States and jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency (Public Buildings Administration) without charge a tract of land and the improvements thereon at Los Angeles, Calif., covered by lease dated January 1, 1947, between the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and surplus to the needs of the Corporation" and in lieu thereof to insert the following "*Provided further*, That the War Assets Administrator, acting for and on behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is authorized and directed to transfer to the United States without reimbursement or transfer of funds, legal title to a certain tract of land and improvements thereon at Los Angeles, Calif., covered by lease dated January 1, 1947, between the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and heretofore designated by that Corporation on Plancor 890 and declared surplus to the needs of that Corporation, and to transfer such property to the control and jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency (Public Buildings Administration): *Provided further*."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 15, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$10,099,000" and insert "$10,211,660."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 2, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$34,392,000" and insert "$37,000,000"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$33,892,000" and insert "$36,500,000"; and in line 19, after the word "appropriation", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation herein made shall be expended on the development of Fort Worth International Airport in Tarrant County, Tex."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board", on page 59, line 14, after the words "per annum", to insert "and the salaries of the other members of the Board shall be at the rate of $11,500 per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce", on page 61, line 21, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a), to strike out "$5,300,000" and insert "$4,500,000"; and on page 62, line 2, after the word "appropriated", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That $25,000 shall be available exclusively to carry out a study of hard fibers and hard fiber products."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 11, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,204,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office", on page 62, line 25, after the word "photolithography", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$8,350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 5, after the word "binding", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards," on page 65, line 7, after the word "data," to strike out "$3,900,000" and insert "$4,339,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau," on page 66, line 20, after the word "stations," to strike out "$21,880,000" and insert "$22,380,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Provisions—Department of Commerce," in section 302, on page 68, line 13, after the word "available," to insert "in an amount not to exceed $10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—The Judiciary—Other Federal Courts—Miscellaneous Items of Expenses," on page 75, after line 23, to insert:

Salaries of criers: For salaries of criers as authorized by the act of December 7, 1944 (28 U. S. C. 9), and the acts of March 3, 1911, and March 3, 1891, as amended (28 U. S. C. 224 and 547), $468,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 25, after the word "for," to strike out "$1,775,000" and insert "$1,844,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 12, after the word "clerk," to strike out "$577,000" and insert "$607,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer on behalf of the committee and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 76, in line 25, after the figures "$1,844,000", it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law

clerks of circuit and district judges (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the main (CAF–4), senior (CAF–5), or principal (CAF–6) clerical grade, or assistant (CAF–7), or associate (CAF–8) administrative grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the junior (P–1), assistant (P–2), associate (P–3), full (P–4), or senior (P–5) professional grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further,* That (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed $6,500 per annum, except in the case of the senior circuit judge of each circuit and senior district judge of each district having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed $7,500."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota in behalf of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this provision has been in the bill for several years. It was stricken out by the House of Representatives this year. It permits the fixing of the salaries of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges in accordance with a formula developed by the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges. In accordance with the amendment, the salaries of such law clerks and secretaries of long service will be somewhat in excess of the salaries permitted by the Classification Act. I may say that in the codification of the Federal judicial procedures, now pending in the Judiciary Committee, this provision is included in that code, which already has passed the House, and that is why the House did not include this provision in the appropriation bill. But in case that code is not enacted at this session, we want this appropriation bill to include this amendment, so as to permit the secretaries and law clerk of circuit and district judges to be paid in accordance with the pay schedules which they themselves have permitted. Funds in the amount of $65,000 are included in the bill, in order to permit this to be done.

If this amendment is not adopted, it will mean substantial pay cuts for such secretaries and law clerks who have been with their judges for a number of years, and probably it will mean that the judges will not longer be able to have the benefit of their services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota in behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in printing the bill, one word was omitted on page 42. I offer an amendment to correct that omission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 20, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether the appropriations contemplate substantial reductions in the pay rolls of the four departments.

Mr. BALL. I do not believe there will be any reduction in the Department of Justice for which the appropriation remains about the same as last year. There will be some reductions in the Department of Commerce, but none in the Judiciary. There will be some increase in the Department of State, particularly for the Office of Information.

Mr. KEM. There is a widespread feeling in the country that pay rolls in many of the Government departments, including some of those dealt with in the pending bill, are entirely beyond reason, that they have swollen and grown beyond any reason. I ask the Senator if the committee studying the situation confirmed that as a fact, or determined otherwise?

Mr. BALL. I may say to the Senator that the subcommittee is pretty well satisfied with respect to the Department of Justice. It is one department which did not increase its employment very much during the war. Although some additional work was assigned to the Department the increase in employment was relatively minor. The Department of State of course has expanded tremendously. As a matter of fact, the committee had to increase the amount of the appropriation by nearly $12,500,000 above the amount allowed by the House, principally by reason of the increase in the State Department's budget, which the House had cut. Although the Budget estimates for the departmental and foreign services were less than for the current fiscal year, the House had cut the budget estimates about $6,500,000. Both the subcommittee and the full committee felt we simply could not justify reducing the appropriation for the Department of State. That would have forced a layoff of about 800 employees in Washington and 700 or 800 in the field, or abroad. In view of the critical international situation, the committee did not feel it could justify that kind of reduction at the present time, although I think probably a majority of the subcommittee feels that the administrative organization in the Department of State in Washington is wasteful and that probably there is considerable duplication of effort, simply because geographical desks are set up for various regions and countries in order to discharge four different functions connected with intelligence, political affairs, economic affairs, and the information program. I think the subcommittee feels that the duplication of geographical desks, in many cases dealing with very similar subjects, could be eliminated or at least considerably reduced, but the committee did not feel that it could at this time force a reduction of that kind on the Department by a drastic cut in funds.

Mr. KEM. Was the attention of the committee directed to the situation in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. BALL. Yes. The House cut the Department of Commerce, particularly the Census Bureau, in connection with current census statistics. The major increase for the Department of Commerce is in that Bureau. We granted, as I recall, about a third of the requested restoration. The House, for example, completely eliminated the appropriation for the collection of Government statistics. We did not feel that could be justified, though I am inclined to agree with the Senator that in many of the statistical agencies of which, to my knowledge, there are three major ones, there is considerable duplication, and considerable expense could be saved through better coordination in the gathering of statistics for the Government.

Mr. KEM. I am sure the Senator is cognizant of the fact that in the 1946 campaign a great deal was said about reducing Government pay rolls. When the Eightieth Congress convened, it was widely thought that substantial reductions would be made. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks all has been done in that respect that should be done, and if the pending bill represents a determined and courageous effort to reduce pay rolls in the departments affected.

Mr. BALL. I may say to the Senator that last year, particularly in the Department of Commerce, there was an over-all reduction of from 20 to 30 percent. I think there could be a further reduction in many of the departments, but it is very difficult for a congressional committee to make the reductions intelligently without better cooperation by the departments themselves. For example, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which, incidentally, did not appeal the reductions made by the House, spends at least $100,000,000 a year. To study its expenditures in detail and decide intelligently where reductions can be made would usually take more time than a subcommittee of Congress can devote to one particular bureau, and there are 30 or 40 such bureaus covered by the bill.

I think that as the years roll along we can concentrate each year on one particular bureau and perhaps make a thorough study. I think we did a very thorough job last year. I will admit we did not dig into the bureaus as deeply this year as we did in 1947, but as I say I do not think we have provided for any great expansion of employment in any of them. There is a reduction in the Department of Commerce, there is no reduction of expansion in the Department of Justice, there is some in the State Department, as I say, and in the new Office of Information.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator another question, addressing it to him as a member of the Appropriations Committee generally, rather than as chairman of a particular subcommittee. Why is it that when appropriation bills come from the House to the Senate, we so often find it necessary or advisable to increase the amount allowed by the House?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Missouri, I think the explanation is simply that a tradition has developed to the effect that the House handles the bills initially, and the House usually makes about as drastic a cut as it thinks any bureau can stand. In actual practice, the function of the Senate Appropriations Committee is like that of an appeal board, in passing upon reductions made by the House. It is only within the past 2 years that there has been any effort on the part of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to go into the departmental requests and items, regardless of House action, and to make reductions in items beyond what the House has made, even when the department or bureau was not appealing; but in general the function of the Senate and of the Senate Appropriations Committee in handling the bills is that of an appellate tribunal, passing upon reductions made by the House.

Mr. KEM. Why is it that it cannot work the other way? Why cannot the interests of the public and of the taxpayer be considered by the Senate when acting in the capacity of a reviewing authority? We have just passed on the bill for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related agencies. My recollection is that at the last session the appropriation was reduced by the Senate. I was very much encouraged to learn today that it has again been reduced by the Senate. I do not mean to make invidious comparisons; I am merely seeking information, but why is it that a committee can, in two successive sessions, put on that kind of performance, whereas so many of the other subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, as the Senator says, act as a reviewing authority, with the idea of determining how the appropriations may consistently be increased?

Mr. BALL. I think we decreased some items in the bill. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee which handled the labor and security bill. Last year we increased a great many items, but we came out with a net decrease, because we reduced grants to States for unemployment compensation. This reduction comes about largely because we reduced the cash appropriation to pay for contract authorizations already granted in the amount of $60,000,000. We reduced the figure from $60,000,000 cash to $40,000,00 cash, because we were convinced they would not need the cash during the coming fiscal year. Eventually they will need it. It is a reduction only in the next fiscal year. So that while the reduction in the next fiscal year is real, it is a situation which does not obtain as to every bill.

Mr. KEM. I notice that the net result of the bill is to increase the aggregate amount provided by the House by approximately $12,000,000. Is most of that amount for additional pay-roll expense?

Mr. BALL. Most of it is to keep the pay rolls at or somewhat below existing levels, particularly for the State Department. Except in international broadcasting, there are no pay rolls increased above existing levels.

Mr. KEM. Where does the increase come in, then?

Mr. BALL. The House reduced the funds for the State Department, I believe, approximately $6,500,000 below the budget estimates. The Senate committee could not find any justification at this time, facing the situation which we face in international affairs, for reducing the funds for the Foreign Service of the State Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 5607) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I voted against the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The RECORD will so show.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 428) to provide for an increase in the combined amounts of retired pay for services as a commissioned officer and compensation from a civilian position with the Government which may be received by individuals and that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to notice previously given by the Chair, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of executive business.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

W. AVERELL HARRIMAN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will report the nomination of Mr. W. Averell Harriman.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Averell Harriman to be United States Special Representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that I voted against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Harriman.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The RECORD will so show.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Air Force nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will return to the consideration of legislative business.

EFFORTS TO UNDERMINE THE FREE PRESS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to take a few moments to discuss what I consider one of the most flagrant and vicious attempts to undermine the free press of this country that I have come across for many years. This attempt was made in two ways. One was out-and-out bribery of American newspaper cartoonists. The second was a despicable set of lies, addressed to the editors of this country, regarding the National Health Assembly, which meets in Washington May 1 to May 4, 1948.

The culprit is the so-called National Physicians Committee—a notorious and disgraceful lobby managed by a few highly paid public relations men who, through misrepresentation, annually extort hundreds of thousands of dollars from physicians and drug houses. In the past, this organization has been repeatedly guilty of using the vicious Hitler-Stalin tactic of the great lie—for example in labeling as communistic legislation endorsed by two Presidents of the United States and sponsored by six Members of the United States Senate, four of whom are also members of that church which is perhaps communism's greatest enemy. Despite the fact that it was dealing with matters literally involving life and death, the National Physicians Committee has spent over a million dollars in appeals to fear and hate, but not a nickel on appeals to reason.

Now, to the everlasting shame of thousands of honest and conscientious doctors throughout the country, this depraved group, in their names, has reached a new low and is attempting to bribe the cartoonists of America and thereby to buy the editorial opinions of the Nation's press.

It is to the everlasting credit of Editor and Publisher, perhaps the leading magazine in the field of practical and effective journalism, that it accepted the National Physicians Committee's full-page advertisement of a fake prize contest, through which the bribe was offered, and then ran an editorial which denounced the advertisement as an attempt at bribery, which called on the American society of newspaper editors for a revision of the canons of journalism to make such trickery impossible in the future.

I have here a copy of the full-page advertisement I referred to. It was published in the February 28 issue, Editor and Publisher. It is signed by the National Physicians Committee of Chicago, Ill.

The advertisement announces the offer of 14 cash awards to newspaper cartoonists for the most effective portrayal "of the meaning and implications of political distribution of health-care services in the United States."

The top prize is $1,000, and eight other awards range from $500 to $100.

Despite the obscure phrasing of the basis of these awards, the purpose is obvious. What the committee is looking for—and what it will distribute the prize money for—is published cartoons attacking the principle of national health insurance.

To make this purpose crystal clear, so there will be no possible misunderstanding, the advertisement reprints a sample cartoon, published some years ago by J. M. Darling, otherwise known as "Ding."

This cartoon shows Congress in the guise of an unattractive old biddy pouring out a dose of medicine to be administered to the poor long-suffering public. The medicine is labeled "Socialized Medicine—$3,000,000,000 a Bottle." The frightened Mr. Public is being held tightly in the grasp of a gentleman labeled "Political Quack." In the foreground is another gentleman, labeled "Medical Science" who is depicted as having been bound and gagged—in other words, helpless to prevent the outrage. And in the background is a group of mourners gathered around the coffin of an admittedly able citizen, now presumably deceased, labeled "Free enterprise."

At the top of the cartoon is the caption, "It is all mixed and ready to swallow."

I have no quarrel with Mr. Darling or with his right to present his own views through his syndicated cartoon strip. From a purely objective viewpoint I can even admire the skill with which he managed to compress into one picture all the prejudices and fears of those vested interests which are arrayed against this proposed legislation.

What I do object to is this outrageous and cynical attempt, on the part of the National Physicians' Committee, to bribe the cartoonists of America into helping them spread their propaganda. No matter what opinion any member of this honorable body may hold as to the merits of the legislation involved, I know that each of my colleagues will join me in condemning this vicious, underhanded attempt to buy the free editorial-cartoon expression of the newspapers of this country.

Do not make any mistake. In spite of the risk of possible flare-backs which such a campaign of chicanery may engender, this method of poisoning the wells of public opinion is extraordinarily and insidiously clever. No self-respecting newspaper cartoonist would countenance an outright effort to offer him a bribe. He would reject indignantly any attempt to slip him, say, $50 for putting across a cartoon angled to meet the requirements of some special interest. But a prize contest is, psychologically, something else again. On the surface it is all open and aboveboard. By the terms of the conditions, he could even submit a cartoon in favor of so-called socialized medicine—that is, if he were naive enough to believe that such an entry would be given a moment's consideration.

I say it may seem open and aboveboard. But the real catch in this contest—now get this—is the requirement that the cartoon, to be entered, must first have been published in some newspaper or syndicate feature. The committee makes sure that the cartoon achieves its normal circulation before it is even judged.

There is probably many a hard-pressed cartoonist, sitting hunched over his drawing board, trying to dig out an idea for tomorrow's paper, who might grasp at this ready-prepared subject as a means of meeting a deadline. Moreover, like lots of the rest of us, he might well be worried over money. Who could not use an extra thousand—or even an extra hundred?

This latest and most outrageous attempt to exert undue influence on public opinion focuses attention once again on this highly questionable National Physicians' Committee. The full name of this group is the National Physicians' Committee for the Extension of Medical Services. It describes itself as a "nonpolitical, nonprofit organization for maintaining ethical and scientific standards and extending medical services to all the people."

It calls itself "nonpolitical," yet is registered under the Lobbying Act. It calls itself "nonprofit," but the three laymen running it profit to the tune of ten to fourteen thousand dollars a year salaries, plus apparently unlimited expense accounts. It calls itself a "physicians committee," but its list of contributors of $500 or more submitted under the Lobbying Act sets forth the names of some 14 drug manufacturers, but does not include that of a single physician. It says its purpose is to extend medical services to all the people, but its record shows over a million dollars spent in opposing health legislation, and not a penny spent or an action taken which extended medical care to anyone.

From behind all this pious verbiage emerges the blunt fact that the committee is the political lobbying and propaganda bureau of the American Medical Association—and that its chief purpose today is the blocking of any legislation aimed at the extension of medical services under a system of national health insurance.

Over the past 6 years this committee has admittedly spent over a million dollars in its propaganda efforts to accomplish this end. It has flooded the country with more than 25,000,000 pamphlets and circulars distributed through every conceivable channel, including over-the-counter hand-outs in the large drugstore chains. It has arranged for the publication of more than 3,000 full-page advertisements in various newspapers throughout the country. It has swamped newspapers and other periodicals with everything from carefully angled news stories to pretendedly forthright, carefully written editorials which an editor is free to run as an expression of his own views. It has made wide use of the radio, direct-mail solicitation, education, and every other known technique of public relations, including the direct lobbying of United States Senators and Representatives here in Washington.

This cartoon-prize award stunt is merely the latest example of the committee's consummate skill in publicity methods. It is apparently a forerunner of the campaign which has been scheduled for this year and for which, I am informed, the committee is planning to spend some $600,000—or double the amount spent in 1947.

Some of this money is undoubtedly contributed by physicians who perhaps believe that the inauguration of a system of national health insurance will damage their own pocketbooks. But tens of thousands of dollars, by the admission of the committee itself, have been contributed by the great pharmaceutical manufacturers and other interests allied to the drug and medical fields.

I cannot believe that these manufacturers are opposed to a health-insurance program which would make medical care available to many more people than can now afford it. After all, even from a purely selfish point of view, these men must realize that more people getting more medical care means more drugs

sold. One is forced to wonder whether it can be the power of the politicians of organized medicine to endorse or withhold endorsement of drug products which accounts for these contributions by reputable manufacturers to so odious an outfit.

This National Physicians' Committee was organized originally to take over the publicity and propaganda activities of the American Medical Association at a time when it was feared that such activities might undermine the tax-exempt status of the parent organization. Many reputable doctors—members of the AMA—have protested the right of this committee to assume these functions. They charge it with being an irresponsible clique which, by its ruthless and scurrilous attacks on all proponents of national-health insurance, is putting not only the AMA but all honest medical practitioners in bad odor with the American people.

The basic line of attack of this propaganda is quite simple. It is to smear the whole project as socialized medicine, relying on the effect of that horrendous word "socialism" to scare ordinary minded citizens away. Not content with this snide attack, they are now labeling the proposal out-and-out communistic. Riding the wave of our present international difficulties, they are working the "Red menace" for all it is worth.

National health insurance, they tell us, is a project conceived by the Kremlin and fostered by Communist Reds and fellow travelers in this country for the sole purpose of inserting an entering wedge for the overthrow of our democratic system of government. Any person who supports the project is pro-Stalin and anti-American. Any person who opposes it is a stanch defender of private enterprise and the American way of life.

I do not have to state my own profound conviction about democracy and the American way of life to resent this cheap, mendacious appeal to emotionalism and insult to the intelligence of the American public.

I have no present intention of discussing the merits of the bill, as such. I recognize that there exist many honest differences of opinion as to the advisability of enacting such legislation. But while I am on the subject, I should like to draw attention to the smear attack now being unleashed by this same national physicians committee against the projected National Health Assembly which is to meet here in Washington on May 1.

This National Health Assembly, as Senators all know, has been called by the Federal Security Administrator, Oscar R. Ewing. The purpose of the assembly is to develop a concrete plan for increasing the health safeguards of this Nation over the next 10 years. It will be attended by some 700 to 800 representatives of public and private organizations and agencies concerned with various phases of the Nation's health. Its executive committee comprises leaders in the several fields involved, including a number of eminent physicians and other outstanding leaders in the health field.

There is no one in touch with the many pressing problems of public health in this country who does not recognize the vital necessity of making an expert appraisal of our needs and of laying down a concrete program of action.

Among these are:

The problem of sanitation—of improved water supply and sewerage systems for our towns, cities, and rural areas.

The necessity for more hospitals and medical centers to serve the needs of our population.

The lack of adequate personnel in our public-health services, and the crying need to train thousands more doctors, dentists, nurses, laboratory technicians.

The problem of what to do about the startling fact that 8,000,000 Americans are today suffering from some form of mental or nervous illness.

The always present problem of school health and the need of expanding regular health examinations, medical treatment, and physical education services for the benefit of our children.

Then there are the vocational rehabilitation services, the maternal and child-health services, the services for crippled children, and many other problems.

These are among the major topics for discussion which appear on the agenda which has been drawn up for the assembly. By common consent they are noncontroversial matters, that is to say, they involve areas of activity which most responsible physicians and public-spirited citizens agree should be further explored.

Certainly, to the health and well-being of the 145,000,000 American men, women, and children they are matters of the greatest importance, and any honest attempt, by a responsible group of citizens, to meet the challenge of these problems should be given every encouragement and support.

But what do our friends the National Physicians' Committee say to all this? In a canned editorial, for distribution among newspaper editors all over the country, they lash out at it as a politically inspired move on the part of the President—engineered by what they describe as his extreme leftist advisers—to strengthen his position in the 1948 campaign. Ignoring the clearly stated intent of the assembly, they insinuate that its only objective is to push forward the administration's program of so-called socialized medicine. To their bigoted and narrow minds it can have no other purpose.

As proof of their contention, they point out that both President Truman and Federal Security Administrator Ewing are on record in favor of national health insurance. They charge the Federal Security Administration, which is sponsoring the assembly, as being, in its study division the "nerve center of socialized medicine propaganda for the entire world." And they interject downright lies—or at least totally misleading statements—concerning the experience of Great Britain in implementing a similar system.

I do not have to point out that the findings arrived at on this controversial subject of national health insurance by the study division of the FSA were based on hard, laborious and objective research—and that, despite attack, they have been substantially accepted not only by many prominent physicians, but by such representative leaders as Bernard Baruch, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and Gerard Swope.

By dragging the red herring of Socialist-inspired—or Communist inspired—national health insurance across the trail of this assembly, the National Physicians' Committee reveal themselves as opposed to any rational attempt to improve the Nation's health so long as this attempt is sponsored by the Government. Their cry of free enterprise, as it involves their own profession, is employed to scotch every effort toward liberal reform.

Because of its immoderate activities, this committee has been called one of the most reactionary elements in our entire national economy—and with its powerful propaganda and lobbying machine, one of the most dangerous.

I think that has now been clearly demonstrated. But in order to destroy any possibility that Senators on the other side of the aisle might think my remarks tinged with partisanship, let me quote another characterization of the National Physicians' Committee:

> The National Physicians' Committee has supplied the medical profession and the public with sheer buncombe * * * its publications are misleading * * * it is an inimical force working against the medical profession from within.

Those statements were made, Mr. President, not by a proponent of national health insurance, but by Dr. Shearon, the expert on medical care matters employed by the Republican National Committee.

I hope the people of this country, together with all newspaper editors and radio commentators, will appraise the national health assembly, convening May 1, for what it actually is—and not what these reactionary elements claim it to be.

I hope they will appreciate that it is not called merely to put its seal of approval on a program already determined by the Government, but that it is a meeting of recognized authorities in the field of medical and health services—few of whom have any political ax to grind—and that the sole purpose of these authorities is to lay out a practical and comprehensive program for improving this Nation's health, over the next 10 years, based on their own individual knowledge and experience.

I think it is highly to the credit of this administration that it has sponsored the calling of this assembly. I think it has been wise in its decision to allow whatever program is formulated to be developed from the grass roots for the grass roots of this country, by those who are closest to the actual situation.

I repeat, Mr. President, I think it is to the everlasting shame of thousands of honest, conscientious, social-minded doctors throughout the land that they permit this vicious so-called National Physicians' Committee to continue its activities—and to create the impression that the medical profession of this Nation is opposed to any progress in the domain of this country's public health.

In closing, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three excerpts from the magazine Editor and Publisher which I hereby submit, together with an article by Lowell Mellett from the Wash-

ington Star, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Editor and Publisher of February 28, 1948]

ANNOUNCING CASH AWARDS FOR CARTOONISTS—FOURTEEN IMPORTANT AWARDS

Over a period of years, it has been our privilege to reprint many cartoons portraying artists' appraisal of the political distribution of medical care in the United States. One of these cartoons appears in this announcement.

Any cartoonist regularly employed by any newspaper or magazine of general distribution or by any syndicated service is eligible to submit exhibits to be judged for the awards.

First award	$1,000
Second award	500
Third award	250
Fourth award	200
Fifth award	150
Sixth to ninth awards (each)	100

BASIS OF AWARDS

Judging will be based solely on originality and effective portrayal of the meaning and implications of political distribution of health-care services in the United States.

FOLLOWING ARE THE RULES

1. Entrants must submit 10 copies of publication in which the cartoon has been published, with a letter of formal application approved by his publisher.

2. Full permission must be granted by publisher to reprint the cartoon submitted.

3. Six copies of engravers' proofs of original illustration must be provided.

4. The period of this effort will be March 1 to May 31, 1948. Wherever editorial deadline is prior to April 1, artists may submit advance proofs of publication with statement from publisher that the cartoon is to be published on a specific date.

5. All exhibits submitted must be postmarked before midnight, May 31, 1948, and must be mailed or delivered to twenty-first floor, Lincoln Tower Building, Chicago, Ill. Entrants may submit as many published cartoons as they desire.

6. Judges will comprise a group of nationally known publishers and editors. Decision of judges will be final. In case of ties, duplicate awards will be made. No individual cartoonist shall be eligible for more than one award.

7. In addition to cash awards listed above, an appropriate parchment scroll, award of merit, will be given to each winner.

WRITE FOR FACTUAL DATA

Write today for free package of supplemental data which already have been published by leading periodicals with the objective of preserving in the United States our system of freedom of enterprise to the end that doctors of medicine may retain, in the public interest, their personal independence, their individual and collective integrity and effectiveness.

Your understanding of purpose is sought and cooperation is welcomed in the belief that joint efforts may result in the attainment of these objectives.

We shall be happy to send you additional brochures, articles, and reports of general information which will be helpful to you.

NATIONAL PHYSICIANS' COMMITTEE
FOR THE EXTENSION OF MEDICAL SERVICE
CHICAGO, ILL.

A nonpolitical, nonprofit organization for maintaining ethical and scientific standards and extending medical service to all the people.

[From Editor and Publisher of March 6, 1948]

QUESTIONABLE CONTEST

The National Physicians' Committee for the Extension of Medical Service, an organization opposed to the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill, and other like measures, is offering $3,000 in prizes to newspapers and magazine cartoonists for their "portrayal of the meaning and implications of 'political distribution of health care services in the United States.'" An ad announcing this contest with $1,000 first prize appeared in Editor and Publisher last week.

Completely ignoring the political viewpoint of this committee, which it is not our function to criticize or evaluate, let us analyze the contest.

First, the rules make it clear that no cartoon will qualify for 1 of the 14 cash awards unless it takes a position against the proposed bill. A "Ding" Darling cartoon, printed in the ad lampooning "Socialized Medicine," serves as a guide.

Second, proof of publication is required to enter the "contest."

The contest rules leave no doubt that this is a subtle bribe to cartoonists to support or oppose certain political beliefs (according to how you look at it) and to obtain general circulation for those beliefs in newspapers and magazines. In other words, large cash rewards are offered to cartoonists for doing a propaganda job in behalf of the physicians' committee.

We classify this contest with those photography contests which require cameramen to portray certain products in their published photos—cigars, coffee, etc.—in order to qualify for an award. They are all a threat to independent thinking, objective and unbiased reporting and comment in newspapers.

They offer rewards for doing a slanted job in newspapers and magazines. And it will be difficult for any cartoonist or his editor to deny the charges of critics that they were bribed by the $1,000 first prize into supporting the viewpoint of the physicians' committee, even though their opinion may have been arrived at independently.

The American Society of Newspaper Editors, and all editors' groups, should take a firm stand against such contests. The Canons of Journalism should be amended to require that all newspapermen ignore the cash rewards offered in so-called contests in which qualification is based on getting mention of a product or one side of a controversial political subject into the paper.

[From Editor and Publisher of March 13, 1943]

A VICIOUS ATTEMPT TO BRIBE THE PRESS

To the EDITOR:

Now comes the National Physicians' Committee for the Extension of Medical Service with an attempt to bribe the American press by offering $2,200 in prize money to newspaper cartoonists, as revealed in an advertisement on page 27 of Editor and Publisher for February 28. What an insult. Does this selfish group think American cartoonists can be bought—and for such a paltry list of prizes?

This is the boldest, most insidious, most vicious attempt to infiltrate selfish ideas into the American press that has occurred in recent years.

The committee offers cartoonists a "free package" of supplemental data which will furnish ideas. And look what they expect to get for 2,200 bucks; "ten copies of the publication in which the cartoon has been published with a letter of formal application approved by the publisher" * * * "full permission must be granted by the publisher to reprint the cartoon submitted." Here the committee reveals its purpose—to have original cartoons opposing socialized medicine published extensively in American newspapers.

The advertisement referred to was illustrated by a cartoon by J. N. Darling, titled "It's All Mixed and Ready to Swallow," showing Congress in the character of mother pouring from a bottle labeled "Socialized Medicine, three billion a bottle" into a gigantic spoon for administration to a pitiful little figure labeled "Public," held on the floor by a "Political Quack" while "Medical Science" lies in the foreground, bound and gagged. In the background a group of mourners weep over the bier of "Free Enterprise."

No one questions the right of Mr. Darling to draw this cartoon if it expresses his convictions, nor the right of a newspaper to publish it for the same reason. No one questions the right of the committee to argue its side of this great issue in paid advertisements and such other means as may be available to it. Everyone who understands the purpose of a free press in a democracy will deny the right of the committee thus to attempt to corrupt the press.

I don't believe there is a single newspaper cartoonist anywhere in the United States who will fall for this sordid scheme. On the contrary, I believe it will stir the resentment of every cartoonist, editor, and newspaper worker, and I hope the American newspapers will expose this attempt to subvert their true functions.

Criticisms of American newspapers have been numerous and loudly vocal in recent years. This is an opportunity for American newspapers to show that sometimes when a newspaper slips up, the original blame belongs to some selfish institution or group. The public should know the terrific pressures by pressure groups upon every editorial staff every day in the year and here is a concrete example.

RALPH L. CROSMAN,
Director, College of Journalism,
University of Colorado.
BOULDER, COLO.

[From Editor and Publisher of March 20, 1943]

TO EDITORS FROM DOCTORS

We congratulate Editor and Publisher for its forthright editorial in the March 6 issue condemning the contest announced by the National Physicians' Committee in its full-page advertisement which had appeared in Editor and Publisher a week earlier. This advertisement offered $3,000 in prizes to newspaper cartoonists for portrayal of the meaning and implications of political distribution of health-care services in the United States.

The editorial stated clearly the unethical character of the advertisement thus: "The 'contest' rules leave no doubt that this is a subtle bribe to cartoonists to support or oppose certain political beliefs (according to how you look at it), and to obtain general circulation for those beliefs in newspapers and magazines. In other words, large cash awards are offered to cartoonists for doing a propaganda job in behalf of the physicians' committee. * * * They (such contests) are all a threat to independent thinking, objective and unbiased reporting and comment in newspapers. They offer rewards for doing a slanted job in newspapers and magazines."

Some readers may have been surprised at this attempt by the National Physicians' Committee to pervert journalism. Unfortunately we were not surprised. We were ashamed. We as physicians have long been ashamed of the National Physicians' Committee, because it has conducted a propaganda campaign with disregard for facts and a readiness to employ odious labels in place of reasoned argument.

The name, National Physicians' Committee, may cause many laymen to assume that it speaks for all members of the medical profession. This is emphatically not so. Many physicians are opposed to the aims and purposes of the National Physicians' Committee, and many more are ashamed of the methods it constantly uses.

The committee has misrepresented the national health legislation which it opposes. In the official record of the Senate hearings in 1946, for example (December 1, 1945, pp. 963–963), seven of the committee's statements regarding the bill were shown to be

false by comparing them with the summary of the bill published in the Journal of the American Medical Association. The American Medical Association opposed the bill, but printed a factual analysis of it.

The committee has sent to all physicians of the country—and we believe also to many newspapers and periodicals—statements to the effect that the national health-insurance legislation grows out of collectivist doctrine and emanates from Moscow, despite the fact that the principle of this legislation is supported by such Americans as the President of the United States, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, and the officers of the committee for the Nation's Health named below.

We are informed that the National Physicians' Committee has for some time made a practice of distributing canned editorials on a national scale. Some newspapers have published these opinions as their own. Now the National Physicians' Committee proposes the cartoon contest which has been so justly condemned. We are glad that Editor and Publisher calls upon the men in the profession of journalism to take a firm stand against such contests. We hope that in the future the literary products of the National Physicians' Committee, whether submitted as editorials, news, or advertisements, will be given close scrutiny as to their factual and ethical basis.

We physicians, as members of a scientific profession, want to see this subject of medical care handled in a scientific spirit and according to ethical principles which the best men in our profession and in yours have the privilege to cherish.

Thomas Addis, M. D., San Francisco; Ernst P. Boas, M. D., New York; Allan M. Butler, M. D., Boston; Paul B. Cornely, M. D., Washington; Katharine Dodd, M. D., Cincinnati; Channing Frothingham, M. D., Boston; Harry Goldblatt, M. D., Los Angeles; John V. Lawrence, M. D., St. Louis; Hyman Morrison, M. D., Boston; John P. Peters, M. D., New Haven; Henry B. Richardson, M. D., New York; Harry Saltzstein, M. D., Detroit; Max Seham, M. D., Minneapolis; Edward L. Young, M. D., Boston.

(This advertisement is paid for by the Committee for the Nation's Health, 1709 Broadway, New York, a nonpartisan organization supporting national health insurance. Chairman, Channing Frothingham, M. D., honorary vice chairmen, Jonathan Daniels, Russell Davenport, William Green, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Philip Murray, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, David Sarnoff, Gerard Swope. Directors, Thomas Addis, M. D., Barry Bingham, Ernst P. Boas, M. D., Morris Llewellyn Cooke, John J. Corson, Mrs. Gardner Cowles, Michael M. Davis, Albert W. Dent, Abe Fortas, Channing Frothingham, M. D., Mary Dublin Keyserling, Carl C. Lang, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, John V. Lawrence, M. D., Dorothy Norman, Emil Rieve, Anna M. Rosenberg, V. Henry Rothschild 2d, R. M. Walls, D. D. S., Matthew Woll.)

[From the Washington Star of March 30, 1948]

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION'S ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE CARTOONISTS

(By Lowell Mellett)

Something very interesting has been happening recently in the newspaper world and the public should be told about it. The newspapers have been too modest for the most part to do the telling, so here goes:

There appears in the February 28 issue of Editor and Publisher, trade journal of the newspaper business, a page advertisement submitted by the National Physicians' Committee for the extension of medical service. The committee describes itself further as a nonpolitical, nonprofit organization for maintaining ethical and scientific standards and extending medical service to all the people. Take particular note of the word "ethical," for this story has to do with ethics.

The advertisement is directed at newspaper cartoonists. It offers prizes ranging from $1,000 down to $100 for cartoons on the subject of socialized medicine. To be eligible for the contest the cartoons, of course, must appear in the newspapers for which the cartoonists work.

"Write for factual data," says the ad. "Write today for free package of supplemental data which already have been published by leading periodicals with the objective of:

"Preserving in the United States our system of freedom of enterprise to the end that—

"Doctors of medicine may retain, in the public interest, their personal independence, their individual and collective integrity and effectiveness.

"We shall be happy to send you additional brochures, articles, and reports of general information which will be helpful to you."

Only average intelligence is required to recognize this contest for what it is—a bald attempt to buy the support of America's cartoonists for the American Medical Association's fight against national health insurance. (The National Physicians' Committee is the propaganda arm of AMA.) Editor and Publisher, having at least average intelligence, followed through in its next issue with an editorial in which it said:

"The contest rules leave no doubt that this is a subtle bribe to cartoonists to support or oppose certain political beliefs and to obtain general circulation for those beliefs in newspapers and magazines. In other words, large cash awards are offered to cartoonists for doing a propaganda job in behalf of the Physicians' Committee. * * *

"They offer rewards for doing a slanted job in newspapers and magazines. And it will be difficult for any cartoonist or his editor to deny charges of critics that they were bribed by the $1,000 first prize into supporting the viewpoint of the Physicians' Committee, even though their opinion may have been arrived at independently."

That was the first evidence of a clash between journalistic ethics and the ethics of the American Medical Association—which are not exactly the same thing as medical ethics.

Other evidence was given by angry editorials in a few newspapers, although most newspapers have preferred to remain silent, not wishing to call attention to the fact that the AMA considers it possible to bribe editors and cartoonists. The best evidence perhaps was given by a cartoonist, Roy Justus of the Minneapolis Star. He drew a cartoon but it was not what the doctors ordered. It was designed to burn the pants off the so-called Physicians' Committee. His paper printed it.

A few more incidents of this kind may cause the decent doctors of this country, meaning the majority, to take a serious look at what the AMA has been doing in their name.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next. What business the Senate will consider at that time will be determined then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, April 28, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 22), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John M. Echols, of Illinois.

William Koren, Jr., of New Jersey.

GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Brig. Gen. Francis K. Newcomer, United States Army, for appointment as Governor of the Panama Canal, provided for by the Panama Canal Act, approved August 24, 1912, vice Maj. Gen. Joseph C. Mehaffey, United States Army.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

James Vernon Huntley, Judsonia, Ark., in place of A. E. Nelson, resigned.

Horace M. Grogan, Mabelvale, Ark., in place of C. H. King, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Fenton E. Watson, Mira Loma, Calif., in place of C. E. Faulhaber, resigned.

Jared W. Moore, Modesto, Calif., in place of A. A. Fields, resigned.

COLORADO

Dorothy F. Mullen, Bayfield, Colo., in place of L. E. Landreth, resigned.

FLORIDA

Donald E. McDermott, Boca Raton, Fla., in place of F. A. Clement, resigned.

Lois A. Brown, Immokalee, Fla., in place of H. P. Herbert, resigned.

Evangeline W. Shuler, Indian River City, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Edith Z. Petrey, Valparaiso, Fla., in place of M. L. Woodmansee, retired.

ILLINOIS

John C. McKinstra, Freeport, Ill., in place of F. H. Gibler, resigned.

George M. Farrell, Marseilles, Ill., in place of J. A. Maier, resigned.

INDIANA

Joseph C. Renie, Sharpsville, Ind., in place of C. W. Cottingham, resigned.

IOWA

James T. Kisgen, Carroll, Iowa, in place of J. F. Rettenmaier, deceased.

Elton O. Brill, Kamrar, Iowa, in place of M. J. Torrence, transferred.

KANSAS

Harold D. Vernon, Goff, Kans., in place of E. H. Huerter, transferred.

Charles W. Parker, Highland, Kans., in place of W. D. Gilmore, resigned.

Una V. Shoemaker, Perry, Kans., in place of Guietta Stark, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Virginia C. Kent, Tangipahoa, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MASSACHUSETTS

John A. Marshall, Worcester, Mass., in place of J. T. Sheehan, retired.

MINNESOTA

Orville L. Bahl, Holloway, Minn., in place of L. M. Smith, resigned.

Reuel J. Jacobson, Lutsen, Minn., in place of J. C. Bally, resigned.

Leo L. Panneck, Taunton, Minn., in place of R. A. Panneck, transferred.

MONTANA

Alice Hedges, Antelope, Mont., in place of E. O. Sorvick, retired.

Winnie M. Rife, Roy, Mont., in place of W. L. Marsh, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph E. Stout, Pittstown, N. J., in place of W. T. Snyder, transferred.

Ralph T. Hodge, South Vineland, N. J., in place of Ethel Light, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

John Lynn Jones, Clarkton, N. C., in place of L. A. Smith, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ben Ramsland, Almont, N. Dak., in place of Otis Malone, retired.

OHIO

Gail I. Lauer, Prospect, Ohio, in place of C. B. Dix, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Roberto Ortiz Colon, Vega Baja, P. R., in place of V. C. Aviles, transferred.

SOUTH CAROLINA

David M. Peden, Gray Court, S. C., in place of C. W. Reeves, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Dayton C. Sebade, Wall, S. Dak., in place of L. T. Dartt, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Ronald M. Hinton, Parkwater, Wash., in place of M. G. Rosauer, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 22), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

UNITED STATES SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE IN EUROPE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Col. Kenneth David Nichols, O17498, Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947; such appointment to continue in force only for the duration of his assignment as Army member of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission and Chief of the Armed Forces Special Weapon Project.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Harry Dumont Offutt
Gouverneur Vincent Emerson
Dean Flewellyn Winn
Frederick Arthur Blesse
George William Rice
John Morris Hargreaves
Leonard Dudley Heaton
Silas Beach Hays
Crawford Fountain Sams
Harry George Armstrong

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion. (Date of rank will be the date of appointment.)

To be colonels

Hugh Chauncey Johnson
John Owen Colonna
Charles Calvin Higgins
George Craig Stewart
Louis Peter Leone
Robert Leroy Dulaney
James Clarke Carter
Henry Granville Fisher
Ralph Mundon Neal
Edwin Britian Howard
John Paul Evans
William Harold Schaffer
Allen Dwight Raymond, Jr.
×Harold Rathbun Turner
Glenn Castle Wilhide
Wayne Latta Barker
Russell Vivian Perry
Herbert Spencer Jordan
Dresden James Cragun
Thomas Robinson
William Rush Blakely
Carl Eugene Anderson
William Douglass Paschall
Frederick Mott Thompson
Voris Hamilton Connor
Staten Eugene Rall
Don Emerson Carleton
Kenneth Lafayette Johnson
Paul Green Kendall
Ralph Waldo Russell
DeWitt Ballard

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be first lieutenants

James Gyde Owens
Alfred Karl Ganschow
William Henry Hamilton
Daniel Vance, Jr.
John Walter Patrick, Jr.
George Washington Connell, Jr.
Lawrence Lionel Golston
Darrell Roland Rumpf
John Maurice Van Dyke
Joseph Bordeaux Garrett
Carl Edgar Glenn
Walter William Von Tongeln
Alexander Serge Mikhalevsky
Richard Milo Lyman
Douglas Henry Carter
Albert Ellmore Lockhart
Ralph Herschel Alexander
James Wells Startt
William Haskell Allison
Michael John Burke

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Flora Elasibeth Manahan
Imogene LaVerne Stites
Iva Rene Miller
Margaret Ann Rowland
Sara Elizabeth Garvin
Frances Louise Beauchamp
Mary Elizabeth Rosser
Olga Angelina Zanella
Pearl Ruth Jonah
Catherine Shanley McBride

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

Amelia Dorothy Amizich

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, with dates of rank to be as established under the provisions of the aforementioned title:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Edward Allen Noyes
James Albertus Bethea

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Edgar Erskine Hume
Frank Lamont Cole
Paul Henry Streit
Raymond Osborne Dart
George Ellis Armstrong

To be brigadier generals, Dental Corps

Oscar Peter Snyder
George Robert Kennebeck

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS IN THE GRADE SPECIFIED

To be captains

Ruth A. Robinson, WMSC (OT).
Helen R. Sheehan, WMSC (OT).
Eleanor J. Westfall, WMSC (PT), M433.
Beatrice Whitcomb, WMSC (PT), M2526.
Margaret E. Whitehurst, WMSC (PT), M534.

To be first lieutenants

Rubye W. Archer, ANC, N724114.
Erma L. Baldwin, ANC, N788894.
Mary F. Beck, WMSC (OT).
Margaret E. Bellue, ANC, N735053.
Anna B. Berterman, ANC, N773398.
Goldie L. Bodson, ANC, N761282.
Irene C. Bofenkamp, ANC, N732184.
Phyllis A. Boland, ANC, N772328.
Stephanie M. Borgia, ANC, N796547.
Dorothy P. Briggs, ANC, N744326.
Edna M. Browning, ANC, N761389.
Beth Campbell, WMSC (Diet.), R637.
Elizabeth M. A. Campbell, ANC, N790092.
Mercedes A. Castille, ANC, N734154.
Louise P. Cavagnaro, ANC, N783964.
Delia F. Caylor, ANC, N727405.
Evelyn M. Churchill, WMSC (Diet.), R1083.
Christine Coletti, ANC, N742800.
Freda M. Cornell, ANC, N769363.
Helen E. Cundiff, ANC, N735135.
Olga Dorosh, ANC, N724074.
Marguerite G. Duggan, ANC, N721367.
Clara M. Duley, ANC, N736153.
Elizabeth M. Dunsmore, ANC, N732477.
Virginia D. Earpe, ANC, N768096.
Dorcas E. Easterling, ANC, N734007.
June Egbert, ANC, N785604.
Marjorie B. Erdmann, ANC, N731819.
Marian Eskeldson, ANC, N776284.
Edith H. Fowler, ANC, N755476.
Elizabeth Fowler, WMSC (PT), M2650.
Clara E. Franks, ANC, N768914.
Genevieve D. Guitrau, ANC, N779279.
Thelma A. Harman, WMSC (Diet.), R957.
Helen J. Hash, ANC, N769344.
Jean M. Hawkins, WMSC (Diet.), R799.
Florence D. Hedrick, ANC, N765065.
Thelma M. Horgen, ANC, N783544.
Maebelle Hosterman, ANC, N762298.
Dorothy J. Huelsman, ANC, N764463.
Beatrice E. Johnson, ANC, N742326.
Elizabeth A. Jones, ANC, N753564.
Nettie B. Jones, WMSC (PT), M2664.
Margaret A. Kabana, ANC, N725078.
Mary P. Kent, ANC, N743081.
Nancy C. Kermott, ANC, N776636.
Julia A. King, ANC, N787630.
Dorothea M. Lawlor, ANC, N756293.
Dorothy M. Lear, ANC, N760804.
Laura B. Little, ANC, N779377.
Anna L. Loftus, WMSC (OT).
Verta R. Long, ANC, N726855.
Inez T. Lott, ANC, N788100.
Ruth S. McBurnie, ANC, N783630.
Elizabeth C. Mahoney, ANC, N774018.
Ellen C. Miller, WMSC (Diet.), R2189.
Elizabeth M. Nachod, WMSC (OT).
Evelyn J. Niles, ANC, N765166.
Mary L. O'Brien, ANC, N736465.
Catherine J. D. O'Connor, ANC, N779981.
Elizabeth J. Orr, ANC, N794663.
Marion J. Pace, ANC, N735777.
Margaret E. Pettibone, ANC, N785510.
Carolyn B. Rahm, ANC, N787910.
Virginia H. Ramage, ANC, N779246.
Rosalie M. Requist, ANC, N744241.
Nina M. Romeo, ANC, N721095.
Paula A. Schaefer, ANC, N790228.
Laura B. Schild, ANC, N789215.
Geneva F. Sims, ANC, N729992.
Eleanor M. Slade, ANC, N753147.
Marjorie E. Sodt, ANC, N795537.
Lucile Standley, ANC, N763651.
Dora F. L. Sullivan, ANC, N703917.
Katherine F. Taliercio, ANC, N757533.
Sara A. Tapp, ANC, N764812.
Mary C. Tkacik, ANC, N725709.

Mary L. Todd, ANC, N734185.
Mary E. Vaughan, ANC, N723564.
Sara A. Walb, ANC, N742442.
Wilma L. West, WMSC (OT).
Daisy D. Williams, ANC, N737787.
Dorothy A. Wolfe, ANC, N730872.
Lurline V. Zuerner, ANC, N783276.

To be second lieutenants

Mary K. Berteling, WMSC (OT).
Lottie V. Blanton, WMSC (OT),
Josephine M. Burt, WMSC (PT), M2729.
Virginia D. Coffin, WMSC (OT).
Clara C. Copeland, ANC, N765654.
Elsie L. Deming, WMSC (OT).
Patricia A. Donaldson, ANC, N799398.
Theresa M. Ferrazzoli, WMSC (PT), M2717.
Helen L. Gabler, WMSC (OT).
Lucy J. Kahmann, WMSC (OT).
Mary C. Lachette, ANC, N800010.
Miriam J. Partridge, WMSC (PT), M2805.
Betty L. Reichert, WMSC (PT), M2707.
Susanna Schramm, WMSC (OT).
Mary E. Thelen, ANC, N786940.
Hildegard V. Wenstrom, WMSC (PT), M2752.
Joan M. Wissing, ANC, N802136.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS AND THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS IN THE GRADE SPECIFIED

To be captains

Inez I. Baum, WMSC (PT), M443.
Olga S. Heard, WMSC (Diet.), R75.

To be first lieutenants

Phyllis D. Barsh, ANC, N773722.
Roberta Broyles, ANC, N790616.
Catharine A. Burgmeier, ANC, N779920.
Kathleen R. Creech, WMSC (Diet.), R648.
Evelyn C. Ekstrom, ANC, N754110.
Virginia M. Elder, ANC, N723862.
Ruth M. Engel, ANC, N778098.
Juanita E. Fannin, ANC, N768913.
Lu Gomez, ANC, N788919.
Lulu J. Hartman, ANC, N768377.
Mona O. Hetland, ANC, N777355.
Elizabeth A. Hughes, ANC, N745171.
Esther M. Knoedler, ANC, N732206.
Jean M. Lang, ANC, N721159.
Edna H. Livaudais, WMSC (PT), M1232.
Helen Logan, ANC, N787308.
Frances A. Lusas, ANC, N751622.
Rose M. MacKellar, WMSC (Diet.), R190.
Ethel S. Madden, ANC, N785083.
Ann Markey, ANC, N731072.
Alice M. McDowell, ANC, N768192.
Agnes L. Miller, ANC, N727259.
Alyce G. Milne, WMSC (OT).
Nadine A. Neisig, ANC, N772760.
Rita M. Pfeiffer, ANC, N773595.
Edna L. Phariss, ANC, N732558.
Mary E. Pierce, ANC, N728765.
Olie B. Reed, ANC, N724951.
Margaret J. Rice, ANC, N759617.
Helen A. Rydzewski, ANC, N755886.
Edythe B. Sanborn, ANC, N752594.
Catherine E. Sanford, ANC, N723466.
Dorothy F. Shaw, ANC, N783003.
Barbara M. Short, ANC, N775527.
Carol V. Smith, ANC, N775342.
Virginia L. Smith, ANCV, N773897.
Betty J. Snyder, WMSC (PT), M2496.
Doris M. Vance, ANC, N732635.
Tannie E. Westmoreland, ANC, N764987.
Mary W. Wilborne, ANC, N759122.

To be second lieutenants

Gloria F. Coradi, ANC, N754740.
Frances A. Foley, ANC, N792054.
Marjorie A. Mell, WMSC (OT).
Miriam A. Schulz, ANC, N796722.
Gisela M. Zernick, ANC, N800184.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Frank Frederick Bell
Robert Charles Dean
Whitfield Jack
Ralph Hendricks McKee
Ralph Albert Palladino
Herbert Harold Vreeland, Jr.
Arthur Pope Watson

HONORARY RESERVE

To be major general

Walter Perry Story

APPOINTMENT IN NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier general of the line, to date from December 7, 1947

Errol Henry Zistel

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 502 AND 508 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be first lieutenants

Kenneth McMillin Stewart
Emil John Schutt
Robert Andrew Blair
Ralph Lee Hicks
Shirley Leon Foreman
Robert Thomas Higdon
Edward Joseph Conway
Theodore Phillip Martin
Daniel Joseph Sheehan, Jr.
Alvin Willard Banner
Nelton Ronald Wilson
Milburn Grant Apt
Jack Cox, Jr.
Andrew Jules Chapman
Paul Enos Rova
Robert Francis Kaltenbacher
Billy Gordon Moseley
Jack Victor Allen
Paul Arnold Roney
Philip Reed Vaughn
Douglas John Howard
Robert Ewing Gay
Robert James Pierce
Donald Graham May
William Boyd, Jr.
Robert Rufus French
Albert Edwin Ninde
Elmer Roy Smith
Harlan Eugene Ball
William Alfred Swanson
Lawrence Oscar Thomas
James Millard Davis
Delbert Volney Berg, Jr.
Richard Gene Twyman
Stephen Phillip Walter
Jesse Charles Bush, Jr.
Rufus Winfrey Scott
Dewey Roger Laney
James Edward Leonhard
Leo Cayetano Baca
David Both Van Pelt
William Stanley McGregor
William Richard Werb
Paul Quillian Holloway
Donald Oscar Beck
Leo Dee Putt
Marvin Walter Miller
Don Byron McEntire
John Richard Francis
David Sylvester Melluish
Montie Thompson, Jr.
Robert Joseph Kalina
Ray Barton
Carl Bryan Fountain
Donald William Payne
Joseph Robert Clark
Donald Wilbert Akers
Bushnell Nelson Welch
Edward Charles Whalen
Theodore Leonard Monasee
Charles Arthur Monasee
Gerald Vern Kehrli
Frederick John Reitman, Jr.
Von Harold Dixon
Gerald Francis Fitzgerald

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

James Dennett McIntyre
Arthur William Vanaman
Bryant LeMaire Boatner
Frank Fort Everest
Truman Hempel Landon

To be brigadier generals

Robert Chapin Candee
Rosenham Beam
Hugh Whitt
Joseph Vincent de Paul Dillon
Roscoe Charles Wilson
Paul Thomas Cullen
Oliver Stanton Picher
Ralph Powell Swofford, Jr.
William Dole Eckert

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Emil Henry Molthan
Lacey Van Buren Murrow
Robert Armstrong Nagle

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Charles M. Cooke, Jr., United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list of the Navy with the rank of admiral.

Vice Adm. John L. Hall, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commandant of the Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va.

Rear Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations).

Rear Adm. Herbert C. Lassiter, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

John R. Behr

LIEUTENANTS

Jack F. Buescher
William D. Reed

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

David E. Ward

ENSIGNS

Joseph J. August
Charles A. Sueur

The following-named (civilian-college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

James F. Berry	John R. Huston
William H. Cope	Robert C. Kessler
William A. Cull	Vincent E. Lowery
Calvin J. Curts	Andrew M. Margileth
Donald R. Davis	Philip W. Mayo
Donald J. Dochen	Jack W. Millar
Byron T. Eberly	Stephen R. Mills, Jr.
Wayne L. Erdbrink	James E. McClenathan
John W. Flynn	Richmond T. Prehn
Carl N. Haggard	Donald W. Spicer
Robert McA. Hamill	Donald E. Upp
Walter R. Holland	Joseph L. Whatley
Hal T. Hurn	Henry E. Wolfe, Jr.

John W. Eastlack (civilian-college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Margaret T. Barrow	Vila L. Knuth
Joanna S. Bubp	Andrea Lago
Jane F. Buettner	Veronica A. Lesho
Theresa M. Canjuga	Rita T. Maciag
Beverly A. Coey	Mary M. Murray
Mary M. Deak	Muriel H. Riley
Dorothy M. Frison	Janina J. Rupert
Rita A. Gervais	Shirley E. Sauvage
Betty L. Gregorio	Anna Skaleski
Rosemary L. Gunn	Margaret J. Stewart
Olga Hitchak	Mae B. Stumm
"E" M. Hohmann	Lillian R. Wojnarowski

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Ralph L. Eslick

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Theodore R. Hunley

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from June 4, 1948:

Richard L. Alford	Francis J. Kovalcik
Carl B. Austin	Warren W. Lord
Fred W. Baldwin	Albert F. Lovata
John A. Bayers	Robert B. McKay
Francis E. Brooks	Albert C. MacDonald
Dudley A. Buck	Thomas P. Marks
Francis J. Corrigan	Thomas D. Nabors, Jr
John A. Duffy	Leonard H. Nettnin
Frederick L. Eareckson Jr.	Paul W. Nicholson
	Jerry A. Pacilio
John L. Fogle	Hugh W. Rose
Thomas F. Hahn	Francis J. Roth
Charles R. Hannum	Aimo M. Saari
Charles Z. Hanus	Herbert J. Shields
Elwin R. Harris	Ralph R. Speicher, Jr.
James E. Henry	Douglas DeL. Swift
William W. Holm	Dillan W. Taff
Roy A. Howard, Jr.	James P. Trinity, Jr.
Harry E. Hunt	James W. Walker, Jr.
Harry C. Judy, Jr.	Richard M. Znaniecki
Robert G. Keller	

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, to rank from June 4, 1948:

Herbert E. Reichert
Charles E. P. Schappacher
James E. Weibel

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Domenico N. Bibbo	William T. Peckham
Charles W. Calhoun	Robert R. Raber
Frank W. Day	Jack M. Thornburgh
Herbert R. Foster	Dexter M. Welton
Robert F. Harsch	Robert L. Winkler
Steven K. Kauffman	

Delmar W. Ruthig (civilian-college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Margaret LaR. Boyer	Sonia Loir
Helen S. Crowell	Mae O. Lovin
Helen J. Francis	Owedia M. Searcy
Betty E. Jenkinson	Dorothy D. Stoddard
Virginia M. Jennings	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

George Donabedian
Wilson G. Scanlon
Edward H. Taylor

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

John P. Colmore
Verne K. Harvey, Jr.
Charles E. Rogers

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Philip B. Dalton

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Elizabeth V. Butenas	Wordie Isbell
Bertha E. Harris	Carol E. Sawyer

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Anne J. Chelf	Gertrude W. Killebrew
Marion M. Dooley	Mildred M. Lankenau
Carolyn L. Falconi	Alva B. Pelkington
Mary M. Hogan	Helen K. Quay
Dolores M. Iacone	Phyllis A. Scungio

ENSIGNS

Elizabeth M. Simpson
Dorothy M. Troyan
Irene M. Walters

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenants

Walter E. Anderson	Gordon L. Rea
Hubert G. Bozarth	Frederick M. Steinhauser
Zadik Collier	
Frederick Dykstra	Clyde H. Webster
John R. Gray	Clarence S. Wick
Leon E. Matthews	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father, Thou who hast led Thy children through fire and cloud in ages past, today lead us through the maze of questions that are before us. We pray for a strong, uncontaminated citizenship, free from every subversive element. Shed Thy might upon the perplexing problems and sweep aside all discord which is harmful to the public welfare. Make large our conception of duty and unite us as never before, binding us with the spirit of a loyal determination to preserve the blessed ways of American life. For the sake of our country, we pray Thee to strengthen our wills for every good work; for vacillation, give us steadiness; for ignorance, give us understanding, meeting storm with calm, adversity with fortitude, and defeat with faith. In the name of Jesus our Saviour. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

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

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order until after the Journal is read?

Mr. BUCK. I regret that I must insist on my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order so that the Chair may swear in a new Member?

Mr. BUCK. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

APRIL 24, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of Hon. JOHN ALBERT WHITAKER as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Second Congressional District of the State of Kentucky, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Earle C. Clements, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. WHITAKER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 48]

Andrews, Ala.	Hall,	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur	Morgan
Battle	Harless, Ariz.	Mundt
Bell	Harrison	Norton
Bland	Hart	O'Toole
Bloom	Hartley	Patterson
Bolton	Hedrick	Pfeifer
Boykin	Heffernan	Powell
Buckley	Hendricks	Price, Fla.
Carroll	Jackson, Calif.	Rains
Celler	Jarman	Rich
Clason	Jenkins, Ohio	Rizley
Clippinger	Jenkins, Pa.	Scoblick
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Shafer
Coudert	Jones, N. C.	Sikes
Courtney	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Dague	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Ill.	Kilday	Smith, Ohio
Delaney	Lusk	Stratton
Dingell	McCormack	Sundstrom
Fenton	McCowen	Taylor
Gallagher	McDowell	Thomas, N. J.
Gavin	Macy	Trimble
Gillette	Madden	Wadsworth
Gore	Manasco	Walter
Graham	Mansfield	West
Grant, Ala.	Meyer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 22, 1948, 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 amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2239. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

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

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House, in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 5328, to make certain corrections.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 866. An act 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 for other purposes;

S. 1322. An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 2158. An act to amend the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, so as to eliminate certain provisions of such acts requiring the re-

tention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States; and

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold.

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

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
6. National Archives.
7. Veterans' Administration.

KENNEWICK DIVISION OF THE YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 550, Rept. No. 1797), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

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. 4954) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continued not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTHOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 549, Rept. No. 1796), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

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. 5963) to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 548, Rept. No. 1795), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

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. 5992) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the motion to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman sign the petition?

Mr. RIVERS. I did, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is entitled to 10 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recognized in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIVERS. The proponents of the motion have 10 minutes and the opponents have 10 minutes, and the proponents have the right to close the debate?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated the situation accurately. He has the right to close debate.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the proposition before us at this moment is very plain. It is simply, Shall the House Committee on Agriculture be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2245?

It will be alleged here that to discharge the committee is an attack on the committee system, but, Mr. Speaker, it is the very opposite. The discharge petition method is part of the committee system. It was designed as a great reform. It was designed, if you please, as the safety valve that permits the Congress and the public to bring measures before this body for consideration and a vote when a committee fails to function.

In this particular instance, the need of the discharge method was extraordinary because the committee not alone voted not to bring to this floor any of the pending bills but voted further not even to consider any legislation which might hereafter be introduced during this session. Therefore, with the public demand that this measure be debated and voted on, I certainly urge upon my colleagues that the committee be discharged and that the majority of this House have the right to function as they properly should.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if this proposed measure were not so serious it would be ridiculous. Just think of it. Folks cannot eat oleo unless it is colored to imitate butter, so that they can deceive themselves. Just think of it. If it were not for the fact that long-established practice has permitted this thing to be done under this tax, it would be before the Federal Trade Commission, in my opinion, as an unfair practice, trying to color the product for sale to make it look like butter. If this tax is repealed, the oleo manufacturers will find a way to raise the price corresponding to the cut in the tax. At the present time, with the packages that they put the thing out in, if they want to color it to suit themselves so that they can deceive themselves at their own tables, they can do so by putting a little pellet inside the package so that they do not even have to dirty their hands with it. It seems to me that this whole operation is silly. Why should we want to deceive ourselves? I cannot see it. This tax was put on because it was regarded as an unfair trade practice, and, as I understand it, it was put on before the law providing against unfair trade practices was passed and before the Federal Trade Commission was established.

I hope that the Congress will not try to help the people deceive themselves that this is butter. Why would they care whether it was colored yellow or green or black or white?

One other thing that has aroused my interest in this matter is that linseed oil is used to make paints. I was told this

morning by the Department of Agriculture that linseed oil is one of the main ingredients of some types of oleo. I do not know whether that is something you ought to consider here or not, but it is a very interesting thing. I hope we will not go ahead and deceive ourselves and try to deceive the public into believing that something is butter which is not butter and thus destroy the opportunity that our dairy industry has to supply the people with that kind of table food which we have known for so long as butter.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the measure now before the House, namely the motion to discharge the Agricultural Committee from further consideration of the Rivers' margarine bill, should receive the overwhelming support of the Members.

There never has been any real justification for the present legal discrimination against the sale and use of margarine. Without any doubt whatsoever, the law discriminating against the sale of margarine was enacted as a result of the activities of those who had a desire to provide special privilege for the sale of another commodity, namely, butter.

There is no misrepresentation whatsoever in connection with the sale of margarine. I have always been, and still am, a strong advocate of requiring the truth to be told about the fabric or substance of any commodities sold to the public. I have no desire to see the margarine manufacturers given any advantage in the matter of labeling their goods. I am entirely willing and desirous of having them required to label or mark as clearly as possible the name of their product on the package in which it is sold to the public. I have not heard of any of the margarine producers or dealers who object to doing this. They are perfectly willing to have their product marked for what it is—margarine. That being true, what possible reason can be advanced for the attempt to prevent a free sale of a wholesome food to the public in competition with other food of a similar nature? It is said, however, that it could be sold in the restaurants without label or mark to distinguish it from butter. I patronize restaurants very often, and I never yet have seen margarine sold in such a way as to be mistaken for butter. Even, however, if I may have been an exception, I certainly would have no objection, and I have heard no supporter of the margarine cause object to having a legal requirement to the effect that a statement should be placed on the tables in the restaurants that margarine is being served.

They cry, however, that margarine is given an orange color and that makes it look like butter. The fact of the matter is that when I was a boy at home in school, all the butter that was sold in the village practically, was colored. The butter produced by the farmers was always a very pale-colored substance, and most of the sellers saw to it that coloring was added to make it more attractive. Even if there were any merit to this contention, however, I know of no one who would object seriously to seeing that coloring had been added to other things in the production of margarine.

There is simply no real excuse for this injustice that has been perpetrated on the American people for decades past. Experts on food chemistry will tell you that first-class margarine is equally, if not more, nutritious than first-class butter. Certainly from a sanitary standpoint, there is greater likelihood of margarine, which is purely a vegetable product, being more sanitary than butter would be, in view of the fact that butter is derived from milk which comes from the body of the animal and would vary from the sanitary standpoint as the health of the cow might vary.

No; this is an illustration of a thing that was common in old England before the days when the Parliament had become an institution of any power. A special privilege, such as has been enjoyed by the butter producers in the United States, was granted in a little different way in the time of Elizabeth, but nevertheless had the same effect, namely to give those selling a certain product a price and profit which would not have been possible without the restriction made possible by law. Parliament, in the early reign of Queen Elizabeth, had been a subordinate institution, in fact, almost a powerless body, but there was a constant growth in the resentment against the injustices which were inflicted upon the English people because of the power exercised by the absolute monarchy uncontrolled by a representative body.

To illustrate the extent to which such special privilege, such exclusive monopolies to deal in commodities which were the necessaries of life, prevailed, let me quote to you the following from Taswell-Langmead's English Constitutional History at 394 and the following:

> It was in the Parliament of 1601 that the opposition, which had, during 40 years, been silently gathering and husbanding strength, fought its first great battle and won its first victory. The conflict arose concerning the enormous abuse of monopolies. Under cover of the loosely defined prerogative possessed or assumed by the Crown of regulating all matters relating to commerce, the Queen had taken upon herself to make lavish grants to her courtiers, or patents to deal exclusively in a multitude of articles, mostly common necessaries of life. Coal, leather, salt, oil, vinegar, starch, iron, lead, yarn, glass, and many other commodities were in consequence only to be obtained at ruinous prices. The grievance was first mooted in Parliament in 1571 by a Mr. Bell; but he was at once summoned before the council, and returned to the House "with such an amazed countenance, that it daunted all the rest." After the lapse of 26 years the Commons ventured, in 1597, to present an address to the Queen on the same subject, to which she replied, through the Lord Keeper, that she "hoped her dutiful and loving subjects would not take away her prerogative, which is the choicest flower in her garden, and the principal head pearl in her crown diadem; but would rather leave that to her disposition, promising to examine all patents and to abide the touchstone of the law." In spite of these fair words, the abuse, far from being abated, rose to a still greater height. So numerous were the articles subject to monopoly that when the list of them was read over in the House in 1601 an indignant Member exclaimed, "Is not bread amongst them? Nay, if no remedy is found for these, bread will be there before the next Parliament." A bill for the explanation of the common law in certain cases of letters patent was introduced by Mr. Laurence Hyde, and was debated with unprecedented warmth for 4 days. The ministers and courtiers, who endeavored to support the prerogative, were overborne by a torrent of indignant and menacing eloquence. The populace openly cursed the monopolies, and declared that the prerogative should not be suffered to touch the old liberties of England. Seeing that resistance was no longer politic, or even possible, Elizabeth, with admirable tact, sent a message to the House that, understanding that divers patents which she had granted had been grievous to her subjects, some should be presently repealed, some superseded, and none put in execution, but such as should first have a trial, according to the law, for the good of the people. Robert Cecil, the secretary, added the more direct assurance that all existing patents should be revoked, and no others granted for the future. Overjoyed at their victory, the Commons waited upon the Queen with an address of thanks, to which she replied in an affectionate and even apologetic tone: "Never since I was a Queen," she told them, "did I put my pen to any grant but upon pretext and semblance made to me, that it was both good and beneficial to the subjects in general though a private profit to some of my ancient servants who had deserved well. * * * Never thought was cherished in my heart that tended not to my people's good."

What was done by Queen Elizabeth as evidenced by the foregoing quotation was possible because of her power as an absolute monarch. As chief executive without the check by any power, she was able to grant favors to her friends, as shown in the quotation just given, whereas the present-day monopoly in regard to the sale of butter was granted by the legislative body so as to prevent competition by another food of a similar character. Both are equally vicious, both result in the same kind of harm to the people, who should be able to buy food in a freely competitive market, instead of being compelled to pay high prices to the sellers of a product which has been given a special privilege by law, and thereby enables them to get an extortionate price.

The Rivers bill should be passed by unanimous vote as a matter of justice. Let us make sure that our vote will be so overwhelmingly in favor of the pending bill that no attempt will ever be made to grant by such vicious legislation a monopoly to anyone in the sale of food.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that the discharge rule is one which should be used under only the most unusual circumstances. There may be times if a committee arbitrarily refuses to consider a bill when it might be proper to use the discharge rule, and Members might be justified in signing a discharge petition. I personally have not signed a discharge petition for a great many years. In fact, I have only signed one during the more than 20 years that I have been in Congress, and that was many years ago.

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

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The time to sign a discharge petition is when it is backed here by a well-organized lobby?

Mr. HOPE. Well, certainly in this case the discharge petition was backed by such a lobby. I do not believe anyone would care to controvert that statement.

In this particular case the committee held hearings early in the session. There was no effort to delay the matter. The committee gave the proponents of the legislation exactly the time they asked for. They asked for a week's hearings. They got a week's hearings. I do not believe anyone will say that they did not get a fair hearing. In fact, many of the proponents of the legislation have told me that they did get a fair hearing.

The committee considered the legislation in executive session, carefully. Most of the members were present during all the time of the hearings. In fact, I think we had almost a full committee present during the entire time the hearings were in progress. In the course of those hearings the evidence disclosed that about two-thirds of the people of the United States at the time lived in territory where the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine is absolutely prohibited, and that most of the remainder of the people of the United States lived in States which imposed some restrictions upon the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine.

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

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

Mr. DONDERO. How many States in the Union have laws prohibiting the sale of colored oleomargarine?

Mr. HOPE. At the time of the hearings there were 23 States. I understand that since that time 2 States have either repealed or modified their laws.

Those States, in the main, are States with large population, so that almost two-thirds of the entire population of the country reside in them. Now, the committee felt that since this was a very controversial question, and since any action which this Congress might take at this time would be absolutely without effect in States in which lived two-thirds of the population of the Nation, that the matter was one which should have some further consideration. At the time the committee took action in tabling the measures that were before it, the Chairman was instructed to appoint a subcommittee to give further consideration to this question and to report before the expiration of this Congress. That committee has been appointed and it has been working on this subject matter.

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

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Then, following the observation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], the information was that the committee had not taken action, and to proceed in this manner would indicate that any time the committee did not take the action that somebody wanted they should sign a discharge petition. That would naturally be the situation that would follow here. The committee has, as the gentleman has said, already considered it. It did take committee action, as the gentleman has well stated.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; and in the same connection let the gentleman from Kansas state that, while the form of resolution adopted might give the implication that the committee could not give further consideration to this question during this session, I am advised by the Parliamentarian that the committee could not bind itself not to take up future legislation. Therefore, there is nothing that the committee did which in any way would have prevented the committee from considering any later bills which might have been submitted to the committee during this session.

Now, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I wish very briefly to say that I agree with the chairman that the hearings were very fairly conducted, but was it not the intention of the resolution passed by the gentleman's committee that it would end the possibility of legislation on this matter for this session?

Mr. HOPE. I think that the form of the resolution was such that it would indicate that the committee thought it was concluding its consideration for this session, but, as I have said, that would not and could not have precluded the committee from giving consideration to new bills which might have been introduced.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On that point is it not a fact that the committee could have taken it up at any time by unanimous consent?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; it could have taken it up by unanimous consent or it could have taken up any bill on oleomargarine which might have been introduced at a later date in the same manner that it would take up any bill that might be referred to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances that seem to exist in this situation, it does not seem to me that any case has been made for the discharge of the committee. The committee held hearings—timely hearings; it gave full and fair consideration to the question. It seems to me that no case has been made out for discharging the committee, and I submit that the committee should not be discharged on this vote.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this discharge petition would not be before this House today had the dairy lobby not tricked the Congress some 60 years ago. The trick was to write into the Rules of the House a provision that all margarine tax legislation must be referred to the Committee on Agriculture. That lobby knew full well that no Committee on Agriculture, despite the contrary interest of the American housewife, would ever favorably report a bill to remove taxation on margarine. Their prediction was more than fair.

I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that not a single Republican affixed his name to this discharge petition until after the Committee on Agriculture had failed to act—until after that committee had done its utmost to close the door on margarine tax relief for the balance of this session. It was only then that Republicans, in the interest of American consumers, joined their colleagues from across the aisle in bringing this measure before the House today.

The first and critical step in the elimination of these unconscionable taxes is to vote "aye" on the pending motion.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with everything that my chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], had to say with reference to what happened in our committee. He is a splendid gentleman and as fair as a man can be. But I would also like to call the attention of the House to certain other actions of the committee.

A motion was made at the conclusion of the hearing to table all bills, not only the bills that were pending but all bills that might thereafter be introduced during this session of Congress. That motion was carried. The object of the motion was to kill all bills for this session of Congress, and then in order to make it certain that the Committee on Agriculture could not consider margarine legislation further this year, in order to cinch the matter, a motion was made to reconsider the vote and a further motion was made to table the motion to reconsider. The latter motion prevailed. The committee therefore endeavored, whether it succeeded or not, it endeavored to tie the hands of the House Committee on Agriculture absolutely for the remainder of this session of Congress no matter what margarine bill might be introduced and no matter how meritorious it might be.

Every consumer in this country is interested in this legislation, people throughout the length and breadth of this land, consumers, veterans' organizations, labor, women's organizations—they favor this bill. This is the only opportunity you will have to vote on it. In view of the committee action, you will have no other opportunity. Now is the time. I think the committee ought to be discharged.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take issue at this time with my very dear and beloved friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who seems to hold to the idea that butter has a monopoly on the color "yellow." Why they do not have to pay a tax to color butter yellow 12 months of the year is more than I can understand when the oleomargarine people have to pay a tax for that privilege.

Another very good friend of mine, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED],

made the statement that a powerful and well paid lobby is responsible for this discharge petition. There was a powerful lobby, yes, indeed, the most powerful that has ever been witnessed in this Congress in the years it has been in session. That lobby was composed of the American housewives. The American press, the American radio, and every magazine in the country recognizes this tax is a travesty on the rights of the American housewife. Yes, a lobby, Mr. REED, but not a paid lobby. Every Member of this House can verify that by the mail he has received from independent sources—labor, the housewife, the civic clubs, every interest in the country. They want this tax removed. It is an unfair tax.

Mr. Speaker, I beg of you to vote "yea" when it comes to voting on the pending motion.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, nearly 40 years ago I introduced two bills in the House to repeal or reduce what I considered an unfair tax on oleomargarine, then commonly referred to as "butterine," which was imposed on the country by the dairy interests. Since the introduction of these bills I have endeavored to bring about the repeal of the tax. The matter of the repeal or adjustment of the tax has lain dormant for many years, but when butter rose to the price of a dollar a pound a demand from the housewives from nearly all sections of the country was made for the repeal of what they termed an unfair and unjust tax on this food item daily consumed by their families. Several repeal bills were introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture composed of nearly all Representatives having agricultural interests who failed to report a bill out, whereupon the gentleman from South Carolina filed a petition to discharge the committee from further consideration of H. R. 2245 and with the signing of the petition by 218 Members the bill is now before us for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I concede that there are 22 States in which the dairy interests have succeeded in enacting legislation imposing restrictions on the sale and manufacture of oleomargarine, but two wrongs do not make a right. I am indeed gratified that the House is finally acting to remove this unjust 10-cent tax. In this connection, I wish to say that the continuous rise in the cost of living, embracing an increase on practically every food item, will bring about a similar universal demand for legislation for the return of price controls and rationing.

The statement has been made by several opponents of the bill that it may be expected that the oleomargarine manufacturers will immediately raise their prices. They might do so but my warning is that they had better be careful because the people will not stand for it and may demand that we put a price ceiling on oleomargarine products and other foodstuffs and commodities as well. I say this especially in view of the fact that the vested interests have taken charge of the situation, because it was believed if they were given the right of voluntary action in controlling and reducing prices, prices would have at least been held in check, but despite this voluntary action prices are still increasing and it is only a question of a short time when we will be obliged to act to protect the public from these avaricious combines who, instead of voluntarily reducing prices, are continuing to raise them until today it is impossible for families of low income to even exist.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] lays great stress as to the coloring of oleomargarine. Is it not a fact that 90 percent of the butter is colored and do the butter processors pay any tax on it, so why should those who cannot afford to pay $1 a pound for butter be forced to pay a 10-cent tax on the wholesome oleomargarine substitute?

I observed a few of my Republican colleagues appeared surprised and seemed to doubt my statement that I introduced several measures nearly 40 years ago on this subject legislation. To remove any doubt in their minds, I hope tomorrow I will be given an opportunity to submit positive proof of my efforts years ago to bring about the repeal of this unjustifiable and unwarranted tax on butter substitutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this body for 22 years. I represent a district in the heart of a very large city. I will compare my voting record during that time on legislation favorable to the farmers of this country with any Member of Congress representing a rural district.

I shall vote to discharge the committee and I will vote for the bill to repeal the discriminatory tax on margarine. It is the duty of Congress to do everything within its power to reduce the cost of living. Mr. Speaker, immediately following the decision of the committee to discontinue hearings on the bill to repeal the tax on margarine, butter took a jump of as high as 8 cents a pound in certain sections of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an editorial printed in the San Francisco Chronicle under date of April 23, 1948, entitled "The Margarine Tax":

THE MARGARINE TAX

By all signs, the House will vote at last to repeal the discriminatory tax on margarine, and repeal prospects in the Senate have sharply looked up with Senator TAFT'S announcement that he favors it.

For all the years it has been kept on the books the tax has been entirely wrong in principle. On the pretext that artificial coloring is employed, margarine makers and dealers have been forced to distribute under special taxation calculated artificially to keep the price of margarine so near that of butter as to discourage consumption. The pretext has no validity, for many foods are artificially colored without being penalized, and butter is often among them. The law amounted in principle to Government subsidy of one American industry against its competition for no reason except pressure of a powerful lobby.

Of recent years, realistic considerations have also come to the fore. Many families are feeling the pinch of high prices, and these are often families most in need of additional fat in their diets. It has therefore become a matter of national health, as well as principle, that the Government no longer be a party to this inequity.

Congress should close out a bad practice which has endured too long.

TAXES ON OLEO COMPARED WITH TAXES ON TEA

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the people have resented from our earliest colonial history any direct taxes on their food budget. The wrath of the wives of America today is comparable with the resentment of those hardy colonists who boarded the ships in Boston Harbor and tossed overboard the tea taxed by the British. The taxation of one food for the benefit of a competing food product is equally intolerable. No wonder the women of the country are angry. Not only does the tax on oleo contribute to the higher cost of this spread for the poor man's bread, but millions of hours and tons of good food must be wasted in tribute to the dairy trusts.

Good oleomargarine is the nutritional equivalent of good butter, yet we tax the one and not the other. This is as bad as taxing lamb chops because they are not chemically identical with beefsteak. The dairy spokesmen reply that the tax is necessary to prevent oleo from being sold fraudulently as butter. Of course, they fail to remind us that other products are protected from fraudulent competition without the assessment of tax under the Federal trade and food and drug laws. Why butterfat should feel that it has a monopoly on the color yellow has always been difficult for me to understand. In fact, color is actually added to butter in wintertime to preserve the yellow tint.

The Dairy Trust argues that it would be destroyed if this tax is repealed. The truth is that butter production now results in an oversupply of skim milk, which is largely wasted. If the production of oleomargarine should result in reduced production of butter, there would be available a larger supply of whole milk, which would add to the health of the Nation's children. Moreover, any competition that shakes the price of butter from its $1 a pound pedestal would certainly be most welcome to those consumers who have long ago stricken that item from the family budget.

It is high time that this Congress stopped using the Federal taxing power for the private benefit of the dairy industry and against the best interests of the consuming public, as well as the competing producers of oleomargarine. The power to tax, notwithstanding the judicial statement to the contrary, is indeed the power to destroy when so used.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I am going to vote for H. R. 2245 because I believe the taxes on oleomargarine should be repealed and that this issue should be settled now. I was among those who signed the discharge petition, in order to get this legislation to the floor of the House. American housewives are demanding that these taxes be eliminated and they are right in their demand. They have been patient, but there comes

a time when patience is no longer a virtue.

I have the greatest regard for the dairy industry and I wish to see it prosper. The issue now involved, however, is greater than any industry. It concerns matters of convenience and economy affecting every American home. I do not think we should be penalized for wishing to use oleomargarine. It is commonly recognized as a wholesome, appetizing food product and is much in demand.

Great efforts have been put forth by the butter interests to block this legislation. Now we have the opportunity to have the issue settled on its merits, an opportunity which has been long sought. I believe that sentiment is in favor of this bill and that the House will adopt it.

The Federal taxes on oleomargarine were first enacted by Congress in 1886. All this time, consumers have had to pay these levies and certainly they should be relieved of this burden. I am sure from the communications I have received that the general sentiment in my congressional district is in favor of repeal.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from the further consideration of H. R. 2245, to repeal the tax on oleomargarine. It is my uniform policy not to sign petitions for discharge, but on account of the fact that this and similar bills were bottled up in the Committee on Agriculture with such a stronghold that neither this bill nor any similar bill would be reported, I made an exception and signed the petition for discharge.

The taxes and the occupational taxes, both wholesale and retail, on margarine, have always been without justification. With the existing high cost of living, and especially in view of the inability to produce or to obtain butter when and as needed, the tax is utterly indefensible. I shall not only vote to discharge the committee, but I shall gladly support at any and every opportunity the repeal of this discriminatory tax which I have always opposed.

The tax constitutes the only discrimination in favor of one edible product against another, or in favor of one agricultural product and against another agricultural product. The tax is therefore not only unfair, but it is un-American.

Whatever may have been the prevailing view when the taxes were first levied, the fact is that margarine is now regarded by physicians, hospitals, and consumers generally as a wholesome and nutritious food.

The public is and will be protected from impurities, as both butter and margarine will be supervised under the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act, which requires proper labeling of all food products.

The tax is not only unfair, but the administration of the tax is worse than discriminatory. The restrictions are such that many of the smaller wholesalers and many of the smaller retailers do not handle margarine. The consumers, therefore, are deprived of margarine. The repeal of the tax will carry with it the repeal of the regulations, and will thus make margarine available not only to the consumers in the big cities, but to consumers in the small cities, towns, villages, and countryside.

I have no quarrel with dairy farmers. I do not believe that the repeal of the antimargarine taxes will fundamentally injure the dairy farmers. Something has been said about the tariff on long-staple cotton. There are quotas not only on the importations of cotton, but on other agricultural products. For more than a half a century the antimargarine taxes discriminated against cotton. There are 1,600,000 cotton farms in the 18 States that produce cotton, but substantially 42 percent of the margarine is now manufactured from soybeans, and the soybean crop, especially in the Midwest, in the past 10 years has increased so that it is now valued at $700,000,000 annually. Cottonseed oil is still used in 47 percent of the margarine production.

When food is high, and in justice to the American consumer, and particularly to the American housewife, the tax should be promptly repealed. There is no valid reason for the continuance of the tax. It is utterly unfair to millions of housewives to require them to mix the yellow coloring with the white margarine. The repeal of this iniquitous tax is long overdue.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the signers of discharge petition No. 7 which today brings H. R. 2245 before the House for consideration, I wish to say that while I always endeavor to follow all of the committees of the House, and while I extend to every member of any committee the privilege of exercising his good judgment on any question, as I do to all others on any matter, in this particular case the interests of the majority of my constituents were not best served by withholding the opportunity of enacting this bill, and therefore, I was compelled to assist in bringing this bill to the floor for action.

Mr. Speaker, while I have full respect for the chairman and all of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, I cannot agree with their position in this matter as it is manifestly to the interest of my constituents and my district that I support this bill, and since more than a majority of the Members of the House have indicated their approval of the bill, it is a foregone conclusion that the same will be passed by a comfortable majority.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine. Therefore, I am for discharging the Committee on Agriculture in view of the action of the committee adopting a resolution to table all proposals that would repeal this discriminatory tax.

I signed the discharge petition for which I make no apology. This is not an unusual procedure. In fact it is democracy in its truest form, as carrying out the will of the majority. There is no precedent by such as action as the discharge method of bringing legislation before this House when desired by a majority of the membership, which has been used innumerable times.

The esteemed gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, makes an appeal that his committee should not be discharged of this legislation because of the action of his committee in consideration of the great number of bills pending on this subject. I realize fully the seriousness with which the gentleman makes such an appeal, but in my opinion it fails insofar as the merits of this issue are concerned.

The gentleman has stated the action of his committee. To be sure rather extensive hearings were held on the various bills to repeal what I think is a wholly unjustified tax. To be sure his committee has considered these proposals in executive session. The gentleman admits that his committee adopted a resolution to table any and all such proposals during this session of Congress.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, such action of that committee thwarted the will of the majority of this House and justifies this discharge. Furthermore, this petition was not laid on the Speaker's desk until after the Committee on Agriculture had taken such action. Neither I nor any other Member of this Congress attempted to take such action until a few members on the Committee on Agriculture had said by their action that we will not permit the House to consider this matter of so much importance to the American people. Therefore, in my opinion the argument of the fine gentleman from Kansas should be wholly ineffective.

The vote to occur, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not this House will discharge the Committee on Agriculture. It is not my purpose at this time to enter into the argument as to the merits or demerits of the tax issue on oleomargarine. I do wish to say that I am supporting the repeal of such taxes, and I signed the petition because I believe such a tax is wholly indefensible. It has the effect of a monopoly, to which the American people do not subscribe. It is discriminatory and designed especially to protect the dairy interest in their monopoly, and to force continued high prices for their butter on the consuming public. Check with your grocery store anywhere throughout the country and see how much the price of butter has increased in the last 2 years. Certainly some normal increase was justified, but when there is a shortage of any commodity the slack is usually taken up by the increase in price.

This is not a new issue. It dates as far back as 1886 when the first tax on oleomargarine was provided. That was not sufficient and a complete schedule of rates as now exists was provided in 1902. Let us see what the rate is in determining the justification.

Uncolored oleomargarine is subject to a tax of one-fourth cent per pound. Colored oleomargarine has a tax of 10 cents per pound. We wonder why the one-fourth cent per pound on uncolored oleo? Perhaps it was to try to cover up the real intention of the tax. Imported oleomargarine, regardless of color, is taxed at the rate of 15 cents per pound.

As a further inhibition to the use of oleo, manufacturers have a tax of $600, wholesalers are required to pay a tax of $480 on colored oleomargarine and $200

even to distribute uncolored products. Then comes the retailers who are required to pay an annual tax of $48 for colored oleo and $6 for uncolored.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this vote to discharge the committee should prevail, giving this House the privilege and opportunity of considering such unfair practices on a commodity so vitally needed by the consuming public. It is the democratic way. It is fair. It is right.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it simply burns me up to have a fine, outstanding gentleman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], attribute fraud to oleomargarine because of the use of coloring, when butter does the same thing whenever need becomes apparent. He charges that oleomargarine does it to imitate butter. Of course, both add coloring to give their product a color it does not have, and both are tarred with the same stick. This practice is common to each product, and to many other sales aids.

Why, then, this holier-than-thou attitude?

Another distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] would have us believe that his tongue is not in his cheek when he argues that the House Committee on Agriculture has ever given, or ever means to give, the repeal of the taxes on oleomargarine any real consideration. On this issue opinions are fixed—on both sides. Like the justice of the peace, hearings may be held, but the decision is always written in advance—for every practical purpose. We might as well entrust a rabbit with a cabbage leaf and expect him not to eat it.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to limit my personal remarks regarding the repeal of the margarine taxes to say that the present taxes on colored margarine are discrimnatory and place an unnecessary financial burden on the American families who do not care to color the margarine at home. I wish to read a letter from Dr. Jessie Whitacre, chairman of the Texas State Nutrition Council, College Station, Tex., who has very ably presented the facts concerning the repeal of the tax on margarine:

TEXAS STATE NUTRITION COUNCIL,
College Station, Tex., April 22, 1948.

Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TEAGUE: My varied interest in oleomargarine as a food prompts me to send this message to you as Representative from my district, No. 6, of Texas.

First let me tell you that I am immensely pleased to find your name among those who signed the discharge petition referring to the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245). Next, let me urge you not to fail to be present in the House on April 26, and vote for the Rivers bill then. Do give every possible support to this bill.

My interests in oleomargarine may be briefly stated as follows:

1. As a consumer, I am grateful that research and industry have made available such an excellent food as is oleomargarine with added vitamins. For many years I have used vitamin-fortified oleomargarine for cooking, but from the time butter reached 75 cents a pound here, I have used only fortified oleomargarine on the table.

2. As a homemaker, knowing that vitamin-fortified oleomargarine and butter may be used alternately in food preparation, and for serving too when oleomargarine is colored, I resent having to pay the 10 cents tax per pound for the colored product. When I buy the white oleomargarine and add the color myself, I must pay an extra price in time and energy and have a less attractive product so far as shape is concerned, than if the manufacturer does the coloring and molding.

3. As a nutritionist, I know that no research or demonstration yet conducted, has produced any evidence that vitamin-fortified oleomargarine is inferior to butter nutritionally. The one outstanding difference between the two fats is in price. In five of our local stores today, the price of butter ranges from 90 cents to $1.10 per pound; white oleomargarine from 34 to 49 cents, colored oleomargarine from 49 to 55 cents. It is therefore, irrational from an economic viewpoint to consider oleomargarine with vitamins added and butter competitive products. The choice for consumers in the lower-income classes is not between oleomargarine and butter, but between oleomargarine and no spread for their bread.

4. As an educator, I am obliged to state the facts concerning the relative merits of oleomargarine and butter whenever the occasion arises.

5. As chairman of the Texas State Nutrition Council, I have an interest in the matter beyond my own personal feelings and professional views. This council's objectives are to induce Texans to want optimum nutrition, and to help them to achieve it. The removal of the taxes from the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine will assist the council in its objectives.

6. As a taxpayer, I object to the taxes on oleomargarine on several counts.

(a) The price of vitamin-fortified oleomargarine is higher than it need be not merely because of the direct influence of the taxes on its manufacture and sale but also because in order to comply with the law, the natural color of soybean and cotton seed oils used in making oleomargarine must be removed before these oils can be incorporated into the fat.

(b) The revenue derived from this tax source is comparatively small. For many years the cost to administer the tax laws was greater than the revenue derived.

(c) Most important of any aspect, it seems to me, is the precedent set in this case. Do not the taxes against oleomargarine constitute the only case on record where one industry has been responsible for penalizing by taxation the product made by another industry? One fairly shudders to think of the situation which might arise if other industries would follow the precedent of antagonism of the butter industry against the oleomargarine industry. Suppose the cotton interests were able to bring about the taxing of synthetic fibers. Suppose the producers of any of the materials used in building houses were to bring about the taxation of any of the other materials. We could have a situation very oppressive upon certain ones of our industries.

Too long the manufacturers, sellers, and consumers of oleomargarine have been oppressed by taxes against oleomargarine. I beg you to do all in your power to have those taxes repealed.

Sincerely yours,

JESSIE WHITACRE,
Chairman, Texas State Nutrition Council.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the rule discharged in the House Agriculture Committee for further consideration of H. R. 2245, I wish to point out that the only basis for the tax originally was to protect butter. Before signing the petition to bring H. R. 2245 to the floor for consideration, I read the testimony before the Agricultural Committee and in none of it did I find any real basis for the tax.

I am a member of a family which has operated a dairy farm for several generations and I grew up with the idea that there was substantial justification for the tax on oleomargarine but in all of the thought and study I have given to this matter I can find no economic reason in the national interest or any moral justification for the tax. I know of no other instance wherein a food or a product is taxed for the benefit of another food or product. To levy such a tax on margarine violates the very principles on which our free-enterprise system is based.

It is against the law to represent margarine as butter and the removal of this tax will in no way affect the regulations concerning margarine as set forth in the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act. If it can be proven there is a definite need for strengthening the Federal Trade Act and/or the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act in connection with the sale of margarine, I will most certainly be for that.

The present tax on margarine takes money out of the housewife's pocket for the purpose of protecting another food. With prices continuing their steady rise, a tax of this nature is eminently unfair.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to myself.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to enter into any argument now because every Member of this House has his mind made up on how he is going to vote. There is no question in my mind but what everyone knows how they are going to vote. Now is the time to vote.

I want to clear up one thing, however. It has been charged here that linseed oil is used in the manufacture of margarine. I would like to correct that error without getting into an argument. I call this to your particular attention: The component parts of margarine are corn oil, cottonseed oil, peanut oil, soybean oil, and a considerable amount of dairy products. There is no place in this Nation, and I challenge anybody to say this is not true, where linseed oil is used in the manufacture of margarine. Linseed oil is a flaxseed oil. There is no such thing as the use of linseed oil for the manufacture of margarine in this country. Maybe that is done in other places in the world but not in America.

Mr. Speaker, this is an American product. The American people want this tax repealed. Let us vote on it. Let us get this thing over and take care of the people who eat this spread because they desire to do so. It is good for them, it is good for you, it is good for me; let us give it to them immediately.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is, Shall the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 2245?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 235, nays 121, answered "present" 2, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—235

Abbitt	Fulton	Muhlenberg
Abernethy	Gamble	Multer
Albert	Garmatz	Murdock
Allen, Calif.	Gary	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Gathings	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Goodwin	Nixon
Angell	Gordon	Nodar
Auchincloss	Gorski	Norrell
Bakewell	Gossett	O'Brien
Barden	Grant, Ind.	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Gregory	Owens
Beall	Hale	Pace
Beckworth	Hall,	Passman
Bender	Leonard W.	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Peden
Bland	Hardy	Peterson
Blatnik	Harris	Philbin
Boggs, Del.	Havenner	Pickett
Boggs, La.	Hays	Ploeser
Bonner	Hébert	Poage
Bradley	Herter	Potter
Brooks	Heselton	Potts
Brown, Ga.	Hess	Poulson
Bryson	Hinshaw	Preston
Buchanan	Hobbs	Price, Ill.
Buck	Holifield	Priest
Bulwinkle	Huber	Ramey
Burleson	Isacson	Rankin
Busbey	Javits	Rayburn
Byrne, N. Y.	Jennings	Redden
Camp	Johnson, Tex.	Reeves
Canfield	Jones, Ala.	Regan
Carroll	Jones, Wash.	Richards
Case, N. J.	Judd	Riley
Chadwick	Karsten, Mo.	Rivers
Chapman	Kean	Rogers, Fla.
Chelf	Keating	Rohrbough
Church	Kee	Rooney
Cole, Kans.	Kelley	Ross
Combs	Kennedy	Sabath
Cooley	Keogh	Sadlak
Cooper	Kerr	Sadowski
Corbett	King	Sarbacher
Coudert	Kirwan	Sasscer
Courtney	Klein	Scott, Hardie
Cox	Kunkel	Scott,
Cravens	Lane	Hugh D., Jr.
Crosser	Lanham	Seely-Brown
Crow	Larcade	Sheppard
Davis, Ga.	Latham	Smathers
Davis, Tenn.	LeFevre	Snyder
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski	Somers
Deane	Lichtenwalter	Spence
Delaney	Lodge	Stanley
Devitt	Love	Stigler
Dingell	Lucas	Teague
Dirksen	Ludlow	Thomas, Tex.
Domengeaux	Lyle	Thompson
Donohue	Lynch	Tibbott
Dorn	McConnell	Tollefson
Doughton	McDonough	Towe
Douglas	McGarvey	Twyman
Durham	McMahon	Vail
Eaton	McMillan, S. C.	Van Zandt
Eberharter	McMillen, Ill.	Vinson
Elsaesser	Mahon	Vorys
Elston	Maloney	Welch
Engle, Calif.	Marcantonio	Wheeler
Fallon	Mathews	Whitaker
Feighan	Meade, Ky.	Whitten
Fellows	Meade, Md.	Whittington
Fernandez	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Fisher	Miller, Conn.	Williams
Flannagan	Mills	Wilson, Tex.
Fletcher	Mitchell	Winstead
Fogarty	Monroney	Wolverton
Folger	Morris	Wood
Foote	Morrison	Worley
Forand	Morton	Youngblood

NAYS—121

Allen, Ill.	Brophy	Crawford
Andersen, H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	Cunningham
	Buffett	Curtis
Andresen, August H.	Burke	Davis, Wis.
	Butler	D'Ewart
Arends	Byrnes, Wis.	Dolliver
Arnold	Cannon	Dondero
Banta	Carson	Elliott
Barrett	Case, S. Dak.	Ellis
Bates, Ky.	Chenoweth	Ellsworth
Bennett, Mo.	Clark	Engel, Mich.
Bishop	Clevenger	Evins
Blackney	Cole, Mo.	Fuller
Bramblett	Cole, N. Y.	Gearhart
Brehm	Cotton	Gillie
Goff	Keefe	Rees
Granger	Kersten, Wis.	Riehlman
Griffiths	Kilburn	Robertson
Gross	Knutson	Rockwell
Gwinn, N. Y.	Landis	Rogers, Mass.
Gwynne, Iowa	Lea	Russell
Hagen	LeCompte	St. George
Hall,	Lemke	Sanborn
Edwin Arthur	Lewis	Schwabe, Mo.
Halleck	McCulloch	Schwabe, Okla.
Harness, Ind.	McGregor	Scrivner
Harvey	Mack	Shafer
Hill	MacKinnon	Short
Hoeven	Martin, Iowa	Simpson, Ill.
Hoffman	Mason	Smith, Kans.
Holmes	Michener	Smith, Va.
Hope	Miller, Md.	Smith, Wis.
Horan	Miller, Nebr.	Stefan
Hull	Murray, Wis.	Stevenson
Jackson, Wash.	Norblad	Stockman
Jenison	O'Hara	Talle
Jensen	O'Konski	Vursell
Johnson, Calif.	Phillips, Calif.	Weichel
Johnson, Ill.	Phillips, Tenn.	Wilson, Ind.
Johnson, Ind.	Plumley	Wolcott
Jonkman	Reed, Ill.	
Kearns	Reed, N. Y.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Coffin Taber

NOT VOTING—72

Andrews, Ala.	Hart	Morgan
Andrews, N. Y.	Hartley	Mundt
Battle	Hedrick	Norton
Bell	Heffernan	Patterson
Bloom	Hendricks	Pfeifer
Bolton	Jackson, Calif.	Powell
Boykin	Jarman	Price, Fla.
Buckley	Jenkins, Ohio	Rains
Celler	Jenkins, Pa.	Rich
Chiperfield	Johnson, Okla.	Rizley
Clason	Jones, N. C.	Scoblick
Clippinger	Kearney	Sikes
Colmer	Kefauver	Simpson, Pa.
Dague	Kilday	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Utah	Lusk	Smith, Ohio
Fenton	McCormack	Stratton
Gallagher	McCowen	Sundstrom
Gavin	McDowell	Taylor
Gillette	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Gore	Madden	Trimble
Graham	Manasco	Wadsworth
Grant, Ala.	Mansfield	Walter
Harless, Ariz.	Meyer	West
Harrison	Miller, Calif.	Woodruff

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Taber against.
Mr. Clason for, with Mr. Clague against.
Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Mundt against.
Mr. Coffin for, with Mr. Woodruff against.
Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mr. Meyer against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Gavin with Mr. Kilday.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Fenton with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Gallagher with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Sikes.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Rizley with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Hart.
Mr. McDonough with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Clippinger with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Grant of Alabama.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair on this motion with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WOODRUFF, who is unavoidably absent. If he were here, he would vote "no." I therefore withdraw my vote of "aye," and vote "present."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no" on this bill. I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. WADSWORTH. If he were present, he would vote "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. Without interfering with the rights of the gentleman from South Carolina to move to go into the Committee of the Whole, the Chair will entertain consent requests for extensions of remarks only.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of taxation of co-ops and to include therewith an editorial on the same subject.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

NO HELP TO UNFRIENDLY NATIONS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, before passing the foreign-aid bill, amounting to $6,098,000,000, Congress provided every possible safeguard to prevent any part of this money, or goods purchased with it, from falling into the hands of unfriendly nations.

My Speaker, my attention has been called to a recent sale by the War Assets Administration, held in the city of San Francisco, consisting of locomotives and other heavy machinery, to agents representing foreign countries.

It is the bounden duty of Congress to prevent commodities of any kind finally falling into the hands of any unfriendly nation. It is inconsistent to spend days here safeguarding appropriations for foreign aid and at the same time leave the door open for matériel of this kind to fall into the hands of unfriendly countries.

Mr. Speaker, we had our lesson. We should remember that we sold the Japanese the material to build and the gasoline to run the airplanes used by them in their cowardly attack on Pearl Harbor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Southern California's Future and the Colorado River." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a synopsis of the Maryland veterans laws.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other resolutions.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial written by Mr. L. F. Reid, a newspaperman of Renville, Minn., relative to the request by our various bureaus of Government for free advertisement in small country newspapers.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article about the cattle industry in Hawaii.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters.

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

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution unanimously adopted by the Combined Veterans Committee of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., in tribute to Egbert Camp, United Spanish War Veterans.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include excerpts.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made recently before the spring conference, Middle Atlantic region, Propeller Club of the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed by him to Mr. F. W. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he recently made.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Shreveport Times.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two editorials.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Mr. C. Tyler Wood, deputy to the assistant secretary for Economic Affairs.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject Reciprocal Trade Program Benefits All The People and include two editorials.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an excerpt from a letter and an editorial.

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

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions of the War Department.

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

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Assisting American Agriculture in Oklahoma.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole and include certain pertinent extracts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on the high cost of living.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for 2 hours to go shopping for America's housewives, as I feel it is quite as important for the Members of Congress to know what is going on in the grocery stores of America as in the munitions plants of America.

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

There was no objection.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. RIVERS. 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. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

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. 2245, with Mr. ARENDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS].

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, the matter before us is whether we shall eliminate the highly repressive taxes on colored margarine and give to the consumers of America the rights to which they are entitled from a free, competitive market.

Now what are those taxes?

First. Six hundred dollars a year on manufacturers of margarine.

Second. Four hundred and eighty dollars a year on wholesalers of colored margarine.

Third. Forty-eight dollars a year on retailers of colored margarine.

Fourth. Ten cents a pound on the purchaser of colored margarine.

Oh, yes; the housewife can have uncolored margarine without most of these taxes, and then she can color it herself with all the difficulty and labor coloring it entails, as housewives who use margarine will very graphically attest to. And she will color it, too; of that there is no doubt, because it then

takes on a palatable appearance, and she will buy it, especially in these times of $1 butter, and of that there is no doubt either. So that the net result is a tax placed on the product, the sole purpose of which is, and from its inception has been, to attempt to discourage housewives from purchasing it.

Nobody denies that the remission of these taxes will boost the sales of margarine, although I believe to a lesser degree than the opponents of the pending legislation would have us believe, and that since it is a substitute for butter, there will be a consequent falling off in the sale of the latter. It is quite understandable therefore that the dairy interests should become apprehensive and that they should redouble their efforts to save a subsidy they have enjoyed for many decades, paid for by the housewives of America.

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

Mr. POTTS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know that the oil in every ounce of every pound of oleo made in the United States is subsidized at between 1 and 10 cents a pound?

Mr. POTTS. I am only concerned about the subsidy as it affects the manufacture of butter, that you have a free, competitive market except that this is a limitation on that free competitive market in America. There is no more reason for that than for putting a tax on salad spreads, because they are a competitor of mayonnaise.

It is safe to say, this legislation would not have come to the floor of this House by petition to discharge if margarine taxes were the prerogative of the revenue-raising committee of the House, namely, the Ways and Means Committee. That the taxes on margarine are not truly for revenue-raising purposes is evident from the fact that the Ways and Means Committee does not have jurisdiction over them but rather the Committee on Agriculture. So long as the latter committee has jurisdiction over margarine taxes it can be reasonably expected that margarine taxes will be forever imposed not for tax-raising purposes, because it is not a tax-raising committee, but to give to the dairy interests of the country an unfair advantage having no place in a free-enterprise America.

There is no more sense in putting taxes on margarine because people use it as a substitute for butter than there is in putting a tax on salad spreads because they are competitive with mayonnaise, nor as it might have been in days of yore in putting a tax on leather shoes to keep people wearing wooden sabots.

Progress, whether it be manifest in a superior product or in cheaper cost, should not be held up if we agree on the premise, and I take it we do, that our living standards are higher in this country because we have a freer economy than any other country. The present taxes on margarine are a limitation on that free economy.

I have great confidence in the ingenuity of the dairy farmer to devise other and perhaps better uses and outlets for his milk. Butter is not his only one. Progress begets progress.

It is sometimes contended that butter is entitled to use the color yellow to the exclusion of margarine. That is sheer nonsense and the proof of that is that the housewife may color it herself and the wholesaler and retailer may sell it colored and the housewife may buy it colored upon the payment of a tax—not to the dairy interests, as you would suppose it would be if butter had such a preemptive right, but rather to the Government.

It is said that the tax is imposed to raise revenue to prevent fraud in the marketing of margarine as butter. But that theory is falacious. There is no more basis for saddling the margarine consumers of America with the operating cost of a Government agency charged with the prevention of fraud than there would be in parceling out the cost of such agency in exposing fraud in the sale of hybrid shoes as leather shoes, or in the sale of "blue sky" securities.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. This is a very important issue, and I see very few Democrats on the floor to hear this discussion. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, if my neighbor's house is burglarized, the crime has been committed against the entire citizenry, and I, as one, must contribute through my taxes to the cost of apprehension and punishment of the criminal, even though my own house may never be burglarized. That is sound policy and cannot be disputed.

It follows, therefore, that the cost of preventing fraud in any manner should be borne by the people as a whole.

Put whatever penalties are necessary on the fraudulent sale of margarine as butter; make all reasonable requirements as to wording on packages; but do not saddle solely the consumers of margarine with a cost that is properly that of the whole populace. Do not give a subsidy any longer to the dairy interests at the expense of America's housewives.

Mr. Chairman, this is a nonpartisan measure. The Members on both sides of the aisle from the dairy country have represented their interests well. Their constituents should long remember them for their untiring efforts in preserving the subsidy for so long a time. Now the consumer should have his rightful day.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, you ask me of the state of the Nation, Mr. Hennessey. It is a sad state indeed. The biggest political hoax in many a moon has made strange bedfellows, the likes of which this House has seldom seen.

Oleo can be naturally colored yellow, somebody told them, and with that they fall into each other's arms.

They have buttered their bread, Mr. Hennessey, and now let them lie in it.

And who do we find sharing the same pillow, Mr. Hennessey? The Cotton South and the CIO; both hoping to remove the Federal taxes on oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

Oleo will be cheaper, the CIO murmurs sleepily. But what does the Cotton South dream, Mr. Hennessey? The Cotton South dreams that yellow oleo will bring better prices for cottonseed oil; though how cottonseed oil can go up if the oleo price goes down no man can tell.

Then there is Harry and Henry Wallace cuddled up in another corner. Harry wants the votes of the workingman, and Hank wants whatever the Communists want, so they both plump for yellow oleo and never mind the farmer, Mr. Hennessey.

The Consumers' League is snuggled close to the 26 big Wall Street corporations that make oleomargarine, and all because the big corporations and Eleanor say it is a shame for the ladies to have to take 2 minutes from My Day to color their own oleo.

Every left-wing cartoonist in the country has crawled under last year's $6,000,000 advertising blanket cast over the scene by four oleo manufacturers. And whom do we find under the blanket, Mr. Hennessey, but the conservative publishers who have closed their columns to the nonadvertising farmers. If it is yellow oleo their city readers want, it is yellow oleo they should have.

Life magazine has hold of a $200,000 corner of that advertising, Mr. Hennessey, and if the same blanket covers the unwashed Daily Worker, who is Mr. Luce to complain?

But, Mr. Hennessey, wait until we hear from the 5,000,000 farm families left out in the cold.

And, remember this, if we raise big, strapping babies in the United States of America someone is going to produce milk. If we kill off all the cows, I give you one guess, Mr. Hennessey, filled milk will not do it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me at all times there is a middle ground upon which we can all meet. That goes for the agricultural producer of farm crops, as well as the labor organizations in the great cities.

It is contended by those who desire to remove the tax on oleomargarine that the housewives should have the right to buy yellow oleomargarine without the 10-cents-per-pound tax.

It is likewise contended by the opponents that if oleomargarine is permitted to be colored yellow and sold without a payment of a 10-cents-per-pound tax that yellow oleomargarine will be passed off to the public and served as butter.

Let us be frank and admit that there is merit in both those contentions. The objective of both groups, if they are honest and sincere in their contentions, is to benefit and protect the consumer. The oleomargarine forces would achieve this objective by coloring oleomargarine yellow. The butter forces would accomplish their objective and protect against fraud and deception by having

oleomargarine any color other than yellow so that the product could readily be recognized as oleomargarine.

I am not speaking for either group, but I am speaking for the housewives. The bill I have offered, or will offer, as a substitute will give each group substantially what it seeks and at the same time it will also let the housewife have yellow oleomargarine without the 10-cents-per-pound tax and without having to spend hours in the kitchen coloring the product herself. It will also drastically reduce the taxes on wholesalers and retailers.

The gentleman from New Hampshire, Congressman NORRIS COTTON, has cooperated with me in working out the amendment which I will place in the RECORD at this point. We both feel that here is a plan we can all support. Now we can, under this amendment, always distinguish oleomargarine from butter.

I am going to offer a bill as an substitute for the bill proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], whom I love and have known ever since I have been in this House. I will give you a chance to learn something about this amendment as I proceed. I am going to propose in my amendment that we take the tax off of oleomargarine. That should please the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Amendment in the nature of substitute offered by Mr. HILL:

Strike out everything after the enacting clause and substitute the following:

"That chapter 16, subchapter A, section 2301 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Upon oleomargarine which shall be manufactured and sold, or removed for consumption or use, there shall be assessed and collected a tax at the rate of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; except that such tax shall be at the rate of 10 cents per pound in the case of oleomargarine which is yellow in color: *Provided*, That such tax on oleomargarine which is yellow in color shall be at the rate of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound if such oleomargarine is manufactured, prepared, molded, shaped, packaged, sold, and distributed so that—

"'a. The net weight of the contents of the retail package shall not exceed 1 pound;

"'b. The contents of each package is divided into four equal parts; and

"'c. Each part of the contents of such package is manufactured, prepared, molded, and shaped in such manner so as to have three sides (exclusive of the ends) so that each part will be triangular in shape, or to be in such other form or shape as the Secretary of the Treasury may approve. The Secretary of the Treasury shall not approve any other method of preparing, molding, or shaping of oleomargarine unless he is fully satisfied that the article after all labels have been removed and after it has been cut into patties for use on the table can readily be recognized by the general public as oleomargarine and clearly distinguished from butter.'

"SEC. 2. Chapter 16, subchapter A, section 2302 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after the phrase 'determined as provided in paragraph 2 of section 2301 (a),' the following 'or who shall change or attempt to change the mold or shape or other identifying characteristics of yellow oleomargarine with the intent of defeating the purposes of this act.'

"SEC. 3. Chapter 16, subchapter A, section 2308 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'law' where it last appears in that section the following: ', or who knowingly changes or attempts to change the form or shape or other identifying characteristics of yellow oleomargarine on which a tax at the rate of 10 cents per pound has not been paid with the intent of defeating the purposes of this act.'

"SEC. 4. Chapter 27, subchapter A, part I, section 3200 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after the word 'oleomargarine' the following ', except hospitals which merely color oleomargarine to be served to patients or hospital employees.'

"SEC. 5. Chapter 27, subchapter A, part I, section 3200 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the figures '$200' and insert in lieu thereof '$50.'

"SEC. 6. Chapter 27, subchapter A, part I, section 3200 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the figure '$6' and insert in lieu thereof '$1.'

"SEC. 7. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1948."

EXPLANATION OF THE HILL AMENDMENT

Section 1: This section will reduce the tax on yellow oleomargarine from 10 cents a pound to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound if the yellow oleomargarine is prepared so that it will be cylindrical or triangular in shape instead of in a square or rectangular form. The effect of this will be to let the housewife have yellow oleomargarine at the same price as white oleomargarine but will also give a person who desires to buy butter an opportunity to get butter and not oleomargarine because the shape of the yellow oleomargarine will clearly identify it as oleomargarine and distinguish it from butter. This section provides flexibility so that it may be in some other shape other than round or triangular if the Secretary of the Treasury is fully satisfied that the article after all labels have been removed and after it has been cut into patties for use on the table can be readily recognized by the general public as oleomargarine.

Section 2: This section merely inserts a provision which will make any person who attempts to change the mold or shape of yellow oleomargarine and otherwise destroy its identifying characteristics subject to the full tax as a manufacturer.

Section 3: Section 3 of the bill makes a similar change in the penal provisions of the present Internal Revenue Code so that they will be applicable if a person changes the form or shape of the yellow oleomargarine on which the tax of 10 cents per pound has not been paid in order to defeat the purposes of the act.

Section 4: This section exempts hospitals from the definition of a manufacturer and permits hospitals, which merely color oleomargarine, to serve to patients or hospital employees without payment of a manufacturers tax.

Section 5: This section reduces the tax on wholesalers who handle yellow oleomargarine packaged in the manner provided in section 1 from $480 per year to $50 per year.

Section 6: This section reduces the tax on retailers who handle only yellow oleomargarine prepared and packaged in the manner authorized under section 1 of this act from $48 a year to $2 per year.

Section 7: Section 9 makes the act effective on July 1, 1948. This is the date on which new license fees will have to be paid.

I repeat:

The contents of each package is divided into four equal parts. Each part of the contents of such package is manufactured, prepared, molded, shaped, in such manner as to have—

Now, get this—

three sides exclusive of the ends so that each part shall be triangular in shape or to be in such other form as the Secretary of the Treasury shall order.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall have the power of approval.

Now let us see what we would have. Here is a package of oleo.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman who loves me yield?

Mr. HILL. In just a moment. I do not love the gentleman that much. Now, here is what I was going to tell the gentleman——

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. HILL. As you look at this package——

Mr. RIVERS. Now will my affectionate friend yield?

Mr. HILL. As you look at this package you will find that it is perfectly solid. There is therefore no reason in the world why some type of machine could not easily be made to divide the package into four equal parts and make them triangular in shape. Then they could be cut up into patties and served and there would be no way in the world to confuse it with butter. Color it as yellow as you want.

You can do the same with a pound of butter. Here is a pound cut into four equal parts. There is no use saying it will not work. My desire is to protect the public and if my friend from South Carolina does not want to sell oleo as a substitute for butter he will vote for this amendment.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, whom I love with all my heart.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman with the heart that bleeds so profusely for the people, did he offer that amendment in the committee?

Mr. HILL. It would have been offered, I may say to the gentleman, if this petition discharging the committee had not been signed.

Mr. RIVERS. Did the gentleman ever offer any such amendment in the committee?

Mr. HILL. I would have offered this if it had not been that the matter was taken away from the committee. I may say to the gentleman that I was made chairman of a committee to report on this matter.

Mr. RIVERS. When to report back?

Mr. HILL. I do not quite understand the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. What did your committee propose to report?

Mr. HILL. Tomorrow morning if it had not been for the petition. We were all ready to go. We had this bill drawn up.

Mr. RIVERS. I dislike to argue with the gentleman but you know very well you all passed a motion to defer anything regarding oleo until the next session of Congress.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the gentleman that I was one of those who said we should consider this further. My friends on the committee will stand up and tell you that I was one of the members who stood up and said we should give further consideration to this matter. There is one sitting at the gentleman's right

hand now who will tell you if you ask him.

Mr. RIVERS. It looks to me as though the gentleman was outweighed.

Mr. HILL. I shall ask permission to have this bill printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today.

There is no reason why it should not be accepted. The pound of oleo can be easily shaped in this triangular form, four pieces to the pound and with this peculiar shape the oleo people would not be perpetrating a fraud upon anyone.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. I merely wish to say that I am glad to support the statement made by the gentleman that he tried to get some floor action on all of these bills.

Mr. HILL. And I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I believe that statement and I believe we can do this. I do not think it will be any trouble at all. The oleo shaped in this form can be as yellow as anyone wants it to be or it can be any color, yellow, black, green, or red. Automobiles are not all the same color and no one would want them to be. Why, you know what your wife would say if you went to buy a new car and could get only one color?

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

Mr. HILL. As soon as I have made this one statement: I have nothing to cover up, nothing to shield on this matter. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has proposed a very interesting thing. Right now the gentleman takes the position that butter is much better than oleo; does he not?

Mr. HILL. I take no restrictive position.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But the gentleman does now?

Mr. HILL. If I can secure sufficient time I will answer all the questions.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCGARVEY].

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Chairman, as you all know, on Tuesday, March 20, the members of the House Committee on Agriculture, shelved 19 bills which had been introduced to either repeal or drastically reduce the Federal taxes on colored oleomargarine. The reasons for the committee's high-handed action in this instance are best known only to themselves. It is significant that the members of the committee all represent agricultural districts. Not one member, representing an industrial or city district, was permitted by vote to voice his approval of the bills. Since the people living in such districts comprise the main body of consumers of oleomargarine, and not the people in the farming districts, it can hardly be said that the proposed legislation received the impartial consideration to which it is entitled in a country which functions under a representative form of government.

I am proud that I am one of the signers of the discharge petition to bring the oleomargarine repeal bill to the floor of the House in order that it might be voted on in the American way. This way is directly opposed to the manner in which the oleomargarine repeal bills were roughly pigeonholed with no explanation or reasons given. I represent a large thickly populated city district where some of the leading industrial plants of the country are located, and where the housewives have written me daily regarding the outrageous measure which the committee members have proposed in lieu of H. R. 2245. Yes; I call it outrageous and Sovietlike tactics, and I will not stand idly by.

I should now be home in my district campaigning, as tomorrow is primary election day in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but to me the repeal of the taxes on oleomargarine is so vitally important that I am here today to fight for the repeal. I want every Member of this House to know my feelings and to know that I shall vote for H. R. 2245, and vote against any attempt to forestall or compromise the issue.

The members of the committee have even gone so far as to stoop to giving a ballyhoo circus performance by sending down to Washington charts from the dairy and creamery States of the Union in an attempt to win the Members of the House to their viewpoint. This is a sickening and nauseating performance to go through when the main issue is to relieve the American housewife of the burden of the unfair and unjust Federal taxes on a product which she wants and needs.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the farmers are not the only people who will feel the effects if the present Federal tax on oleomargarine is removed. The consumers are due for a drubbing they do not expect.

In the first place, why do the oleomargarine manufacturers want to color their so-called superior product yellow? What is unappetizing about white? As a farmer's wife very accurately pointed out, "What is distasteful or unappetizing about the white color of an angel-food cake?"

The questionable genealogy of oleomargarine was concisely covered here recently when a great friend of the American farmer, the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, said:

> We must remember that oleomargarine is a contrived product of uncertain ancestry. It can be and has been made of fish oil, animal fats, tallow, waste packing-house by-products, and vegetable oils, both domestic and imported. To say that oleo is the nutritional equivalent of butter is to say that horse meat is the nutritional equivalent of prime roast beef. The statement may be technically true, but it is morally dubious.
>
> In any case, the processing of oleo requires the deodorizing of some oils, the removal of unpleasant off-tastes from others, and bleaching to give a uniform base for the addition of color. Diacetyl must be added to imitate butter's taste. Vitamin A, which is extracted from shark livers, must be added to imitate butter's nutrition. Milk must be added to oleo to imitate butter's texture. The use of yellow would be the final step toward fraud and deceit by imitating butter's color.

If the existing Federal legislation is repealed, the price of oleomargarine will go up. The consumers will suffer. At the present time, most of the oleomargarine that is sold is uncolored. When and if the law is changed so that this oleomargarine appears entirely like butter, the consumers will pay and pay plenty. It has been shown by the debate on this subject that colored oleomargarine is sold in Indiana for as much as 29 cents per pound more than the white oleomargarine. The Federal tax is only 10 cents a pound. The consumer is required to enrich the handful of manufacturers who control the oleomargarine industry to the tune of 19 cents a pound because their product is colored. If there is to be no white oleomargarine to compete in keeping the price down, colored oleomargarine will tend to follow butter prices even more closely than at present.

Another interesting thing that has been brought out since this controversy has risen is that in one 15-year period 30,000 persons were picked up by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for selling oleomargarine as butter at butter prices. The present Federal tax of one-fourth of a cent a pound on white oleomargarine is money well spent by the consumers because it guarantees the policing of the manufacturers and distributors of oleomargarine. A repeal of the existing Federal law would be most unfair to both farmers and consumers.

The farmer knows what repeal would do to him. During the days of drouth and crop failure in Nebraska and in surrounding States, the regular cream check was the thing that enabled hundreds of thousands of farmers to keep going. It was these checks that made it possible for the retail merchant and business and professional men in our cities and towns to stay open for business.

The consumer would do well to inquire more fully into the reason for the present law, to study the probable effects of its repeal, and to realize that oleo and butter cannot and never should be put into competition with each other.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose that anything that may be said in this argument will influence a single vote, especially when the mental attitude of many of the Members is that reflected by the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just preceded me. He very properly has indicated his great interest in this matter to the extent of staying here in Washington to fight for the repeal of what he calls "iniquitous taxes" in behalf of his constituents who are going to vote tomorrow in the primaries in Pennsylvania. The assumption is that by the repeal of this law he is going to get oodles of oleomargarine at a very cheap price for those who are crying and craving for oleomargarine in his district. Now, that sort of an argument to me is typical of the type and character of arguments that I have heard around here since this matter has been before the Congress for discussion. Why not discuss this thing on the basis of some sane, simple facts?

I had two constituents come to my office this morning, fine, splendid people. They were apparently very much exercised because of the propaganda that has gone out in this oleomargarine fight. They felt that there was just one thing to do, give us this tax repeal, in order that the housewife may be able to buy colored oleomargarine and not have to color it herself and be able to buy it at a cheap price.

Now, what are the facts? I explained the situation to them carefully, and without emotional appeal, and when they left my office both of them, highly intelligent people, said, "Why, we never understood that at all. We are going to leave this to your judgment."

What is the situation in Wisconsin, along with 21 other States? They absolutely prohibit the sale of colored oleomargarine. You can color it all you want to out in these other States, but you cannot sell colored oleomargarine at all in Wisconsin or some 21 or 22 other States in this Union. What difference does the tax make then? What difference does it make to the housewife in my State if you repeal this tax that is on the Federal statute books? What benefit is she going to get out of this situation? How are these housewives, that the gentleman who just left the floor pleaded in behalf of, going to get any benefit by the repeal when the sale of colored oleomargarine is absolutely prohibited? A lot of people do not seem to know that. I said to one of these good ladies in my office, "Do you buy oleomargarine?" She said, "Yes." I said, 'You do not have to color it when you use it in cooking, do you?" She said, "No, I do not." I said, "How much Federal tax do you pay on uncolored oleomargarine?" Why, she did not know. I said, "You only pay one-fourth of a cent a pound on uncolored oleomargarine; that is all." I said, "How much oleomargarine do you use in a year?" Why, she was amazed to find out that she would not spend 20 cents a year tax in the use of uncolored oleomargarine. Now, I said, "You cannot buy colored oleomargarine in Wisconsin, and you cannot buy it in these other 22 States." What do they do? They put a little pellet in the package and you can color it yourself, if you want to. She does not really have to. She uses it without coloring, and she only pays about 20 cents a year for the entire family, the quarter of 1 cent a pound.

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

Mr. KEEFE. Just a moment. You fellows have been talking around here for the last 2 or 3 months on this thing and have been talking "malarkey" to a lot of people about this thing. Now, the fact of the situation is just simply this: I want the people in my district to be able to buy oleomargarine, and they can buy all the oleomargarine they want as long as it is not colored, and pay just one-quarter of a cent a pound tax. Why have the oleomargarine people not gone out into the States and made their appeal to the State legislatures where it would count? Why have they propagandized oleomargarine all over this country and made the American housewife believe that if you repeal this law they are going to get a cheap food spread?

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. It seems to me that you have not given the American housewife the facts about this situation. You have led her to believe by this expenditure of millions of dollars for propaganda that if you just repeal this Federal tax everything is going to be lovely and she will get all the oleomargarine that she needs.

Now, let us see. I looked into a Giant Food Market store this morning. They can sell colored oleomargarine in the District of Columbia by paying the Federal tax of 10 cents per pound. What was colored oleomargarine selling for on the store shelves here in the District of Columbia this morning? Fifty-five cents a pound. What was uncolored oleomargarine selling for? Forty-one cents a pound. That is a differential of 14 cents, and the total tax is only 10 cents. The oleo manufacturers have added 14 cents to the base price of uncolored margarine and have raised it to 55 cents a pound. What assurance has the housewife that the price of oleo will be reduced? None at all. Those were the prices cited in the food stores here in Washington this morning. Past experience indicates that if we take this little tax off, the price of oleomargarine will follow the price of butter. You people who are committing that fraud upon the American housewife will wake up if and when this legislation ever becomes law to see that if there is any fraud committed it is a fraud that has led the American housewife to believe that by the repeal of this legislation you are going to get a cheap table spread for the American housewife.

I will tell you what will happen. They are using soybean oil and cottonseed oil now, and the appeal is made that that is American agriculture. You take this tax off and you will see them using imported copra oil that they can buy for a fraction of what it costs to manufacture their product out of soybean oil and cottonseed oil. You will see that there will be no reduction in price. The price of oleomargarine will follow the historic price of butter all along the line.

Let me tell you something. You are going to find that the housewife is going to ask some question on this thing when she understands it. She does not understand the situation today. All she knows is that she has to color her oleomargarine unless she pays 10 cents tax in those States that permit colored oleomargarine to be sold at all. She knows that in my State the State law prohibits the sale of colored oleomargarine. She knows that anything that we do here is not going to change the situation there. Why do you not go out and spend your millions of dollars in the 23 States of the Union that do not permit the sale of colored oleomargarine, and repeal those laws and give some real benefit to the American housewife, instead of kidding them as you are kidding them with this proposed legislation?

Mr. Chairman, in my remaining time I shall try to present some basic facts that should be understood by all before this bill becomes law.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The efforts of chemists to produce a substance compounded of low-priced fats and oils and having the color, flavor, melting point, and other characteristics of butter made from cow's milk came to partial fruition in France in 1870. A French chemist invented a process "to obtain butter. Note the objective "to obtain butter." The financial rewards possible in the manufacture of a butter imitation that could be produced cheaply and sold without restriction in the butter market soon brought the product to the United States. By 1880 the fraud of passing oleomargarine as butter was so prevalent that the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland enacted legislation to protect the consuming public from the racketeers who were pawning yellow oleo as being butter. In the same year the Congress passed legislation to protect the consumers in the District of Columbia. In 1886 the Congress recognized that the fraud had become so flagrant that control by States was ineffective and enacted the first national oleomargarine act. In signing the legislation, President Cleveland stated:

> I am convinced that the taxes which (this legislation) creates cannot possibly destroy the open and legitimate manufacture and sale of the thing upon which it is levied. If this article has the merit which its friends claim for it, and the people of the land, with full knowledge of its real character, desire to purchase and use it, the taxes exacted by this bill will permit a fair profit to both manufacturer and dealer. If the existence of the commodity taxed and the profits of its manufacture and sale depend upon disposing of it to the people for something else which it deceitfully imitates, the entire enterprise is a fraud and not an industry; and if it cannot endure the exhibition of its real character which will be effected by the inspection, supervision, and stamping which this bill directs, the sooner it is destroyed the better, in the interests of fair dealing.

The act of 1886 neglected to say anything about the color of oleo so that the deception continued and the States were obliged to pass corrective legislation. By 1902 a total of 32 States including South Carolina—home State of the gentleman who authored this discharge petition—had passed anticolor oleo laws. During the same year the Congress passed the Grout bill which introduced the principle of a tax graduated according to color. The uncolored product was subject to a manufacturing tax of one-fourth of a cent a pound, while oleo artificially colored in semblance of butter was taxed 10 cents a pound.

1931 LAW ASSIGNED YELLOW TO BUTTER

So anxious were the oleo people to cash in on the historic trade-mark of yellow butter that they soon discovered a loophole by mixing palm oil in the oleo concoction, thereby imparting a naturally yellow color while escaping the 10-cents-per-pound Federal tax. They also experimented with a mixture of cottonseed oil and sulfur to produce the yellow color and evade the tax. This led to the enactment of H. R. 15934 in 1931 which specifically assigned yellow to the rightful product—butter—and said that if

oleo is colored to resemble butter it is subject to the 10 cents' tax.

TAX GIVES INTERNAL REVENUE DEPARTMENT SUPERVISION

With this legislation on the statute books the Bureau of Internal Revenue has been able to maintain effective enforcement.. The consuming public has been protected. The oleo industry has not been destroyed and those who want to eat oleo can have it for about half the price of butter. Yet we are confronted with this fight, sponsored by those who would throw overboard all the experience of nearly 70 years in dealing with this problem. A fight backed by those who want to again allow oleo to take the color of butter without restriction and reopen the door to the temptation of the fraudulent sales that made this legislation necessary.

I am not suggesting that the big and reputable oleomargarine manufacturers are interested in deliberately misrepresenting their product to the public. In fact I am certain they would suffer the greatest damage if this effort to repeal the oleomargarine law is successful.

The only thing that is holding the unscrupulous in check and preventing the bootleg conditions that prevailed in the industry in its early days is this oleo tax law which in my judgment protects the producer as well as the consumer.

It is the tax-collecting feature of this law that places its enforcement within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Bureau, with its trained staff, charged with the collection of taxes on oleomargarine, would be relieved of any further responsibility in connection with this product, if you repeal this tax.

It has been suggested that oleo control can be left to the Pure Food and Drug Act. This is not true as this act covers only shipments in interstate commerce.

COURT CASES INVOLVING FRAUDULENT SALES OF OLEO

With all of its skill in this field the Bureau has found that there are always sharks ready to take a chance in this field because of the terrific possibilities for big profits. I can cite you many court cases taken from the Internal Revenue Department records.

There was the case of Albert Haddad, who sold himself to a reputable Illinois oleo manufacturer as a New York-New England distributor. He got the white oleo and colored it on his pig farm at Stoneham near Boston—as much as 5 tons a day. He reported fake oleo sales to Boston bakeries hoping to outsmart the Internal Revenue agents. With labels describing the product as "creamery butter" he flooded Boston with 375,000 pounds at double white-oleo prices. He was well on the way to a fortune when a New England housewife reported her suspicions to health authorities and the product was found to be oleomargarine.

In another case Harry F. Griggs was a respectable appearing dealer of oleo in Baltimore. Revenue agents noticed that the quantity of white oleo Griggs reported he had sold did not always check with the amounts the agents believed he had sold. They investigated the warehouse and store he operated in his basement and found he was coloring the white oleo and selling it to small groceries, restaurants, and housewives as butter. Griggs was convicted of failing to pay the manufacturers' tax and paid a fine of $3,500. Within 2 years of Griggs' conviction John Seeger and two Washington, D. C., men were convicted of evading Federal taxes on 162,951 pounds of oleo sold as butter to hotels and cafes along the Baltimore-Washington Pike and in the city of Washington itself.

I have a book full of similar cases. They prove that if crooks will defy the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the lure of profits in victimizing the public, what would the situation be if there was no agency of the Government continuously on the job to restrain racketeers, to help make sure that when the housewife pays for butter she really gets butter. I am convinced that our oleo laws are sound and operate in the best interests of the public.

OLEO TAX IS NOT BURDENSOME

Much has been said in this debate about the oleo tax being burdensome. All taxes are burdensome unless the taxpayer gets value for his tax dollar. In the case of oleo the tax is one-quarter of a cent a pound. The license fees paid by the retailer and wholesaler and manufacturer are also small. Applying the total of all these taxes to a family that consumes 3 pounds of oleo a week (156 pounds a year), the total amount of taxes does not exceed 40 cents a year, less than 1 cent a week. Is that too much for the protection of the health of the family, to see that the oleo that is purchased is sanitary and not something mixed in a washing machine in some racketeer's basement?

OLEO RETAIL PRICES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

It is contended that killing the oleo taxes will lower the price to the consumer. I have just demonstrated that if the housewife buys uncolored oleo the cost of the tax is less than a penny a week per family. But this is not the tax that the supporters of this repeal bill want to kill. They want to eliminate the 10-cent tax that applies when the manufacturer colors his product to imitate butter. If this tax is killed virtually all oleo will be placed on the market in the color of butter. Theoretically, if the tax is eliminated the consumer will be able to buy colored oleo for 10 cents a pounds less than he does today. But let us look in at a Giant store here in Washington and see if this is the case. On March 29 these stores advertised uncolored oleo at 35 and 37 cents per pound; colored oleo at 55 cents a pound. In Evansville, Ind., on April 20, the Bazley Market sold Durkees' white oleo for 41 cents a pound, Durkees' yellow oleo at 53 cents a pound; in Terre Haute, Ind., on the same day, white oleo sold for 32 cents a pound, colored oleo at 59 cents.

If this tax law is repealed oleo manufacturers will be free to boost prices as they please. They will add a fancy price, no doubt, for coloring the oleo. The thrifty housewife who today buys white oleo at from 32 cents to 37 cents and colors it herself will find only colored oleo on the grocery shelves at considerably higher prices. Will that help cut down the family grocery bill?

REMOVAL OF OLEO TAX WILL NOT REDUCE BUTTER PRICES

It is claimed that the price of butter is too high and that taking the tax off oleo will bring down the price of butter. The facts are that oleo has advanced in price the same percentage as butter since the end of the war. This has occurred in spite of the fact that the oils which constitute the body of oleomargarine have not increased, but have decreased, in price since the end of the war. In view of this oleomargarine price picture, have consumers any assurance that the oleo interests will reduce consumer prices to the extent that Federal excise taxes might be eliminated or reduced?

OLEO CORPORATIONS MAKING SUBSTANTIAL PROFITS

Could this situation be reflected in the following table showing the net incomes of a few of the major oleo corporations in 1945 and in 1947:

	1945	1947
Glidden Co. (California)	$2,347,644	$12,757,984
Armour & Co. (Chicago)	9,172,538	22,950,269
Best Foods, Inc. (California)	2,515,648	5,288,095
Swift & Co. (Chicago)	12,303,807	22,334,977
Wilson & Co. (Chicago)	5,036,602	15,448,823
Standard Brands, Inc. (Indiana)	9,576,464	[1] 13,947,960
Capital City Products Co. (Ohio)	251,072	1,702,378

[1] 1946.

Butter is one of our basic foods and through the ages has been identified by its natural yellow color. It is the identifying trade-mark that rightfully belongs to butter. The claim that oleo has as much right as butter to the color yellow is false. Oleo in this country is produced from the oils of cottonseed and soybeans. The real reason why these oils must be bleached is that when cottonseed oils are turned into fat they become gray; and when soybean oils are turnd into fat they become green. To have a uniform color the oleo manufacturers must bleach out the gray and green colors. It is impossible to produce a natural yellow oleomargarine from domestic oils.

Butter is always yellow, although at some seasons of the year it is less yellow than at others. When color is added to butter it is for the sake of uniformity, not for the purpose of making it look like some other product.

YELLOW COLOR IS BUTTER "TRADE-MARK"

There have long been recognized ethical standards restricting imitations. For example Brookshire cheese is too close to Swift & Co.'s Brookfield trade-mark to be permitted. An automobile manufacturer was prevented from using a certain shape of radiator because it too closely resembled the Packard design.

Why of all the colors in the spectrum do the oleomargarine people select the yellow color of butter? Why have the manufacturers of oleo made every effort to duplicate the body and texture and melting point of butter. They have added vitamins in an effort to approximate the vitamin content of butter. The flavor of butter may also be added legally to oleomargarine so as to make identification almost impossible. With all this imitation permitted, there remains the

feeling that consumers should be protected by a color identification so that it would not be necessary to call on technical laboratory tests to determine whether it is butter or oleo. Some say that if people cannot tell the difference between butter and yellow margarine what harm is done? The point is that people are entitled to know what they are paying for—beef, not horsemeat; butter, not oleo. Labels on cartons are not enough. Most consumers get part or all of their butter—or oleo after it has left the containers—in individual servings or in bulk from grocers. It is an easy matter, also, to switch a pound of yellow something or other into an empty butter carton. Federal food and drug laws cannot protect the public in intrastate shipments and sales.

OLEO SHOULD HAVE DISTINCTIVE COLOR OF ITS OWN

By means of a costly advertising campaign the oleo people have convinced the average housewife that oleomargarine is as nutritious and healthful as butter. If that is true why do the oleo interests insist upon copying what they contend is an inferior product. Why should they not insist upon a distinctive color of their own. Peanut butter sells under its own characteristic brown color and its own typical flavor. Even though peanut butter uses the term "butter," there is no controversy because there is no consumer deception.

Advocates of this oleo tax repealer have gone so far in this debate as to make the charge that butter and milk products spread undulant fever. I do not know how many housewives they have convinced of this libel. But as a result of this false propaganda the oleo supporters may have built up a large following of people who do not want to eat butter, who may fear that it is a carrier of undulant fever. Why are not these people then entitled to some protection so that they will know that they are being served oleo instead of butter when they eat in a hotel or restaurant. If oleo had its own distinctive color they could be sure they are not eating butter.

To show you what I mean I have arranged a display of oleo colored in various hues any one of which could be selected as oleo's trade-mark. I have also arranged a display of ice cream in the many fascinating colors in which this tasty product is manufactured. You have no aversion to eating pistachio ice cream although it comes in a bright green color. Why not produce oleo in some similar color. The 10-cent Federal tax would not then apply. There would be no necessity for repealing the oleo-tax laws which I have pointed out are really a protection for the consuming public.

Aside from this angle of protection for the consumer there is a still more serious aspect to this matter in the impact the repeal of these laws would have upon our national economy.

During the war we heard much of the slogan "Guns or butter." Our New Deal managers placed the production of war weapons in opposition to the production of butter and inevitably butter became a war casualty. Creamery butter production dropped from better than 1,800,000,000 pounds before the war to a low of 1,168,000,000 pounds in 1946. When the wartime food-rationing program was set up butter was placed at a conspicuous disadvantage in the order of preference given milk and dairy products. At the same time margarine was given a distinct advantage with respect to other fats and oils commodities. The margarine industry was allowed to use fats and oils at a rate which permitted an output higher than in the prewar years. Exported margarine was exempted from quota restrictions. As a result, margarine production in the period 1943–45 averaged 600,000,000 pounds, 250,000,000 pounds above prewar output. The impetus margarine production received during the war is still carrying it forward. It now exceeds the monthly output of butter. In comparison with margarine, butter is relatively expensive to produce. The cost of butter includes a large element of labor, as well as raw materials in the form of fodder and grain. Margarine, a machine product, costs little to produce.

Butter production has not recovered from casualties it sustained during the war period, and it may take some time for it to regain its normal per-capita production even under the most encouraging circumstances. Repeal of the oleo legislation will not make that road easy. In fact, repeal of the Federal laws and repeal of the color restrictions might result in the oleo manufacturers reaching their first goal, namely, a billion pounds of oleomargarine. It is quite easy to foreglimpse what would result should oleomargarine consumption reach that gigantic figure while creamery butter is trying to climb back from its low production of a billion three hundred million pounds to the almost 1,900,000 pounds which it had reached in prewar days.

Oleo manufacturers claim that their product does not hurt the dairy industry, but the records show that when oleomargarine consumption goes up the consumption of butter declines. This advance of oleo into the butter market is being made without any appreciable advantage to the American farmer in spite of widespread propaganda to the contrary.

FARMERS NOT BENEFITED BY OLEO INDUSTRY

During 1946 the American farmer received $25,322,896,000 in cash income from the products of his farm, of which he could attribute $39,376,000 or less than two-tenths of 1 percent to the portion of his farm products utilized in the manufacture of oleomargarine. Of this latter amount $16,759,000 went for cottonseed oil and $18,603,000 went into soybean oil. At the moment the American margarine industry is using domestic cottonseed and soybean oil but there is no assurance that the industry will not again turn to foreign oils which in normal times are much cheaper than domestic oils. Before the war the principal ingredient of margarine was coconut oil imported from the Philippines and other far eastern countries. That supply was shut off by the conflict, but coconut oil is beginning to show up again in the import statistics. During 1948 approximately 20,000,000 pounds of coconut oil was used in the making of margarine for the American market. Significantly this oil was used almost exclusively in the manufacture of factory colored oleo. Copra products are coming back by leaps and bounds in the East Indies and Philippines. What the score will be for 1948 I will not venture a guess, but I think the southern cotton growers and those who dabble in soybeans should take careful note of the trend. Disaster nearly struck the soybean and cottonseed oil industry early in 1947 when the coconut oil began arriving in quantities from the Philippines. Domestic vegetable oils were at a high point but the arrival of the foreign oils sent the entire price structure down to prewar levels. Only vastly increased Government buying for export saved the industries involved from crippling losses.

OLEO WILL NOT HELP SOUTHERN COTTON

I have observed that many of my southern colleagues have signed this discharge petition apparently in the belief that expansion of the oleo industry would help the southern cotton industry. The records reveal that dairying and other competing interests are tremendously more important as sources of cash income to southern farmers than oleomargarine. For instance cash income to farmers in the State of Carolina, represented by my good friend, the Honorable Mr. RIVERS, in 1940 amounted to $1,090,000 from oleomargarine and $19,294,000 from sources injured by oleomargarine. In the 10 cotton States cash income in that year from oleo was $17,539,000 compared with $478,803,000 from sources injured by oleo. It is unfortunate that some farmers in these States have been led to believe that more oleo would improve their economic status.

While less than two-tenths of 1 percent of farm income is traceable to oleomargarine, dairy products gave him a cash income of $4,116,930,000 in 1946. Normally in the United States 45 to 59 percent of all milk which is processed is made into butter. If butter production is drastically reduced, it would mean a decrease in total milk production. Milk is a seasonal product with substantial surpluses accumulating during the flush season. It is at this period of surplus milk that the bulk of the butter is made and stored away for consumption during the lean period. To assure consumers of an adequate supply of fluid milk in the lean season the dairyman must maintain a herd of greater size than he would need at the flush season. If he cannot convert the surplus milk into butter during the flush period he will have only one recourse and that is to cut down the size of his herd. The Department of Agriculture statistics show that he has been compelled to reduce the number of milk cows on his farms steadily since 1945 and today has fewer animals than he had in 1934. If this trend continues the shortages of fluid milk in the dry periods will grow progressively worse. Shortages in fluid milk supply are usually reflected in higher prices to the consumer.

There is another serious aspect to this picture relating to the conservation of our valuable soil, the soil that gives America the highest standard of living in the world. Check the older countries and you will find that countries which

place great stress on their dairy herds such as Denmark, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden are the only ones in Europe whose people at present receive an adequate diet. The others, such as Italy, India, China, and many others which have tried to get along without this basic industry are suffering from inadequate diet and are dependent on our generosity to keep them alive. This condition is due in large part to the fallacy of some countries in thinking that they can crop their lands, leave it open to wind and water erosion year after year. This policy has lost for them forever that valuable top soil so necessary to the growth of vegetation. The dairy industry is the only type of farming that goes with a sound soil-conservation program. From that standpoint alone it is to the interests of all America to see that this great industry is not destroyed.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the Atlanta Constitution carried a statement sometime ago that the CIO Political Action Committee had voted to establish political headquarters in two congressional districts in the State of Georgia to defeat Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, of Clarkston, and myself, it being stated that Judge DAVIS and I are looked upon with great disfavor by the CIO Political Action Committee. In this connection it might be noted that on the last blacklist issued by CIO Political Action Committee my rating was given at zero minus.

Since this announcement was made the CIO Political Action Committee has been planting its agents in Georgia, particularly in the second and fifth congressional districts preparatory to the initiation of an aggressive campaign against Judge DAVIS and myself.

This is not the first time, Mr. Chairman, that the CIO Political Action Committee has opposed me for Congress. Mr. Sidney Hillman testified before the House Campaign Expenditures Committee that in the 1944 primary the CIO contributed $4,500 to my opponent in that election, but I happen to know that this was but a small part of what they spent to defeat me. They had scurrilous literature printed outside the State and shipped in in bales and distributed by a host of agents that were sent in from other States.

Mr. Chairman, the Special House Committee on Un-American Activities investigated the CIO's National Citizens Political Action Committee and made some interesting discoveries.

The NCPAC was organized so that the CIO–PAC could carry on political activities which it was prevented by law from financing.

Sidney Hillman was chairman of both CIO-PAC and NCPAC. Both organizations had the same treasurer. Both organizations operated out of the same headquarters at 205 East Forty-second Street, New York.

The set-up of NCPAC was as follows:

NATIONAL CITIZENS POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE OFFICERS

Sidney Hillman, chairman; James G. Patton, vice chairman; Freda Kirchway, vice chairman; R. J. Thomas, treasurer; James H. McGill, comptroller; Clark Foreman, secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Verda White Barnes, Elmer A. Benson, Van A. Bittner, Clark Foreman, Sidney Hillman, Freda Kirchway, James Loeb, Lucy Randolph Mason, James H. McGill, Philip Murray, James G. Patton, Gifford Pinchot, R. J. Thomas, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, A. F. Whitney.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Adamic, Louis, author, Milford, N. J.

Alexander, Dr. Will W., vice president, Julius Rosenwald Fund, North Carolina.

Anderson, Mary, former director, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Anderson, Mrs. Sherwood, New York City.

Baldwin, C. B., assistant chairman, Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee, New York City.

Balokovic, Zlatko, president, United Committee of South Slavic Americans, New York.

Barnes, Verda White, director, Women's Division, Congress of Industrial Organzations' Political Action Committee, New York.

Bauer, Catherine, author, California.

Benet, William Rose, poet, New York.

Benson, Elmer A., ex-Governor, Minnesota.

Bethune, Mary McLoed, Daytona Beach, Fla.

Biggert, Mrs. Robert, Winnetka, Ill.

Bittner, Van A., United Steelworkers of America, Washington, D. C.

Blaine, Mrs. Emmons, Chicago, Ill.

Bliven, Bruce, editor, New Republic, New York.

Boas, Dr. Ernest P., New York City.

Bowie, Dr. W. Russell, professor, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Bremer, Otto, banker, St. Paul, Minn.

Bunzick, Zarko M., president, Serbian Vidovdas Congress, Akron, Ohio.

Burke, J. Frank, Pasadena, Calif.

Butkovich, John D., president, Croatian Fraternal Union, Pennsylvania.

Carey, James B., secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Clyde, Mrs. Ethel, Huntington, Long Island.

Connelly, Marc, Los Angeles, Calif.

Cooke, Morris Llewellyn, consulting engineer, Philadelphia, Pa.

Coolidge, Albert Sprague, professor, Harvard University, Massachusetts.

Corrothers, Rev. S. L., president, National Nonpartisan Colored Ministers' Association of the United States of America, Westbury, Long Island.

Curran, Joseph, president, National Maritime Union of America, New York.

Dalrymple, Sherman H., president, United Rubber Workers of America, Ohio.

Davis, Dr. Michael M., editor, Medical Care, New York.

Dombrowski, Dr. James A., executive secretary, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Tennessee.

Dunjee, Roscoe, editor and publisher of the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma.

DuPoint, Ethel, writer, Kentucky.

DuPont, Zara, Cambridge, Mass.

Durr, Mrs. Clifford, vice chairman, National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, Virginia.

Eliot, Thomas H., attorney, Cambridge, Mass.

Embree, Edwin R., president, Julius Rosenwald Fund, Illinois.

Epstein, Henry, attorney, New York City.

Fitzgerald, Albert J., president, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, New York.

Foreman, Clark, president, Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

Frazier, Dr. E. Franklin, professor of sociology, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Galbraith, John Kenneth, editorial department, Fortune magazine.

Gimbel, Elinor, committee for the care of young children in wartime, New York City.

Green, John, president, Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, New Jersey.

Gutknecht, Judge John, municipal court, Chicago.

Harburg, E. Y., motion-picture director, Hollywood.

Hastie, Judge William, dean, Howard University Law School, Washington.

Hays, Mortimer, attorney, New York City.

Haywood, Allan S., administrator, Federal Workers of America, Washington.

Hecht, Ben, writer, California.

Hewes, L. I., Jr., National Council on Race Relations, Palo Alto, Calif.

Hillman, Sidney, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Hollander, Sidney, manufacturer, Maryland.

Hughes, Langston, poet, New York.

Imbrie, James, banker, Trenton, N. J.

Kenyon, Judge Dorothy, New York City.

Kingdon, Dr. Frank, author, New York.

Kirchwey, Freda, publisher, the Nation, New York.

Krzychi, Leo, president, American Slav Congress.

Kulikowski, Adam, publisher, Opportunity, Virginia.

Lange, Oscar, professor, University of Chicago.

Lapp, John, independent labor conciliator, Chicago.

Lecron, James, assistant to Henry A. Wallace, as Secretary of Agriculture, Berkeley, Calif.

Lee, Canada, actor, New York City.

Lerner, Max, author, editor, PM, New York City.

Lewis, Alfred Baker, Greenwich, Conn., president, Trade Union Accident and Health Association.

Lewis, John Frederick, president, Art Alliance, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lewis, William Draper, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lochard, Dr. Metz T., editor, Chicago Defender, Chicago, Ill.

Loeb, James, secretary, Union for Democratic Action, New York.

Luyten, Dr. W. J., professor of astronomy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
Mason, Lucy Randolph, Atlanta, Ga.
Maurer, Dr. Wesley, school of journalism, University of Michigan.
McAllister, Mrs. Thomas F., former director, women's division, National Democratic Party, Grand Rapids, Mich.
McConnell, Bishop Francis J., New York City.
McCulloch, Frank, director, Mullenbach Institute, Chicago, Ill.
McDonald, David J., secretary-treasurer, United Steelworkers of America, Pennsylvania.
McGill, James H., McGill Manufacturing Co., Valparaiso, Ind.
McMahon, Francis, professor, University of Chicago.
McWilliams, Carey, attorney and writer, Los Angeles, Calif.
Motherwell, Hiram, author, New York.
Murray, Philip, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.
Mulzac, Hugh, captain, United States merchant marine, Jamaica, Long Island.
Neilson, William A., educator, Falls Village, Conn.
Niebuhr, Dr. Reinhold, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Norris, Hon. George W., Nebraska.
Osowski, Dr. W. T., president, American Slav Congress, Michigan.
Patton, James G., president, National Farmers Union, Colorado.
Perry, Jennings, editor, Nashville Tennesseean, Tennessee.
Pinchot, Cornelia Bryce, Washington, D. C.
Pinchot, Gifford, Milford, Pa.
Platek, V. X., president, National Slovak Society, Pennsylvania.
Pope, Dr. Liston, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
Popper, Martin, executive secretary, National Lawyers Guild.
Porter, Katherine Ann, writer, New York.
Poynter, Nelson, publisher, St. Petersburg Times, Florida.
Quilici, Judge George L., municipal court, Chicago.
Ratica, Peter, president, United Russian Orthodox Brotherhood of America, Pennsylvania.
Reid, Dr. Ira, associate director, Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Ga.
Reynolds, J. Louis, Reynolds Metal Co., Virginia.
Ricker, A. W., editor, Farm Union Herald, St. Paul, Minn.
Rieve, Emil, president, Textile Workers Union of America, New York.
Robeson, Paul, actor, New York.
Robinson, Edward G., Hollywood, Calif.
Robinson, Mrs. Edward G., Hollywood, Calif.
Robinson, Reid, president, United Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers of America, Colorado.
Rosenblum, Frank, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York.
Rosenthal, Morris S., Stein-Hall & Co., Inc., New York.
Ross, Mrs. J. D., Seattle, Wash.
Ryan, H. Frank, managing editor, Courier-Post, Camden, N. J.
Sackett, Sheldon F., editor, Coos Bay Times, Marshfield, Oreg.
Schlesinger, Arthur M., professor of history, Harvard University.
Schuman, Frederick L., professor of international relations, Williams College, Massachusetts.
Schwartz, C. K., attorney, Chicago, Ill.
Seiferheld, David S., president, N. Erlanger Blumgart & Co., New York City.
Smathers, Hon., William H., New Jersey.
Smith, Lillian, editor, South Today and author Strange Fruit, Georgia.
Smith, S. Stephenson, Eugene, Oreg.
Soule, George, associate editor, New Republic, New York City.
Speir, Mercedes Powell, president, Richmond Consumers Cooperative, Richmond, Va.
Steele, Julian D., president, Boston branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Boston, Mass.
Sweezey, Alan, professor of economics, Williams College, Massachusetts.
Stone, Maurice L., business executive, New York.
Thomas, R. J., president, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Detroit.
Tilly, Mrs. M. E., jurisdictional secretary of Christian social relations, of the Southeastern Jurisdiction of the Women's Society for Christian Service, Methodist Church, Georgia.
Tobias, Dr. Channing H., member of Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation and Mayor's Committee on Unity, New York City.
Townsend, Willard, president, United Transport Service Employees of America, Chicago, Ill.
Van Kleeck, Mary, Russell Sage Foundation, New York City.
Walsh, J. Raymond, director of research, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Political Action Committee, New York.
Waring, P. Alston, farmer-author, New Hope, Pa.
Weaver, Dr. Robert C., Mayor's Committee on Racial Relations, Chicago.
Welles, Orson, Hollywood, Calif.
Wesley, Carter, publisher, Houston Informer, Texas.
Wheelwright, Mrs. Ellen Du Pont, Wilmington, Del.
Whitney, A. F., president, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Ohio.
Williams, Aubrey, National Farmers Union, Washington, D. C.
Wilson, Mrs. Luke I., Bethesda, Md.
Wise, James Waterman, author, radio commentator, New York.
Wright, R. R., Jr. (Bishop), executive secretary, Negro Fraternal Council of Churches in America, Ohio.
Young, P. B., publisher, Norfolk Journal and Guide, Virginia.
Zeman, Stephen, Jr., president, Slovak Evangelical Union, Pennsylvania.
Zmrhal, Prof. Jaroslav J., president, Czechoslovak National Council, Illinois.

This list contains 141 names. Checking the 141 on this list of the National Citizens Political Action Committee against the 25 organizations the Attorney General has characterized as subversive and Communist, we find 82 of the 141 have been affiliated with one or more of these 25 subversive organizations, which organizations include the following:

American Council on Soviet Relations.
American League for Peace and Democracy.
American League Against War and Fascism.
American Peace Mobilization.
American Youth Congress.
Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder—from the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary.
Communist Party.
Congress of American Revolutionary Writers.
Daily Worker.
Emergency Peace Mobilization.
Freiheit.
International Labor Defense.
International Publishers.
International Workers Order.
League of American Writers.
Michigan Civil Rights Federation.
National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.
National Committee for Peoples Rights.
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.
National Negro Congress.
New Masses.
United States Congress Against War.
Washington Bookshop.
Washington Committee for Democratic Action.
Workers Alliance.

The National Citizens Political Action Committee, to all intents and purposes was the right arm of the CIO Political Action Committee, not only was loaded with avowed Communists and fellow travelers, but even contained the name of the naturalized American citizen, Dr. Oscar Lange, a professor at the University of Chicago who, upon the formation of the United Nations, renounced his American citizenship to become Ambassador representing Poland at the United Nations and is listed as such on page 85 of the delegations to the United Nations at Lake Success in the January-February 1948 issue of the list of such delegations.

There is not a Member of this body who does not know that Oscar Lange could not have been appointed as Ambassador representing Poland without the consent of the Soviet Union and without complete and unswerving adherence to the Communist Party line.

Langston Hughes, the Negro poet, was also a member of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. His works have been published and widely distributed by the Communist Party. A fair sample of his subversive and un-American poetry published for the eighth convention of the Communist Party, United States of America, entitled "The Worker's Song," reads as follows:

ONE MORE S IN THE U. S. A.

Put one more S in the U. S. A.
To make it Soviet.
One more S in the U. S. A.
Oh, we'll live to see it yet.
When the land belongs to the farmers
And the factories belong to the workingmen,
The U. S. A., when we take control,
Will be the U. S. S. A. then.

Now, across the water in Russia
They have the big U. S. S. R.,
The Fatherland of the Soviets,
But that is mighty far
From New York, or Texas, or California, too,
So listen, fellow workers, this is what we have to do:

Put one more S in the U. S. A.

(Repeat chorus.)

But we can't win out by just talking,
So let us take things in our hand.
Then down and 'way with the bosses' sway—
Hail, Communist land!
So stand up in battle and wave our flag on high,
And shout out, fellow workers, our new slogan to the sky.

(Repeat chorus.)

But we can't join hands strong together
So long as whites are lynching black.
So black and white in one union fight
And get on the right track.
By Texas, or Georgia, or Alabama led,
Come together, fellow workers—black and white can all be red!

(Repeat chorus.)

Another of Langston Hughes' poems reads as follows:

Good bye, Christ Jesus,
Lord, God, Jehovah;
Beat it on the way from here;
Make way for a new guy with no religion at all,
A real guy named "Marx Communist, Lenin Peasant, Stalin Worker, me"—
I said "Me." Go on ahead now. You are getting
In the way of things, Lord—
And step on the gas, Christ.
Move, and don't be so slow about moving.
The world is mine from now on.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the membership of the House to some factual information which is a matter of record concerning the organization of the CIO Political Action Committee.

The CIO Political Action Committee was organized by the CIO executive board on July 7, 1943, and was composed of the president of the CIO, the secretary-treasurer of the CIO, 9 vice presidents of the CIO, and 38 other leaders of the CIO unions. Out of the 49 executive board members of the CIO, the following had notorious Communist records: Lewis Alan Berne, Donald Henderson, Joseph P. Selly, Julius Emspak, Grant W. Oakes, Eleanor Nelson, Joseph F. Jurich, Ben Gold, Morris Muster, Harry R. Bridges, Ferdinand C. Smith, Lewis Merrill, Abram Flaxer, Michael J. Quill, Joseph Curran, Reid Robinson, E. F. Burke, Frank R. McGrath.

Among those who were notorious for their Communist-front affiliations and who obtained seats at the national CIO convention in Philadelphia in 1943 as representatives of CIO industrial councils, were the following avowed Communists: Meyer Adelman, Harold Christoffel, Philip M. Connelly, Arthur Daronatsy, Len de Caux, James Drury, Fullerton Fuller, Sander Genius, Bjorne Halling, Mel J. Heinritz, J. F. Jurich, Saul Mills, Luverne Noon, Lee Pressman, George Wilson.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the membership of this House is fully aware that Harold Christoffel, who led the traitorous Allis-Chalmers strike during the critical war period, is now under sentence of 6 years in the penitentiary for perjury he committed before a committee of the House, in denying under oath that he was a Communist.

It is well known that the CIO-PAC and its affiliated and cooperating organizations have spent millions of dollars in past elections in trying to defeat Members of Congress who voted in the traditional American way, and that Members of Congress have been subjected to vicious attacks, smears, and libels by the CIO in heated campaigns; and it is well known that these enormous CIO funds have been recklessly and illegally used, and are being used today in an attempt to defeat Members of Congress who have insisted on voting in the best interest of the whole American people.

In some cases in the past they have succeeded in purging honest and conscientious servants of the people, but by far they have not succeeded in getting their endorsed mouthpieces into either the House or Senate.

Recently, Mr. Chairman, I obtained information concerning the director of the CIO Political Action Committee, who succeeded the late Sidney Hillman as the master mind of that organization. I am speaking of Mr. Jack Kroll, of Oaks and Burnett Streets, Cincinnati, Ohio.

I know that the Members of this House and the American people will be interested to know that Mr. Kroll was born in London, England, June 10, 1885; that he came to the United States in 1898, and that although he has been in this country for 50 years, he has never even applied for citizenship. Jack Kroll is actually registered with the Department of Justice as an alien, being so registered in 1946.

Mr. Kroll became associated with Sidney Hillman in 1910 and was continuously associated with him until Mr. Hillman's death in 1946. But, even though Mr. Hillman continued to espouse an alien ideology, he actually was a naturalized citizen.

Think of it, my colleagues, here is an alien, the head of a great political organization with millions of followers and with millions of dollars in funds, out to defeat Members of Congress and endeavoring by every means to try to influence American citizens in their votes and to persuade them to accept candidates who are completely subservient to the CIO and who, in many cases, are followers of the Communist Party line.

Last year, soon after Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, Mr. Kroll's CIO-PAC published a "voting guide"—a "blacklist" of Congressmen—naming 340 Members of the House and 28 of the 32 Senators coming up for reelection this year, charging that they "voted against the people" and demanding their defeat.

The Communist-led CIO unions have since added the names of 104 Representatives and Senators who had been CIO approved until they voted aid to Greece and Turkey to save those countries from communism. This means that out of 477 Members of Congress up for reelection, only 5 meet with full CIO approval.

Such contemptible affrontery is to be expected from an organization which places an alien in charge of its political activities in American elections.

Although Mr. Kroll has never taken the trouble to apply for American citizenship, he certainly has taken advantage of loopholes in the American election system, because I am advised that he has had the audacity to vote many times in Chicago and Cincinnati, where he now lives.

Mr. Kroll will probably try, unsuccessfully I am sure, to get some of his alien ideas into the Democratic platform and he will attempt to make his influence felt in the selection of the nominees of the Democratic Party in the coming elections.

I say this because, right now, Jack Kroll is an unopposed candidate for delegate at large from Ohio to the Democratic National Convention to be held in Philadelphia on July 12.

Any man who has made his living here; has enjoyed the protection of our laws; has availed himself of the privileges afforded under our system of government, and has deliberately maintained an alien status for 50 years, is most certainly not an American.

I, for one, resent the intrusion of such a person into the American political scene. And every right-thinking American will also resent and reject the gratuitous advices of this alien and his CIO Political Action Committee.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN].

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is unnecessary to devote much time or talk to the discussion about this legislation which will remove the punitive tax on oleomargarine. It is my feeling that most of the Members have already made up their minds as to how they intend to vote. This present punitive tax is outdated and whatever situation which may have justified its having been levied in the first place no longer exists. Margarine is a proper food and has achieved its place and should be permitted to have the standing which it deserves. You will hear a great deal about the violations and the dire things which will result from the elimination of the tax on oleomargarine. I think we can forget that. If there are to be any violations, they would result whether there is a tax or not. There is still ample provision for penalizing any violators. The criminal element if they desire to substitute oleomargarine for butter can do that just as well whether there is a tax or not. As a matter of fact, there is a greater incentive for them to violate with a tax than there is without. Recently you saw what happened with reference to the price of butter. When it looked as if the House committee on Agriculture might act favorably on one of the bills under consideration having to do with the tax on oleomargarine, butter prices fell. When the committee shelved the legislation, butter prices rose 6 cents or more a pound immediately.

Removing the punitive tax from oleomargarine is not going to be detrimental to butter or the producers of butter. If there should ever need to be a tax on oleomargarine, butter, or any other commodity, it seems to me that that should be determined by the Ways and Means Committee. That is the committee

which usually determines what taxes are proper and the amounts. However, as I have already said, there are enough votes in this body to pass this bill. We have enough information to act and I intend to vote to remove the Federal taxes from oleomargarine.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, this Congress has been subjected to a high-powered and highly financed lobby by the oleomargarine interests. They have resorted to everything from legitimate arguments to highly fanciful and emotional statements having no basis in either logic or fact. In all events, it seems clear that the oleomargarine trust feels justified in spending vast sums of money in an effort to eliminate the tax upon colored margarine so that innocent consumers can be more readily deceived into accepting and using oleo instead of the more wholesome and nutritious product of butter.

Mr. Chairman, it has always seemed to me extremely strange that the oleo trust should be so insistent upon trying to secure the tax-free privilege of coloring their synthetic compound a shade of yellow to most closely resemble butter if their oleo product were the delectable and wholesome product which they say it is. It should be apparent to any objective observer that the only reason the oleo trust wants to color its product yellow is to make it look like butter since people generally prefer butter as a spread upon their food. That being the case there can be no valid objection to the maintenance of a tax upon such a coloration process since it seems only right and fair that the oleo trust should not be permitted to traffic and profit upon the virtues of butter by imitating its color without paying something in the nature of a royalty, or a "patent fee" or an "imitator's license" or a copyright privilege for endeavoring to disguise its product so it looks as much like butter as possible in color, shape, and size. Certainly if the oleo trust finds it necessary to pawn off its product as butter by coloring it yellow, it should in simple justice pay the small tax now imposed for being allowed to continue to practice that deception.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing distasteful or repugnant about nutritious and wholesome food which happens to be white in color. Vanilla ice cream is the most popular of frozen foods and it is white in color; angel food cake appeals to the taste of kings and emperors as well as men in every walk of life and it is white in color; nobody ever heard of coloring mashed potatoes yellow in order to induce people to eat them and wheat bread remains the staff of life without resorting to any disguise against its pure white color. Why is oleo colored yellow, Mr. Chairman? Simply to make it look like butter and simply because consumers prefer butter to oleo. That being the case, I think this legislation should be defeated and the tax on colored oleo retained since it helps protect the consumer against deception and adulteration and since it aids butter makers in their long fight to raise and maintain the standards of their product against unfair competition and against fraudulent imitation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the action of the House today on this legislation is not only uncalled for, but entirely ridiculous. It is economically wrong. It is wrong from every angle. The producers of oleomargarine have made tremendous profits during the war and established the greatest lobby that has ever come to Washington and out of that was born this resistance to the action of the committee. The committee did what all the other committees of the House do. We studied this legislation and knew what was best for all concerned. For years I was taught that if you were not familiar with a piece of legislation, you could always justify your action by following the recommendations of the committee. But here a few Members side-stepped that and put a petition on the desk. Certain Members of the House rushed down the aisle in their greed to get votes in this election and signed that petition to discharge the committee. This action will have far-reaching effects. I do not know what oleomargarine is made out of, but I do know that they say it is made out of peanut oil, cottonseed oil, and soybean oil. Maybe some other things are in it. But I have here an Associated Press report saying that an oleomargarine chemical factory blew up and killed 28 persons and damaged 18 buildings. Now there may be some high-powered stuff in it—God only knows. But I do know that certain members of the committee recently wanted to go into an oleomargarine plant to see just what was there and how they were operating, and they were denied that right. I do not know whether it was because there were certain things going in, but here I have a little bottle full of worms taken out of cottonseed. If I took them in my hand and squeezed them, juice would run out of my hand. That goes into cottonseed oil.

Last fall when the Committee on Agriculture went down through the South, we rode 400 miles in a single day. It was during the time when the cotton was spoiling in the fields and the peanuts were rotting in the shocks because the weather was wet. We rode 400 miles, but we did not see a farmer out trying to save his crops, although it was a nice, clear, windy day. At the same time farmers were complaining about their crops rotting in the field. I could not understand; it was not Sunday, they were not in church. The reason was they did not care.

Those crops were subsidized. Those crops had price supports and were insured by the Government. Those are the crops that go into the manufacture of oleomargarine. The reason they were not in the field was not because they were in church. When I mentioned that in Rocky Mount, N. C., that we did not see a single farmer out saving his crops, they said, "Of course not; it is Saturday." Saturday, hell. On that Saturday every dairy farmer in America was cleaning his cows, his barns, producing good dairy products, checking the milk from every teat from every cow, getting it out on time so that we would have wholesome dairy products. That was every dairy farmer in America, when those farmers in the South would not work because it was Saturday. The dairy farmers not only did it on Saturday, but they did it on Sunday, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, when those farmers down South, who had their crops insured, who were the recipients of all the New Deal hand-outs during the years, did not care whether they harvested their crops or not, because they were insured; they had price supports, so that today the Commodity Credit Corporation is loaded with peanuts and cotton and tobacco, that they had to force them into the ERP to get them off their hands. That is why there is a billion dollars' worth of tobacco going into ERP.

Recently Commodity Credit Corporation sold $3,000,000 worth of peanuts to a Philadelphia broker on agreement to take them back if he could not make money on them.

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

Mr. GROSS. I do not yield. I do not have time to yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I just wanted to inform the gentleman——

Mr. GROSS. Sit down. I have the floor. I do not yield.

This thing is wrong from an economic standpoint. This assault on the dairy industry, which has been the greatest mainstay to soil conservation and improved farming in America, is today getting a body blow. We have now 2,000,000 less cows than we had 2 years ago. That has its reflection in our milk supplies. That has its reflection in all of our dairy supplies, in our meat supplies, and in our veal supplies. Yesterday, the St. Louis manufacturers put shoes up 10 cents a pair wholesale because of the rising cost of cowhides; not steer hides or bull hides, but cow hides. This bill reflects itself in every budget in every home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been very interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS], and about the uncleanness and worms in the cottonseed oil, and so forth. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is too honest to make any misstatement. I think he has been rather misinformed or that he has overlooked that the soya bean and cottonseed oil that ultimately goes into the manufacture of oleomargarine, together with the skimmed milk, has been put through a refining process, so that all the available decomposition is of course removed. That is a fact.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not going to yield at this time. I do not intend to yield until I get through.

I have here, as a matter of comparison, which I will insert in the RECORD, a state-

ment from the Department of Agriculture, the Pure Food and Drugs Section, for the years from 1930 to 1947. There were prosecutions pertaining to butter for filth, decomposition, and/or productions under insanitary conditions amounting to 705.

In those same years, 1930 to 1947, the seizures in oleomargarine for filth or decomposition amounted to just two. I think it would be well for the Members of the House to peruse this RECORD tomorrow, where it gives everything in detail.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. I will not yield at this time.

Further, I will read from the Federal Security Agency Bulletin, Food and Drug Administration, simply to show what this adulteration under filth and decomposition means—these 705 cases in that period of time as against 2.

Nature of the charge: Adulteration, section 402 A–3, the article consisted in whole or in part of a filthy substance, by reason of the presence of insects, insect parts, insect fragments, setae, rodent hair—that is rat hair—hair similar to rat hair, hair similar to cat hair; moth scales, nondescript dirt.

The article had been prepared, packed, and held under insanitary conditions, whereby it might have become contaminated with filth.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Where do you find all that stuff?

Mr. MITCHELL. This is in the record of the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. RIVERS. But what kind of product do you find that in?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is butter, my friend.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania was asking about the farmers of the South and of my great State, where we raise a lot of soybeans; and, incidentally, for your information, 9 of the 11 counties in my district are dairy counties. When he was speaking about the farmers who neglected their fields and the farmers that he is acquainted with who were so busily, industriously cleaning up their creameries, I wonder if he impressed the House with the fact that he has visited so many creameries that he can conscientiously testify to the fact in the face of the documentary evidence I have produced here which is irrefutable because there are legal cases, there are many of them here, and I will refer you to pages 92, 93, 94, and 95 of the Federal Security Agency notices of judgment under the Federal Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will not yield at this time.

I think rather than take salad oils that are derivatives of our farm products, soybeans, cottonseed, peanuts, and what have you, I think perhaps the butter people might think along in terms of refining the butter before they put it on the market; in fact, from all of the evidence I have, it is time we recognized that if what the gentleman said is true, that every jar of mayonnaise and every jar of salad oil on the grocery shelves of America would be contaminated.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think it should appear at this point in the RECORD that our distinguished colleague from Indiana is speaking of what happened during the present administration. With the present administration, no one would expect any prosecution of the cottonseed lobby, but would expect a great deal of prosecution so far as the dairy industry was concerned.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, to those who would defraud the American public by serving colored oleomargine for good, pure, unadulterated butter, I ask the question: "Would you favor the sale and serving of horse meat in public eating places without informing the people what they were getting?" If it is a fraud to sell horse meat to the public without telling the customer what he is getting, it is fraud to serve oleo to the public disguised as pure butter.

Why do the manufacturers of oleo want to color their product? They know the people prefer butter because of its sunshine color, because butter is made from unadulterated cream. Butter tastes good because it takes 4 pints of cream to make a pound of butter. Butter by nature is our symbol of good living.

There is no foreign oil in butter, no cottonseed oil, no coconut oil, no soybean oil. Butter is made from pure cream churned to a golden nugget. Butter does not have to be artificially impregnated with vitamins; it does not have to be adulterated to look like something it is not. Oleo manufacturers know oleo would not be bought or served on the table by the American housewife if it was put on the market in its original dirty-white color. You have heard the expression "tattle-tale gray." That is the real color of margarine. "Oleo" Members of Congress know their baby could not be pawned off on the housewife if they tried to dispose of it in its natural color. Because they want oleo to displace butter as a spread for bread, they want to adulterate it and color it to look like the golden globules of butterfat that gather when pure cream is churned into pure butter. They try to make oleo taste like butter, so they adulterate it with foreign oils to imitate the creamy flavor of pure butter. Butter by nature contains vitamin A, vitamin D, vitamin E, and the other natural food elements that combine to make butter one of nature's masterpieces. Soybean and cottonseed oil and foreign coconut oil from which oleo is made do not contain vitamins nor anything else that is tasty or palatable, so the oleo boys have to adulterate their oleo in an attempt to make it taste and look and smell like butter. My premise is: If you want to pawn off an adulterated imitation on the American public, why not let the people know they are getting an adulterated imitation. Why make it possible for these imitators to deceive and defraud the people by selling them an adulterated imitation of golden delicious butter at a price far beyond its value, and thus make it possible for the Oleo Trust to sacrifice a basic American industry on the altar of unconscionable profits, fraud, and deceit?

More than 65,000,000 meals are served to the public in public eating places in the United States every day. What a wonderful harvest for the Oleo Trust. What a market for the oleo interests to pawn off their adulterated imitation of butter at butter prices—an imitation that costs but a fraction of the cost of butter. This would afford the Oleo Trust the opportunity of disposing millions of pounds of oleo to the public, who would think they were getting butter. Billions of dollars of unconscionable profits for the Oleo Trust. No wonder they are spending millions in their oleo campaign.

The attempt of the oleo interests to destroy the dairy industry is not new. It started in Paris in 1872 and in the United States 2 years later. Neither is the regulation of the sale of oleo and taxation of this imitation of butter new. In all parts of the world the manufacture and sale of oleo have been subject to regulation and taxation of one form or another. In our neighbor state of Canada the use of oleo is completely prohibited. Wherever oleo has been sold in all parts of the world, it has been artificially made to look like butter and to defraud the public by passing it off for butter.

Oleo is usually made by mixing a vegetable fat, such as cottonseed oil, soybean oil, or coconut oil, with some skim milk and certain chemicals, and fortifying it with artificial vitamins by the addition of fish-liver-oil concentrates.

To the farmers of the Southern States and to any other person who believes that oleo manufacture is a good thing for the farmers of this country, I want to make it clear that less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the total cash income from the products of the farm is received from farm products utilized in the manufacture of oleo. That does not bear out the statement made by the oleo interests that oleomargarine manufacture is a boon to our farm populace.

Inasmuch as cottonseed oil is the basic ingredient of oleo, the southern farmer is told that oleo manufacture is an important source of income for him. But the facts show that all the cottonseed oil used in oleo manufacture accounted for only about one-half of 1 percent of the cash income of the cotton farmer. An increase of a mere five one-hundredths of 1 percent per pound for cotton lint alone would have meant more to cotton farmers than all the cottonseed oil used in the manufacture of oleo. The cotton farmer receives approximately four times as much cash income from cottonseed oil used in vegetable shortening and

from cottonseed byproducts sold as dairy feed as he receives from the entire oleo business. If the dairy industry is destroyed by the oleo interests, as is their aim, the loss to southern farmers from the sale of byproducts of cottonseed as dairy feed would offset many times their income from the sale of cottonseed oil for oleo manufacture.

The representatives from the cotton districts of the South should contemplate these facts before they vote to sacrifice the dairy industry on the altar of the Oleo Trust.

In a report of the Federal Trade Commission it was revealed that about 60 percent of the average annual production of crude cottonseed oil was handled by only three corporations—Procter & Gamble, Wesson Oil & Snowdrift, and Swift & Co. The sphere of control of these large corporations extends from the local cotton gin to the final processor and manufacturer, where the refined cottonseed oil is actually used. By the time the refiner, the broker, wholesaler, the crusher, and ginner have all taken their percentage of profits, the amount left for the cottonseed farmer is very small; in fact, almost imperceptible.

The total cash income to farmers in the Cotton Belt in 1946 was a little more than five billions. Of this huge sum only about seventeen and one-half millions was or could be credited to the sale of farm products used in the manufacture of oleo. Thus it is a fact that only one-third of 1 percent of the cotton farmers' cash income can be traced to oleomargarine.

For every $100 the average cotton farmer or farmer in the Cotton Belt receives from his farm, he can credit only about $34 cents to oleomargarine. But he does receive $8 out of every $100, on the average, from the sale of his dairy products. In other words, the average farmer in the Cotton Belt actually receives 24 times as much today from the sale of his dairy products as he receives from the sale of cottonseed oil and other ingredients of oleomargarine. Let the representatives of the cotton States give these facts to their cotton farmers. Thus the agruments of the oleo interests and their representatives are completely debunked.

In fact, in the most specialized cotton States, the dairy industry is much more important as a source of cash income to the farmers than is the manufacture of oleo. That may be a revelation to some of the Representatives from the Southern States. In Mississippi where practically every farmer raises cotton, the cash farm income from dairy products in 1946 was nine times as great as the cash farm income credited to oleo manufacture. Here are the figures from the United States Department of Agriculture and from the United States Department of Commerce, that speak for themselves, proving that the total farm income from oleo manufacture is but a small fraction of the income derived from the sale of dairy products and other farm products, the sale of which is hurt by the manufacture of oleo, in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas:

Important cotton State	Cash income to farmers in 1940	
	From oleomargarine	From sources injured by oleomargarine [1]
Alabama	$1,919,000	$30,956,000
Arkansas	2,263,000	36,891,000
Georgia	1,815,000	35,949,000
Louisiana	765,000	22,277,000
Mississippi	3,035,000	39,908,000
North Carolina	1,244,000	37,909,000
Oklahoma	639,000	63,802,000
South Carolina	1,090,000	19,294,000
Tennessee	888,000	65,766,000
Texas	3,881,000	126,051,000
Total, 10 cotton States	17,539,000	478,803,000

[1] Cash farm income from dairy products, lard, vegetable shortening, cottonseed meal, and soybean meal sold for dairy feed.

It is unfortunate that some farmers in these States have been led to believe that more oleomagarine would improve their economic status. If oleomargarine were eliminated from the market the increase in cash income from these competing products, notably dairy products, would be substantially greater than the insignificant income that can be attributed to oleomargarine.

In the State of South Carolina, the home of my distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS, who is the protagonist of oleo in this fight, the cash income to farmers in his State in 1946 from the sale of oleo products totaled only $1,090,000 while the sale of cottonseed meal as a dairy feed brought his farmers $1,823,000; the sale of lard brought his farmers $2,492,000; vegetable shortening brought them $2,627,000; and the sale of other dairy products brought those farmers in South Carolina $11,253,000. Amazing as it may appear, the cotton farmers of South Carolina received $12,325,000 from the sale of butter and dairy products alone, which is $11,235,000 more than the total they received from the sale of all their oleo products in South Carolina. In fact, the amount received from the sale of all oleo products from the farms of South Carolina, the home of my distinguished colleague, is only about 5 percent of their total farm income.

The farmers of Alabama and Arkansas receive more from the sale of butter alone produced on their farms than they receive from all the products that go into the manufacture of oleomargarine. These figures should be revealing to the representatives of the cotton belt districts of the South who appear to be the leaders in this oleo fight against the dairy cow.

Now let me speak to the representatives of the farmers who produce soybean oil. In 1946 less than 14 percent, less than one-seventh, of the total soybean oil production was used in the manufacture of oleo. Most soybeans are grown in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Ohio.

Like cottonseed oil, soybean oil is used in vegetable shortening and is interchangeable with many other edible fats and oils. Thus the price of soybean oil is dependent on the supply and demand of all fats and oils, and follows closely the price of cottonseed oil. The farmers of the leading soybean States are also heavy producers of dairy and hog products. Here are the figures from the United States Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce showing that the farmers from Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Ohio get less than 2 percent out of oleo products as compared with their income from butter and other dairy products, soybeans used as dairy feed, lard, and vegetable shortening:

	Cash farm income in 1946
Butter	$186,355,000
Other dairy products	462,733,000
Lard	217,125,000
Vegetable shortening	62,678,000
Soybeans sold as dairy feed	39,209,000
Total	968,100,000
Total from oleomargarine	16,571,000

As indicated here farmers in these States receive 58 times as much from sources adversely affected by oleomargarine as they do from all the farm products used in its manufacture. In fact, a reduction of 3 percent in the cash income from dairy products alone would completely eliminate their entire income from oleomargarine.

It will also be revealing to my distinguished colleague from the Hoosier State, the Honorable EDWARD MITCHELL, the gentleman who is the antagonist of the dairy farmer, that the dairy farmers of the good State of Indiana in 1946 received from the sale of butter alone over eighteen millions, whereas they received less than three millions from the sale of their oleo products and from other competing interests to the dairy industry. Does the gentleman from Indiana realize that his farmers are receiving approximately 50 times as much money from the dairy cow as they receive from the sale of soybean oleo products and margarine?

Faced with these facts, does he still want to destroy the dairy industry in his State? Does he still insist on sacrificing the dairy industry on the altar of oleomargarine?

During 1946 the cash income that farmers throughout the United States received from the sale of farm products used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, as compared to the total farm income from all other products, shows that only 1.12 percent of the total income from cotton and cottonseed was derived from the sale of oleo products and only 5 percent from soybeans; and an infinitesimal percentage from other farm products as is shown from the following figures received from the United States Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce:

Source of cash income	Cash income to farmers in 1946		Percent from oleomargarine
	From products sold by farmers	From portion used in oleomargarine	
Cotton and cottonseed	$1,495,814,000	$16,759,000	1.12
Soybeans	371,501,000	18,603,000	5.01
Cattle and calves	3,715,226,000	707,000	.019
Dairy products	4,116,930,000	817,000	.020
Hogs	2,971,829,000	342,000	.012
Peanuts	152,222,000	1,470,000	.097
Corn	746,473,000	678,000	.091
Total	13,569,995,000	39,376,000	2.902

Even a casual observation of these data reveals that farmers are not depending upon oleomargarine as an outlet for their farm products.

The above facts and figures should be carefully studied and contemplated by the representatives in this Congress who are putting on the fight for the oleo interests.

Most of the oleo interests or oleomargarine producers are in Illinois, California, Ohio, and New Jersey. There were 47 plants licensed to produce oleo in 1947. These plants were owned by 25 corporations, four of which were the Big Four meat-packing companies. The bulk of oleomargarine is produced in the United States by five or six large corporations.

With oleomargarine selling at 28.3 cents a pound, the farmer received only 8.86 cents, which represents a differential of almost 20 cents a pound between what the farmer gets for the ingredients that go into a pound of oleo and the price the Oleo Trust gets from the consumer. Do you think for one moment that the Oleo Trust will knock off 10 cents a pound on colored oleo if the Federal tax of 10 cents a pound on colored oleo is repealed by this Congress. You are very naive if you believe the Oleo Trust is that charitable. If the Federal tax on colored oleo is repealed the price of colored oleo may go up considerably in every State where the sale of colored oleo is not prohibited.

A lot of propaganda has been flooding the country to the effect that you are paying 10 cents a pound more for oleo now than you would pay if the Federal taxes are repealed. This propaganda is very misleading to the housewives. There is a Federal tax of only a quarter of a cent a pound on uncolored oleo, which is absorbed by most dealers and manufacturers. This should make no difference in the cost of uncolored oleo to the consumer. There are 22 States, including the States of Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and Illinois, that prohibit the sale of colored oleo within their borders, to protect the people from the fraud and deceit of having colored oleo served to the public as imitation, adulterated butter. The Armour Research Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology has revealed that through scientific experiments and tests cottonseed oils turn gray in color when made into oleo, and soybean oils turn a greenish color when made into oleo. Oleo must first be bleached to remove those colors. The oleo manufacturers desire to imitate the golden color of butter, so they deceive the consuming public by coloring their product to look like butter, which they aim to displace as a spread for bread. Whatever the Congress does in this fight will not lower the price of oleo in States where its sale is prohibited, as is the case in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois.

If oleo does displace butter as a spread it will mean practically the destruction of the dairy industry. Every dairy cow and every dairy herd that is thereby destroyed means less milk, less cream, less butterfat, and less beef, less veal, and less hides and leather for the American public. There is no question but that there will be a scarcity of milk, cream, butter, a scarcity of meats and meat products, and a scarcity of hides and leather with the destruction of the dairy industry. Every dairy cow and every calf that is removed from the dairy picture means an increasing scarcity of dairy products, a scarcity of meats and meat products, and a scarcity of hides and leather products. This will result in higher prices for milk, cream, and butter, higher prices for meats and meat products, and higher prices for shoes and leather products just as surely as night follows the day. As you know, 40 percent of our meat supply in this country comes from our dairy herds.

Instead of getting oleo for less, the consuming public will pay a higher price for oleomargarine. With a continuous decrease in the number of dairy cows and dairy herds in the country, it is absolutely a foregone conclusion that butter and dairy products will go higher in price because of the ever-continuing scarcity of dairy products. And so the consumer is bound to meet with disappointment, if he thinks the repeal of the Federal tax on uncolored or colored oleo will bring about lower prices, either in the cost of oleo or milk or butter, or in the cost of meats or meat products, or in shoes or leather products. All these products are bound to increase in cost to the consumer. And the Oleo Trust will fill their pockets with huge profits. Is it any wonder the Oleo Trust is spending so much money in this fight for oleo against the dairy cow?

The gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, pointed out to us last week in an address before the House that colored oleo has sold in our National Capital for as much as 12 to 18 cents a pound more than uncolored oleo on the same day. He also pointed out that in Terre Haute, Ind., colored oleo sold for as much as 29 cents a pound more than uncolored oleo. Surely this is proof sufficient to indicate what will happen in every State where colored oleo is not prohibited, if the tax on colored oleo is repealed.

In every State where the sale of colored oleo is not prohibited, the price of oleo will follow the price of butter. With no competition from uncolored oleo to keep the price down, the consuming public will pay more and more for oleo until there will be practically no difference between the cost price of colored adulterated oleo and pure golden delicious butter. The consuming public will thus pay huge and unconscionable profits and tribute to the Oleo Trust. Right now the profit of the Oleo Trust on every pound of oleo amounts to many times the amount of the Federal tax. They could sell oleo to the public for much less than the current price, and still make huge profits.

The facts and figures I have given to you thus prove that a repeal of the Federal tax on oleomargarine will not only do a great injustice to the dairy farmers of the entire United States, but it will do great harm to the consuming public, to the man and woman with a family, because of the increased prices that will follow in the cost of oleo, butter, in milk and dairy products, and in the cost of meats, meat products, leather, leather products, and shoes.

To prove to every Member of Congress how seriously harmful the production of oleomargarine is to the farmers and the consuming public of this country, I attach the following tables for your examination and study:

Cash income received by farmers from oleomargarine and competing interests in 1946

CASH INCOME TO FARMERS FROM SOURCES ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY OLEOMARGARINE

State	Butter [1]	Other dairy products [2]	Lard [3]	Vegetable shortening [4]	Cottonseed feed sold as dairy feed [5]	Soybean feed sold as dairy feed [5]	Total competing interests	Cash income to farmers from oleo [6]	Cash income from competing interests per dollar from oleo
Alabama	$2,117,000	$18,945,000	$3,226,000	$4,621,000	$1,972,000	$75,000	$30,956,000	$1,919,000	$16
Arizona	199,000	9,088,000	156,000	644,000	318,000		10,405,000	263,000	40
Arkansas	3,340,000	20,686,000	3,275,000	5,666,000	2,034,000	890,000	36,891,000	2,263,000	16
California	8,935,000	224,910,000	3,953,000	1,938,000	730,000		240,466,000	873,000	275
Colorado	7,843,000	18,399,000	1,834,000	245,000			28,321,000	29,000	977
Connecticut	41,000	32,068,000	241,000	10,000			32,360,000	1,000	32,360
Delaware	51,000	7,297,000	132,000	146,000		68,000	7,694,000	38,000	202
Florida	189,000	24,449,000	2,221,000	222,000	27,000		27,108,000	64,000	424
Georgia	2,655,000	22,712,000	4,335,000	4,503,000	1,718,000	26,000	35,949,000	1,815,000	20
Idaho	8,830,000	28,467,000	1,544,000	99,000			38,940,000	10,000	3,894
Illinois	30,889,000	144,837,000	52,912,000	29,481,000	6,000	18,353,000	276,478,000	7,958,000	35
Indiana	18,118,000	109,598,000	37,858,000	10,953,000		5,714,000	182,241,000	2,881,000	63
Iowa	111,648,000	46,414,000	99,024,000	14,797,000		9,889,000	281,772,000	3,722,000	76
Kansas	24,083,000	46,857,000	10,423,000	1,445,000		845,000	83,653,000	344,000	243
Kentucky	10,327,000	41,742,000	6,070,000	533,000	24,000	153,000	58,849,000	122,000	482
Louisiana	431,000	16,020,000	2,595,000	1,844,000	1,285,000	102,000	22,277,000	765,000	29
Maine	2,121,000	21,571,000	270,000	16,000			23,978,000	1,000	23,978
Maryland	1,651,000	47,306,000	1,388,000	177,000		100,000	50,622,000	65,000	779
Massachusetts	364,000	38,255,000	575,000	12,000			39,206,000	1,000	39,206
Michigan	26,252,000	163,419,000	7,684,000	969,000		339,000	198,663,000	244,000	814
Minnesota	95,768,000	144,123,000	33,340,000	2,962,000		1,039,000	277,232,000	702,000	395

Footnotes at end of table.

Cash income received by farmers from oleomargarine and competing interests in 1946—Continued

State	Butter [1]	Other dairy products [2]	Lard [3]	Vegetable shortening [4]	Cottonseed feed sold as dairy feed [5]	Soybean feed sold as dairy feed [5]	Total competing interests	Cash income to farmers from oleo [6]	Cash income from competing interests per dollar from oleo
Mississippi	$1,734,000	$25,179,000	$1,648,000	$7,008,000	$4,077,000	$262,000	$39,908,000	$3,035,000	$13
Missouri	30,695,000	90,011,000	27,267,000	4,975,000	808,000	2,707,000	156,463,000	1,363,000	115
Montana	4,921,000	11,062,000	1,473,000	238,000			17,694,000	23,000	769
Nebraska	39,285,000	13,640,000	23,581,000	839,000		101,000	77,446,000	194,000	399
Nevada	345,000	2,829,000	121,000	39,000			3,334,000	4,000	834
New Hampshire	231,000	13,971,000	89,000	8,000			14,299,000	1,000	14,299
New Jersey	100,000	51,796,000	823,000	70,000		25,000	52,814,000	109,000	485
New Mexico	648,000	7,142,000	407,000	618,000	264,000		9,079,000	235,000	39
New York	9,089,000	306,772,000	1,349,000	147,000		12,000	317,369,000	15,000	21,158
North Carolina	2,812,000	26,762,000	2,968,000	3,417,000	1,522,000	428,000	37,909,000	1,244,000	30
North Dakota	25,612,000	14,096,000	4,617,000	240,000		8,000	44,573,000	27,000	1,651
Ohio	25,700,000	161,884,000	27,331,000	7,447,000		5,253,000	227,615,000	2,010,000	113
Oklahoma	18,189,000	37,175,000	5,360,000	1,718,000	1,349,000	11,000	63,802,000	639,000	100
Oregon	9,189,000	36,914,000	1,860,000	120,000			48,083,000	12,000	4,007
Pennsylvania	7,544,000	209,337,000	4,292,000	236,000		78,000	221,487,000	47,000	4,712
Rhode Island	4,000	6,087,000	56,000	1,000			6,148,000	(7,000)	42,993
South Carolina	1,072,000	11,253,000	2,627,000	2,492,000	1,823,000	27,000	19,294,000	1,090,000	18
South Dakota	18,551,000	13,487,000	14,560,000	459,000		39,000	47,096,000	81,000	581
Tennessee	7,107,000	49,958,000	5,144,000	2,199,000	1,088,000	270,000	65,766,000	887,000	74
Texas	11,772,000	91,610,000	7,350,000	9,299,000	6,017,000	3,000	126,051,000	3,881,000	32
Utah	2,150,000	17,947,000	656,000	60,000			20,813,000	6,000	3,469
Vermont	1,388,000	58,005,000	134,000	19,000			59,546,000	2,000	29,773
Virginia	5,252,000	44,390,000	3,206,000	966,000	63,000	204,000	54,081,000	278,000	195
Washington	8,908,000	63,220,000	1,575,000	91,000			73,794,000	9,000	8,199
West Virginia	1,832,000	18,441,000	885,000	64,000		3,000	21,225,000	8,000	2,653
Wisconsin	46,639,000	461,954,000	16,739,000	547,000		142,000	526,021,000	86,000	6,117
Wyoming	1,390,000	6,278,000	473,000	112,000			8,253,000	11,000	750
Total, United States	638,011,000	3,078,363,000	429,647,000	124,712,000	26,127,000	47,164,000	4,344,024,000	39,377,000	110

[1] Cash income from farm butter sold plus butterfat in creamery butter times price received by farmers per pound of butterfat for cream sold at wholesale.
[2] Cash income from all dairy products less income from butter.
[3] Estimated at 14.46 percent of cash income from hogs.
[4] Estimated amount of farm cash income which could be properly attributed to ingredients used in shortening.
[5] Estimated amount of cash income which could be properly attributed to soybean and cottonseed products sold for dairy feed.
[6] Estimated amount of farm cash income which could be properly attributed to ingredients used in oleomargarine.

NOTE.—The method used in making these detailed calculations was informally approved by various disinterested experts in the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Some of the figures shown here are based, in part, upon preliminary data and are therefore subject to slight revision.

The following fact knocks out the argument that existing Federal laws are restricting the production of oleomargarine. During the last half of 1947 production of oleo had increased to the rate of 800,000,000 pounds per year. In February the production of oleo had reached the rate of 1,000,000,000 pounds per year.

How many people pay the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine? Not very many. During the last half of 1947, for example, only 4 percent of the tax-paid oleomargarine was colored. Only 4 percent was therefore subject to the 10-cents-per-pound tax.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE CURRENT DAIRY SITUATION

1. More customers for dairy products in our rapidly increasing population.

2. Consumption per capita at much higher rates.

3. Fewer cows to meet this increased demand.

The Secretary of Agriculture has set a goal of 120,000,000,000 pounds of milk for 1948. Already production has fallen so far below our needs that it is unlikely that we will meet that goal this year. In February per capita milk production per day was only 1.80 pounds, the lowest point reached in 10 years.

FEWER DAIRY COWS

Here are the facts on the reduced number of dairy cows being milked this year:

Cows and heifers 2 years old and over kept for milk in the United States:

1937–46 average	25,973,000
Jan. 1, 1947	26,098,000
Jan. 1, 1948	25,165,000

This means a loss of 3.6 percent or 933,000 cows in our herds in the last year.

Heifers 1 and 2 years old kept for milk cows:

1937–46 average	5,645,000
Jan. 1, 1947	5,602,000
Jan. 1, 1948	5,685,000

Heifer calves under 1 year kept for milk cows:

1937–46 average	6,317,000
Jan. 1, 1947	6,768,000
Jan. 1, 1948	6,485,000

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD].

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted at this time with an all important issue in which both those pro and con may be overconcerned. Fear, apprehension, and perhaps just a bit of prejudice has entered into this dispute. I have resentment or malice toward none. After having been here almost two full sessions, I have many friends on both sides of the aisle, of that I am sure.

I come before you to make a plea in behalf of the men and women who toil in the factories and the shops. I ask you to help them so that they can eke an existence from their earnings. This bill to repeal taxes on oleo will not only help them to help themselves but will benefit the Nation as a whole as well.

With the advancements made in the science of chemistry new fields are opening each day for more and varied uses for farm products. Let us dwell awhile upon the fact that the United States Government has paid out countless millions of dollars to the American farmers in the last decade or so in the form of subsidies to continue the present unbalanced program. If we are not to stop this practice, we may be driven to subsidize the urban population by such methods as granting them more pay and thereby further contributing to the devaluation of the American dollar. In my opinion, all such subsidies are just another form of governmental control and bring more clearly before our eyes the specter of the Hammer and Sickle. Let us all work together in an effort to protect all of our people from the repercussions of such a program.

I have talked to many Members of the House who agree that these taxes on oleomargarine are discriminatory and unjust. However, these same men do not feel that they can vote for the removal of these taxes in view of their constituents' strong objections to such an action. I say to these Representatives that you will regret it if you continue to express opposition to this bill because when you hurt some of the citizens of the United States you must of necessity hurt the entire public. For example, in the farm districts of my own State of Michigan, which is a good model for other parts of the dairy country, small grocers in those very same districts stock oleo on their shelves. I ask at this time, who are the consumers of this product, if it is not the farmer?

With this information in mind, I do not come before the House to debate the benefits of this legislation but to plead in behalf of those poor unfortunates who are helpless to help themselves and in behalf of the farmers who will be helped by the passing of this bill. Again, I feel that we should do everything possible to help these people.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of answering certain questions to be asked by the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of the fact that numerous inquiries have been coming to me, what he proposes to do about the further consideration of this measure, and when it will be concluded? I understand there has been an arrangement

entered into between the minority leader and the majority leader to have the Committee rise this afternoon at 4 or 4:30 in order to take up some very important District matters.

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. Now then, beyond that, is it the intention of the gentleman to call this measure up tomorrow, or call it up on Wednesday?

Mr. RIVERS. It is not our intention to call this matter up again until Wednesday as the result of an agreement entered into between all parties affected. I want to make it plain at this time, because some of the Members have to catch trains and fill other commitments, and we want to give them an opportunity to do that.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to make this further suggestion, if the gentleman will yield further, that it was anticipated to call up for consideration tomorrow the bill dealing with the authorization for the construction of a courthouse here in the District of Columbia. Later in the week it had been expected that we would call up the so-called tidelands bill. I would like to announce to the membership that if the courthouse matter is disposed of early tomorrow, I would like very much to finish with, at least, general debate on the tidelands bill in order that later on in the week, if we could not conclude it tomorrow, we would be able to reach it and dispose of it.

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. On this tidelands bill, the understanding was that it was not coming up until Thursday because some of the Members who are very much interested in it could not be here. The author of the bill has a primary tomorrow. It was programed for Thursday. I also want to ask this question: A bill being considered by virtue of a discharge petition is the order of business until finished?

Mr. RIVERS. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. And if other business intervenes, then I ask, Does not the bill lose its special privilege so that it could be objected to if called up at some future time? No agreement between the leaders can keep alive a special privilege unless it be by unanimous consent?

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is not a question of agreement. The so-called oleomargarine bill is the pending business until disposed of. The gentleman in charge of the bill is not under compulsion to move on any specific date after it comes up for consideration to go into the Committee of the Whole, and the gentleman from South Carolina has just announced that he does not intend to make that motion again until Wednesday.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman feel that the person who controls a discharge petition can control the business for the rest of the session and bring up the bill as unfinished business if, when, where, and how he may see fit?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not at all.

Mr. MICHENER. I say that that is not the rule. It is not logical and it cannot be done.

Mr. RAYBURN. All I say to the gentleman is that anyone could move tomorrow that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the oleomargarine bill, but as far as we who are vitally interested in it are concerned, we are going to try to vote that motion down if it is made.

Mr. RIVERS. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that this has not been arbitrary, this has been done because Members have asked me to do it and I have tried to cooperate. I am paid to stay here 365 days a year, and I can be here tomorrow or any other day. I am just trying to help the Members from the gentleman's side and my side who cannot be here tomorrow. I am willing to vote now, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, as has been pointed out, the matter that is now pending is the unfinished business, and its continuing consideration will depend upon the action of the House. As the gentleman has pointed out, this suggestion has been made and, as far as I know, will be followed. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that my suggestion regarding the beginning of the consideration of the tidelands bill tomorrow was made at this time in order that we might learn whether or not there are any reasons why that should not be done. As the gentleman has pointed out, it was programed for Thursday. This situation that has developed will necessarily interfere in some degree with the continuing prosecution of the program for the week. I made the suggestion only with the idea that we might make some progress, and I will be glad to confer with the gentleman about it.

Mr. MICHENER. The author of the bill has a primary tomorrow and will not be here.

Mr. HALLECK. Then, of course, the bill cannot go on tomorrow.

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

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

Mr. DONDERO. Is there any difference in the program as outlined in the notice as far as the courthouse bill is concerned, which comes under our committee?

Mr. HALLECK. No; that bill will be on for consideration tomorrow.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, one of the basic issues involved in this legislation is the propriety and desirability of using the tax laws to affect the relative position of competing industries. In the case of oleomargarine, the taxing power is used as a punitive measure against one industry, to advance the interest of another. In the process, the public is deterred from the free exercise of its consumer preferences. Competing industries are deprived of the full benefit of the free-enterprise system, which conflicts with the public interest and should be avoided. These taxes unnecessarily burden consumers far in excess of the amount paid in taxes.

Every group has a right to enjoy a free market for its products. The consuming public should be given the right to buy the products it wants. Margarine should be placed in the same legal status as butter or any other wholesome food product. It would still be subject to all pure food laws and subject to the same laws against misrepresentation of its character or content that apply to butter or any other food.

Health authorities have pointed out that the food value of oleomargarine is equal to that of butter. While the vitamin A content is about the same, oleomargarine contains larger quantities of vitamin E than does butter. Oleomargarine is just as easily digested as is butter. The National Research Council states, and I quote:

> The present available scientific evidence indicates that when fortified margarine is used in place of butter as a source of fat in a mixed diet, no nutritional differences can be observed.

If lower-priced fats are more generally available for human consumption, there undoubtedly will be a tendency to use them more freely than when an extremely expensive fat, such as butter, must be purchased. Therefore, the removal of the restrictions on margarine would encourage a greater use of margarine in cooking and on the table, which, in turn, would probably result in a further improvement in nutritional status of the average individual.

Those families that can afford to use butter will continue to do so. But those families who have had to reduce their consumption of fats because of the cost of butter and margarine would be enabled to increase their use of fat through the purchase of margarine, when the price is lowered by removal of taxes.

Because of my interest in doing everything possible to reduce the cost of living, I signed the discharge petition several months ago to bring this legislation before the House, having been the fourteenth Member to sign the petition. The cost of food is the largest single item in the budget of the working people and I urge the Members to vote for H. R. 2245, to reduce the cost of this valuable food product by the removal of the unjust and discriminatory tax.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the general purpose of this legislation is to lower the cost of living, if possible, and of course we are all for that, but there are other things than butter prices that need correction. May I remind my good friend from South Carolina that we now have an import limitation of 29,000 bales on short-staple cotton, and 91,000 bales on longer cotton fiber, a year. That is not very much on a production basis of

11,000,000 bales, which is the estimate for this year. I can think of no other agricultural product that is protected by an embargo. I find that textiles have gone up just the same as has butter and to the same degree. The price of cotton textiles has increased about 300 percent since 1939. I want you cotton Members to listen to this because we are going to do something about it if the oleo tax is repealed. In that event we are going to do away with the quota, and it is my good fortune to be the chairman of the committee that can do it. The commodity index shows that the price of cotton textiles was 57 in 1939. In 1948 it is 168.9, an increase of about 300 percent. I find that on the New York Cotton Exchange, short-staple cotton is being quoted at 38.14 cents a pound. Sheeting and shirting and all the other things in the manufacture of which cotton is used have also increased 300 percent. It is not fair to differentiate between the cotton grower and the butter producer. But if you folks are prepared to go ahead and carry out your program, we are going to do something about cotton a little later on.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. I remember that you did not make any threats when we voted with you to override the President's veto so that we could reduce taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, but you did not vote that way out of love for me or my party. You voted that way because your constituents demanded it of you. Deny it if you can.

Mr. RIVERS. I am voting for the American people now, too, and no threat that you can make can deter me in my action.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman cannot kid me.

Mr. RIVERS. I would not try to kid you, and neither can you kid me.

Mr. KNUTSON. No, the gentleman knows better than to try to kid me. He did not vote to reduce taxes because he wanted to vote with Republicans.

Mr. RIVERS. You do not remember the days when you came around asking us to help you. You remember that, do you not?

Mr. KNUTSON. I recall the gentleman coming to me of his own volition and telling me he was for tax reduction. His intelligence on that occasion did him credit.

Mr. RIVERS. You cannot remember those days, can you?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further.

I appreciate the gentleman's help, and I hope that the gentleman will not take a position that will prevent our cooperation in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further; I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. I yield the gentleman two more minutes in order to ask him a question.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is not enough time, because the gentleman would use it all himself.

Mr. RIVERS. Then I do not yield the gentleman any time.

Mr. KNUTSON. The duty on cotton 1⅛ inch or longer is 3½ cents a pound, and the current price is 42 cents. Can the gentleman justify that high price? Can anyone justify it? I am not saying that butter is not too high, but so is nearly everything else.

As for you poor misguided creatures who pulled the chestnuts out of the fire for the southern minority, I cannot understand you at all. You did what the New Dealers shied away from for 16 long years, and a few of you actually seem to be proud of your blindness.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two more minutes to make a further statement along that line.

Mr. KNUTSON. I wish I had time to pay my compliments to the Republicans who signed the discharge rule in the way I really should like.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. KNUTSON. New Deal Congresses had 16 years in which to take up oleo tax repeal, but it was too hot for them, so a group of Republicans obligingly does it for them.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. And the gentleman from South Carolina gave me two, which makes five.

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

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I cannot yield further.

I want you Members from the cotton-raising sections to just look ahead a little bit. Just as sure as you pass this tax repeal, we are going to bring down the price of wearing apparel into the manufacture of which cotton enters and just as surely are we going to remove all quotas on cotton imports. When we have to compete with the oleomargarine manufacturer who wants to put the dairyman out of business, I will say, as was said by some of the dictators over in Europe some years ago, "If you pull us down, by the eternal, we will pull you down with us." Think it over.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill which would relieve millions of American people, particularly the housewives, of this unjust and un-American tax on margarine.

It seems to me that this provision in the law which allows those of us who can afford butter which has been colored artificially by the producers without any penalty, and which, on the other hand, requires those who use margarine to pay a penalty if they desire to purchase it colored by the producer, certainly is discriminatory and violates the basic principles of democracy.

Nowhere in American economic life is there a more unfair violation of the economic spirit of the Nation than is presented by the cynical set of taxes which besets oleomargarine, and I feel strongly that this represents a national principle not in keeping with our democratic way of life.

Butter itself is artificially colored 8 months a year. That fact need not even be printed on the butter package. To color margarine requires a $600 Federal license plus a tax of 10 cents a pound. For millions of low-income families, butter today is too costly and they do without it. Anything that can be done to lower the cost of living and help these families, and to save taxes, should be done rather than the creation of new taxes and new controls. Even our Government during the war urged the eating of margarine and there is no reason why this cheaper food should not be available to our people, without tax.

During the past few weeks I have received a great many communications from my constituents, stressing the need for the repeal of this tax. It is my duty, as their representative in Congress, to protect them against legislation which will tax them unjustly. In behalf of them, I am proud to be among those who signed the discharge petition in order that this legislation be brought to the floor of the House today for action and shall vote to abolish this unfair tax on oleomargarine for the welfare of our country.

We are constantly seeking every possible means to ease the burden of the high cost of living, and yet these unjustified taxes and fees continue to swell the price of a basic commodity. I firmly believe anyone who is interested in benefiting the American public will vote for prompt passage of this bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, in the few short years of my service in this House, I can think of no subject which has caused oratory to flow so freely as this subject of margarine taxes. As the oratory has flowed and sounded good in the ears of its enumerators, it has fed on itself, carried on of its own momentum to erroneous conclusions which are as fantastic as they are unrealistic.

The remarks of the very able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] delivered in this House last Thursday afternoon well illustrate my point. I have always regarded, and I presently regard, the gentleman from Minnesota as one of the ablest Members of this House. But just listen to what he told us on Thursday. The removal of the tax on margarine will eliminate the production of butter. Elimination of butter production will cause the disappearance of the dairy cow. Disappearance of the dairy cow means that our children and our children's children will go without milk. Worse yet, the exit of the dairy cow will mean neither direct fertilizer for our fields nor nitrogen-fixing crops erstwhile used to feed those cows. Our soil will lose its fertility; the lush fields of America will be ruined.

Ladies and gentlemen, it just is not so. Let us get down to cold facts and weigh the pros and cons of this margarine tax without flights of fancy. Let us canvass who is harmed by the tax; who, if anyone, is benefited by the tax.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I decline to yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] is not on the floor.

Mr. BUCK. I regret that he is not here. I saw him here just a few minutes ago.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield until I have finished my statement.

Let us get down to cold facts and weigh the pros and cons of this margarine tax, without flights of fancy.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BUCK. Does the tax benefit the public revenue? No. The yield is picayunish. The Treasury Department itself testified before the recent hearing of the Committee on Agriculture and advocated the tax's elimination.

Does the tax benefit the dairy farmer? No. Despited the tax, margarine sales have increased more than eightfold in the 61 years of the tax's existence. Meanwhile, butter prices have recently reached the highest points in history and butter is still selling in my community in excess of $1 per pound.

Does the tax benefit the cotton planter? Obvously no.

Does the tax benefit the soy farmer? Obviously no.

Does the tax benefit the housewife margarine user? Obviously no.

Whom then does the tax benefit? It benefits no one. Therefore it is a bad tax. Therefore the tax should be eliminated. Therefore the House of Representatives should vote to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from further consideration of this measure.

Let us now proceed further, Mr. Chairman, and explore whom the tax harms, if anyone. Mr. Speaker, it does not harm the rich. Dollar-a-pound butter is too small an item in the rich man's budget.

It does not harm the well-to-do who employ a servant. The latter is assigned the messy, time-consuming job of coloring the margarine.

Whom then does the tax harm? Mr. Chairman, it harms the great preponderance of American housewives who do their own work—who must take time they can ill-afford from their 14- to 16-hour day to add the color which they and their families want but which has been denied them by the dairy lobby. Think of next fall, gentlemen of Congress. Think of housewives in every congressional district in the Nation. Will they be thanking their Congressman for the boon of added leisure? Or will they be damning their Congressman with every stroke of their margarine spoon? Think hard, gentlemen, think hard.

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

Mr. Chairman, as you have noted, we have refrained from making any charges here reflecting on any section of this country. Sectionalism in my part of the world is dead. I can only speak for that part.

This oleo tax is certainly not sectional. The biggest city in the whole world is New York City and they are vitally interested in this tax. The high cost of living knows no section or no city and this tax affects everybody in this country.

I do not regard this as a tax, I refer to this as a ransom. I have consistently referred to this so-called oleo tax as a ransom and as a tribute to certain interests in this country.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I do not yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a farmer?

Mr. RIVERS. I do not yield.

Now I want to say this to the gentleman. Modern margarine is composed of of soy oil, of cotton oil, peanut oil, and of corn oil—remember that, they grow corn in every State of the Union—and a sizable quantity of milk goes into oleo, too. Let me tell you how much milk was used in oleo last year: 116,242,000 gallons or pounds, whichever unit they use.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I do not yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RIVERS. No, I do not yield; I just do not yield, that is all.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, not for a correction?

Mr. RIVERS. The Members apparently do not understand me; I just do not yield.

It was unfortunate.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I decline to yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RIVERS. For how long?

Mr. Chairman, I yield a half a minute to the gentleman from Iowa. I love old BEN; I guess I have got to yield to him.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows, of course, that I have gone along with the folks from the South on a lot of things they have wanted. The gentleman knows that, does he not?

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentlem n says so, I agree with him.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that, does he not?

Mr. RIVERS. All right, certainly; and I have gone along with the gentleman, too.

Mr. JENSEN. All right; now, this strikes directly, this bill strikes directly at the heart of the economy of the Dairy and Farm Belt of America. That is what it does.

Mr. RIVERS. I disagree with the gentleman. This is a consumers' bill.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has a perfect right to disagree with me, but he knows as well as I do that our economy to a great degree is built around the old milk cow; and he knows also that this bill if made law is going to be a direct detriment to the old milk cow and what she means to America.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I just do not agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to anybody. How can I make a speech when my friends take all my time?

Mr. MITCHELL. Will not the gentleman yield that I may correct the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman yields to him to correct me then I must ask him to yield to me to correct the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I just do not yield to anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate when the chairman of a great committee makes threats. I am not here to vilify anybody. I have the utmost confidence and faith in the fairness of the membership of the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives is the finest jury in the world, made up of the most intelligent men and women of either branch of our Congress or of any parliamentary body in the world, and I say that without reservation. The gentleman from Minnesota is not the only one who has made threats; another distinguished gentleman has made threats against the South. This is not a southern bill, Mr. Chairman; this is an all-American bill. When these gentlemen make threats of what they are going to do, I will leave our cause in the hands of the rest of the membership of the committee. I just do not believe they will support him. I regret that a man in a responsible position would make a statement like that.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I am willing to let the House vote on this issue, I am willing to abide by the vote and I will cast no aspersions upon any Member regardless of his color, his class, his party label, or the section from which he comes. I will be perfectly satisfied with your verdict.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great section of our country where the glaciers deposited top soil of which there is no better in the world, out in the great sections of Illinois, Indiana, and that part of the world. That is where soybeans are grown. The soybean oil which is placed in oleomargarine approximates the amount of cotton oil placed therein, of which there is no better in the world. Those two components make up a great proportion of the composition of margarine.

Now, let me say something about margarine. We have had abundant testimony before all of the committees of the House, in 1-minute extensions of remarks and in every conceivable way by which people could have exposed and debated this proposition. But margarine is a healthful food. Dr. Anton Carlson testified before the Committee on Armed Services to that effect on proposed legislation introduced by myself and the gentleman from Indiana. We have shown beyond peradventure of doubt or beyond

the pale of skepticism the healthful ingredients of this product. It is loaded with vitamins and it is good for children and growing people.

Mr. Chairman, we are not alleging that butter is not good, or the number of cases in which there have been prosecutions in reference to butter. This is not presented on the demerits of butter or anything found therein. This is presented on the basis of American fairness, on the basis of taxing one edible product grown on the farms of this Nation on behalf of another. That is not fair. In effect, that is taking property without due process of law, and in direct contravention of the amendments of the Constitution, and you know it.

When I was with the Department of Justice and I first argued these cases about the police power of the Federal Government and the States, I saw that terrific discrepancy and unfair venture on the part of the Congress. I then resolved I would use what ability I possessed to some day make these two products competitive with one another in accordance with the basic American theory of supply and demand and competition.

I am glad to say that by a 2 to 1 vote the House is going into this matter today. The AMVETS testified before the Committee on Agriculture—that great organization composed of veterans of World War II—that the American housewives in 1947 spent twelve or thirteen thousand years mixing margarine. I want to relieve them of that 12,000 years' labor.

Something else was shown beyond peradventure of doubt which nobody can question. Because of the tax on oleomargarine, and regardless of how infinitesimal the tax may be that is imposed as a tribute on oleomargarine, it is not sold in the small grocery stores. Consequently the people who cannot afford the luxury of butter cannot buy it. It can only be bought in the big cities where they pay for it through their nose, and you know it.

I have no complaint, Mr. Chairman, about States like Wisconsin that prohibit the sale of colored margarine. That comes under the heading of States rights and I will defend you with my all as long as I live on that proposition. If the States do not want it, that comes under the heading of their business. I will not complain about that. But when the Federal Government through its strong arm of taxation tells your people and mine what they can have, when they can have it, and what price they shall pay, I say that somebody has got to raise his voice and I will raise my feeble voice.

It does not sound good, but believe you me that it is honest and it is sincere. I say to you that this tax is un-American. I say to you that it is unfair. I say to you that as far as the House of Representatives is concerned, regardless of the wailing of those who say this thing is unkind, I am sure, based on your characteristic and historic fairness, that you will remove this tax so far as we are concerned and let the other body assume its own responsibility. The people of this country have their eyes glued on us today. Do not let us fail them.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think the RECORD should show that the distinguished new agricultural leader of the Nation, my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], made a misstatement when he told of how many million pounds of milk were used in oleomargarine. That is not a factual statement and I want it to appear in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest hoaxes ever perpetrated before the American public, the American press, and the Congress of the United States was executed to build up the present case for repeal of the oleomargarine laws.

The hoax had its origin back in 1943 when Mr. Arthur G. Hopkins, an oleomargarine manufacturer from Sherman, Tex., representing the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, an organization made up of 20 large oleo corporations, appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture.

He stated:

> Margarine can be made yellow without the addition of any artificial color.

And later upon questioning from members of the committee he stated clearly and without equivocation that margarine could and would be made a natural yellow color from cottonseed and soybean oils if it were not for the fact that these oils had to be bleached because of present Federal regulations.

The next year, in 1944, Mr. Hopkins appeared before the committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate. At this hearing, Mr. Hopkins presented an elaborate array of samples and charts purported to prove beyond a shadow of doubt that margarine made from cottonseed and soybean oils which have not been bleached produces a natural golden color.

After these statements were made they were picked up by the journalists of our country and repeated during the ensuing years all across our land without ever being modified or revoked by any member of the oleomargarine industry.

Fortune magazine, in November 1944, ran an article which purported to be a studious and unbiased analysis of the butter-oleomargarine problem. That magazine stated in an article entitled "Will Butter Win the Peace" that some cottonseed and soybean oils can produce a yellow margarine.

In the Reader's Digest of May 1947, page 29, there appeared the following statement:

> On the other hand, all margarine made from soybean oil naturally would have a yellowish color. Under the punitive tax law, however, this natural color of the oil must be bleached out and the resultant fat left an artificial white.

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial dated January 20, 1948, stated:

> The strange thing about this is that oleo made from cottonseed or soybean oil is naturally yellow and must be bleached to avoid the tax.

Similar statements even found their way into our farm journals. For example, in Pathfinder for February appeared the following:

> Soybean oil gives margarine a naturally yellow color without using chemical dyes, but to avoid the 10-cent color tax, this oleo must be bleached.

In the Farm Journal for March 1948, appeared this statement:

> Margarine makers say butter has no monopoly on the yellow color; that margarine oils must be bleached to eliminate a naturally yellow color.

What is the truth, and wherein lies the hoax and deceit that have been practiced in connection with this butter and oleomargarine controversy? The hoax and the deceit lie in the fact that these statements are plain, unadulterated misrepresentation.

At the hearings held by your Agricultural Committee last month, the truth finally came to the surface. It was demonstrated before the committee that, when cottonseed oil is manufactured into margarine without bleaching, the resultant color is a dirty white and not a light golden color. When soybean oil is manufactured into margarine without bleaching the resultant color is green and not a light golden color.

These facts have been recently publicly corroborated by one of the outstanding independent research laboratories in the country, the Armour Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology.

Carrying the hoax still further, the Margarine Manufacturers Association, through their official representative, stated before congressional committees that the only reason the oleomargarine industry bleaches their oils is because of the presence of Federal laws. This is a second deliberate falsification of the truth and an enlargement of the original deceit.

The plain, unadulterated truth in this respect is that the oleomargarine industry would have to bleach their oils even if there were no oleo tax laws on the books. The oleo manufacturers are forced to bleach these oils to remove undesirable odors, flavors, and colors, like dirty white and green.

Regardless of the other merits of this controversy, we should be fully cognizant and the American people should be made fully aware and the American press should be completely informed of the false colors under which the oleomargarine industry has presented its case.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, 26 oleomargarine corporations who produce nearly all of that product sold in the United States, who want the law changed so that they can sell yellow oleo to imitate butter, have taken advantage of the present high cost of butter and all other products under the guise of reducing the cost of living in an attempt to repeal the present tax on oleomargarine.

In building up their campaign for repeal, the oleo and cottonseed-oil lobby employed one of the outstanding adver-

tising agencies in New York City to direct a Nation-wide advertising campaign. During the year closing November last, they spent in this advertising campaign $6,000,000, according to a report of Time magazine. The gist of their advertising campaign was that oleo is as good as butter and is entitled to be sold yellow in color in imitation of butter. Naturally, this amount of money spent in the advertising columns of newspapers brought about a lot of favorable editorial support, as many newspapers often express their appreciation of paid advertising with favorable news and editorial comment in return.

The 1,250,000 dairy farmers who were working long hours to produce milk and butter spent no money to counteract the efforts of these 26 corporations. Much of their propaganda as a result of the millions spent has not given or disclosed the true facts to the people as to this situation.

This is a fight for greater profits led by the comparative few oleo manufacturers in the country, and by the cotton lobby of the South. It is a fight for more money and bigger profits on the part of both of them. It is not a sincere effort to reduce the cost of living, and certainly is not in the interest of the health of the millions of our children, the people generally, and is not in the interest of the general welfare of the Nation.

For this reason I feel it my duty and solemn obligation in the interest of the people I represent and in the interest of the economy of the Nation to oppose this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, for many years the law of the State of Illinois and 22 other States has prohibited the sale of yellow oleomargarine. If we were to pass this law, yellow oleomargarine, as an imitation for butter, could not be sold in the State of Illinois. There must be considerable merit in maintaining the law as it is, otherwise those representatives of the people in Illinois, who serve closest to them, would not continue the law in force to prohibit the sale of yellow oleo.

Anyone can now buy oleo in its natural white color throughout Illinois and the Nation without paying the 10 cents per pound tax. The tax is only one-fourth cent per pound and is paid by the manufacturer.

This oleo fight, led largely by the cotton lobby of the South and the oleo manufacturers who want to sell the growing children and the people of Illinois and the Nation, renovated oil instead of nature's pure wholesome butter, I repeat, is a fight for greater profits and more money. It all hinges on color. Here is one reason they want the right to color their white oleo and sell it in the yellow color imitating butter. There are 65 million meals each day served to people in restaurants and public eating places. None of these millions of people would have any protection and neither would the Federal Government, as to whether or not they were serving oleo and charging the higher butter prices for it. If this law permits them to color oleo in imitation of butter, they can go freely into the manufacture of ice cream, cheese, and other butter products. I do not believe the American people want to repeal this law and throw the butter, ice cream, and cheese business of this country wide open to many unscrupulous people who would sell these synthetic products at any price they can get.

Mr. Chairman, last week you could buy in Terre Haute, Ind., yellow oleo cut in quarters to imitate butter in a carton which said country fresh, flavored with butter, with the picture of a dairy farm on the carton. While oleo costs 32 cents there, this package was selling at 59 cents. After adding the 10-cent tax for the yellow color there was still an overcharge to the consumer of 17 cents.

There is little question, if oleo is allowed to compete with butter in color as the repeal of this law would permit, that the price of oleo will be raised by the manufacturers, guaranteeing them millions of dollars that otherwise would be saved to the consumers who are now buying oleo, if the Federal law is kept on our statute books unchanged.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, under the present law, the tax in Illinois to the consumer is nothing. It takes only a few minutes' time to color their oleo, if they desire to do so. I know this is quite a little chore, but let me point out that thousands of housewives on the farms also find it quite a chore to wash and clean the hand separators after the night milking is done, so they will be fresh and sanitary to receive the morning milk, many times before daylight the next morning.

In considering this bill we must take into account what is best for the farmer, the purchasing power of his family, and the fertility of the soil. Then we must take into consideration the product the consumer gets, its nutrition value, whether you want your small and growing children to have a sufficient supply of wholesome milk, ice cream, and cheese products, or whether you want to substitute for milk and milk products a mixture of cottonseed oil with a small amount of soybean oil and other oils, with a small amount of skim milk added, together with coloring matter, producing an imitation butter.

Mr. Chairman, if these oleomargarine corporations and the cottonseed interests of the South are able to put over this legislation, I predict that it will strike such a blow against the dairy interests that the dairy herds, already too low, will be reduced by 2,500,000 head within the next 3 years. The loss of the butter market will be felt first by 1,250,000 small farmers who sell farm separated cream, most of them only milking three to six cows.

This proposal to repeal the tax if adopted, will change very largely the whole course of agriculture in the Northern States. It will finally bring disaster to the dairy business, which employs more people and produces more farm income than any other segment of agriculture.

The Government, recognizing the food value of milk and dairy products through the years past, has spent millions of dollars through State College Agriculture Extension Service for the expansion and improvement of dairying. During the past year there was spent on dairy extension work alone $900,000. The passage of this legislation reverses our course. The effect of this legislation is to begin to undermine and destroy the fine results of the Government's past efforts.

When you vote for this bill, you vote to restrict the future opportunity of 1,750,000 boys and girls doing 4–H Club farm work. You vote to restrict the opportunity of these future farmers of America. There are 101,606 farm girls alone enrolled in dairy cattle activities. We need to encourage the boys and girls to stay on the farms. This bill, if enacted, will discourage them.

These farmers and their families for a market depend upon 5,000 creameries. This cream is a considerable part of their weekly cash income. They are not a part of any oleo corporation or lobby. They are just plain, hard-working, small farmers who work long hours, month after month to produce a little milk and cream, and many other farm products that the people in the villages and cities must have.

If this bill is passed, it will strike such a blow in reducing the dairy herds and the supply of milk that the demand for the scarce amount of milk will be so great the price of milk will go up to where the very consumers who are signing petitions to Congressmen urging us to make this mistake, will be paying far more for milk than they will save on a few pounds of oleo. If this thing happens it can well affect the health and growth of millions of children here in America. It is a terrible price to consider paying to allow the oleo people and the cottonseed-oil people to imitate the yellow color of butter in order that they can make more millions for the comparatively few of them who are interested in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this administration and the Congress has insisted on giving away billions of dollars in food to European countries through the Marshall plan. If this legislation passes there will be less food for the American people and less food to ship abroad.

Mr. Chairman, we depend upon our farmers for all of the food we consume. We must have a sound and prosperous agriculture because it is the cornerstone of our economic prosperity. Agriculture employs more people and is the biggest single business in the Nation. How can we expect sufficient agricultural products to keep prices reasonable if you endanger 20 percent of the farmers' production income. Twenty percent of the total income of agriculture in the Nation is derived from dairy products.

THIS LEGISLATION MEANS LESS MEAT

The Department of Agriculture gave out a statement a few weeks ago that it would take 10 years before dairy herds were built back up to the number necessary. There are 2,600,000 less dairy cows in the Nation today than there were in 1945. There are 21,000,000 less sheep and lambs in this Nation today than in 1942. There are 38,000,000 less hogs today than there were in 1944. That is the reason meat is so high at this time. Now by this legislation you will start the reduction of dairy cattle which means the reduction of milk, butter, and cheese. Through the sale of veal calves, heifers,

and older dairy cattle comes approximately 35 percent of the present beef supply of the Nation, hence this legislation will add to the shortage of meat. It is well to read this paragraph again so that you may better understand the terrible price the people and the economy of this Nation will have to pay if this legislation is enacted.

With less cattle to slaughter each year it will not only mean less beef which will cause prices to go higher, but it will mean less hides, fats, oils, and tallow. Less hides will mean an increase in the cost of shoes, leather goods of all kinds including luggage. The women of this Nation who have been deceived by this $6,000,000 advertising campaign into writing the Congressmen in the hope of saving a few minutes' time in coloring oleo, or in the hope of saving a couple of dollars a year in the price of oleo, will find that they will be caused to spend five times as much as they save, when they buy purses, luggage, shoes, milk and, yes, oleo at higher prices.

The oleo manufacturers, as soon as they are given the use of the yellow color to imitate butter, will doubtless raise their prices and get all the traffic will bear.

Mr. Chairman, turning our thoughts to Illinois, may I point out that the hundreds of thousands of dairy farmers, most of them marketing cream from only a few cows each week, received, last year in Illinois, a cash income of $175,726,000. The oleo manufacturers only bought soybean oil in the amount of $7,958,000. On the other hand these dairy farmers purchased Illinois soybean feeds from the soybean industries alone in the amount of $18,353,000—more than twice the amount sold to the oleo manufacturers.

These figures show that the market the soybean farmers should want to protect is the dairy farmers, their best customers.

Mr. Chairman, may I sum up this argument by saying to those who have been deceived by the advertising propaganda campaign put out in favor of oleo, that they give consideration to the following:

The present Federal law protects you and the public so that you know what you are buying. The present tax helps to hold down the price of white natural oleo which will go up if it is taken off. The present Federal law costs you practically nothing in taxes. If it is taken off no one will know what they are buying, and the general public will be cheated out of millions of dollars annually by unscrupulous persons who will sell oleo at regular butter prices. By reducing the dairy herds, butter will go higher and oleo prices will likewise be raised. Milk, by reduction of dairy herds, will go higher which prices will be reflected in bottled milk, ice cream, and dairy products. Leather of all kinds will go higher because of the reduction of the number of hides. Beef will go higher because about 35 percent of the beef of the Nation now comes from the dairy herds.

Mr. Chairman, the consideration of this bill leads me to refer to the Navajo Indians. The New Deal, several years ago, when the policy was to kill off livestock, reduced the goat herds of the Navajo Indians and restricted their pasture lands to the point where starvation overtook them and the Congress recently voted to give them several million dollars for immediate aid in food products. Now the Government is buying a million goats for the Navajo Indians in order that they may have goat milk and goat meat.

This legislation will start the dairy cow down the same trail. More carcasses of dairy cows will go into the coolers of the meat processors of the Nation during the next few years if this legislation passes, than ever before. That will mean less heifers and steer calves annually to help out in the meat supply of the Nation. It will mean less milk as well.

I will not be a party to striking such a blow against the biggest segment of agriculture in the Nation. I will not vote for what I sincerely believe, to be against the interest of every man, woman, and child in America and against the entire economy of this Nation. As a member of the Farm Bureau for 25 years and from my experience in farming and agriculture I think I know the danger of this legislation to all the people.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress votes millions of dollars each year out of the Federal Treasury for soil conservation. The Congress realizes, with the great increase of population and our commitments to the world that during the war our soil has been depleted. I am sure you Members of Congress who have driven through any dairy section know from first hand that no farm crop puts back through the byproducts of dairying as much fertilizer on the soil as do the dairy farmers. No group of farmers grow as much legumes and alfalfa and rotate crops preserving the soil equal to the dairy farmers. When you reduce dairying in this Nation you take away the necessity of growing legume crops, greatly depleting the soil.

Nothing is of greater importance than preserving the fertility of the soil to feed the expanding population throughout the years to come here in America. Dairying is the backbone of diversified modern agriculture. During flush milk production the manufacture of butter is a necessary outlet for surplus milk which cannot be sold in bottles. Butter continues to be the product upon which the dairy farmer largely relies.

It is a product which both farmers and consumers must be able to count upon in the future. This bill should be defeated in the interest, not only of agriculture, but in the interest of the consumers and the entire economy of the Nation.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to pay tribute to those men who have fought so nobly, I should say, to get this bill out of committee.

I would like to compliment all of you; particularly the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. It was my pleasure to be in Mr. RIVERS' district last week, and the people down there are behind him in this fight. I might say that the people all over South Carolina and all over this country are against this iniquitous, abominable ransom, as the gentleman from South Carolina calls it. They are behind him in this fight. We in South Carolina hope that this tax will be repealed.

I was very much interested in the rantings and ravings of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] whom I like, and also the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], whom I also like. I would like to say that this is a forward step today, I believe, toward the ultimate achievement of the true opportunity system. The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned South Carolina, Georgia, and North Carolina, and spoke of the farmers down there. I would like to say that their income is much lower than that of the farmers of Pennsylvania. They are struggling to raise cotton. They have a right to expect a fair opportunity under the American system. I do not believe that this tax is fair. It is undemocratic. It is un-American, and discriminatory on the farmers of the South and throughout the country.

I would like to say also that I am against sectionalism. I am against the injection of sectionalism into this debate.

Mr. GROSS. If you fellows down there would not label dairy products as filthy, your people might be eating it and be better off.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say we are not labeling dairy products as filthy products.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, your Mr. RIVERS and your Mr. POAGE, and the whole gang of them, have labeled these things as unfit for human consumption. We could not even find people using milk and butter down there.

Mr. DORN. I do not yield further, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman's observations about our use of milk and butter disqualifies him further as a witness about conditions in the South. My people use dairy products and the dairy industry is growing. The gentleman has injected sectionalism into this debate. I stand on the merits of this bill. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] made no such statements. They are both gentlemen and believe in conducting debate on a high plane. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has handled this side admirably.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman be in favor of removing the quarter-of-a-cent tax on reprocessed butter?

Mr. DORN. I am not committing myself on that. We are arguing the tax on oleomargarine. If the gentleman is in favor of something like that, he is privileged to bring it up. They will not hold it up in the Committee on Agriculture like some of your members attempted to hold up this oleomargarine bill, and thus keep the bill from coming

before this democratic body and letting it be acted upon.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But there was one member of your own party. The gentleman should not blame us for all of it.

Mr. DORN. The gentleman is correct. Such important legislation should always be nonpartisan. The members of both parties, who would seek to hold this bill in committee, I criticize. There is nothing wrong with letting the membership of this House vote on any bill, any legislation, pro or con. I compliment my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] on the wonderful job he has done in bringing this bill, in the democratic, American way, before this Committee to be considered.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DORN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Did you ever question why he did not do it when the Democrats were in power, all these years?

Mr. DORN. Well, they raised the question a while ago about the New Deal spending money in the South. Your State, a two-party State, received more New Deal money than South Carolina.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed by the trend of the argument today on the vital matter of taxation of oleomargarine. There can be only one approach to this problem. All other argument is superfluous. Let us answer this question today: Is our dairy industry worth protecting?

There can be only one answer to this question—an emphatic "Yes." Our action today must result in beating down this attempt to repeal all Federal taxes on oleomargarine, or else we will be legislating the destruction of one of the Nation's most important industries, the dairy industry.

This has been labeled a butter-oleo fight. Herein lies the basic error in thinking which has resulted in bringing this matter up for consideration today. It is not a contest between butter and oleo; it is not a contest between the soybean or cotton farmer and the dairy farmer. It is a fight vital to every citizen of the Nation; and it is a fight between the entire public and the margarine interests.

By a clever, well-financed propaganda campaign, the oleo industry has been successful in injecting false issues into its campaign to repeal existing taxes, and has enlisted a wide popular support. I urge you to put aside all preconceived notions, for I assure you many of them are false. Let us examine the question rationally, without emotion or prejudice, then vote accordingly, in the best interests of the Nation.

Because I come from a butter-producing State — North Dakota ranks seventh in the Nation—you will say that I cannot objectively outline the issues today. Because I come from a butter-producing State, I am acquainted with this problem, and have attempted to understand it, and my conviction is not one recently acquired, but represents a long intimacy with the problem. I assure you I have at all times attempted to think objectively on this matter.

MARGARINE'S ARGUMENTS

First, let us examine the arguments, and evaluate them, of the proponents of tax repeal.

They contend that oleo can compare with butter in every respect. While I shall never believe this, I answer them by saying, "So what?" Even if it is the equal of butter, it should not be permitted to imitate butter. Horse meat may be the equal of beef, but our people are entitled to know when they are being sold horse meat. The argument is not whether butter and oleo are on or near a par in nutritive and food value; the question is, Should we protect our dairy industry?

The proponents of tax repeal cry "special-privilege tax," "subsidy," and "restraint of trade." Even if their cry is right, it is evading the basic question. Should we protect our dairy industry? We have tariff to protect industry; they are special-privilege taxes. We subsidize many farm products, including cotton and soybeans, I am told. We regulate many industries for the good of the Nation; regulation constitutes restraint of trade. But if these things are justified, then the cry is a cry of "wolf," and is merely designed to arouse emotion.

Now the oleo people tell us that if we take this tax off their product it will reduce the cost of butter and the cost of margarine. This is pure, unadulterated propaganda. How can removal of a tax on margarine reduce the cost of butter? They are not competing today because of the wide variance in price between butter and oleo. Further, the cost of butter is not high compared to other prices of products made from milk and butterfat. The price the farmer receives for butterfat sold the creameries to make butter is much lower than the price the same farmer would receive if he should sell this same butterfat to evaporators, cheese factories, or as fluid milk. When you consider that it takes an hour of labor to produce a pound of butter, including all the steps involved, from caring for livestock, through transportation to the creamery, and transportation to the market, we wonder how butter can sell for less than a dollar a pound. Compared to the butterfat content of fluid milk at 20 cents a quart, it is an excellent buy. No; taking the tax off oleo will not reduce the cost of producing butter nor the price the consumer will have to pay.

The tax on uncolored oleo is a quarter of a cent per pound, a reasonable license fee. Remove this tax and how much will it reduce the cost of oleo to the consumer? Not more than a quarter of a cent a pound.

The housewife has been hoodwinked into believing that the 10-cent tax on colored margarine is being paid by her. Nobody is paying for it unless the oleo is colored when she buys it. The most taking this color tax off could do would be to give the housewife colored oleo at the same price she pays for uncolored oleo today. But I am not too confident that the greedy margarine interests will be so kind as to hold the price down, if they can get the privilege of making their product appear like butter.

But, they argue, take off the 10 cents tax on colored margarine, then we can save the housewife hours of work. Let us examine this follow-up and alternate argument used when it is obvious that the propaganda is not falling for the reduce-the-cost-of-living fallacy which has been sold to the public, including many Congressmen. In the first place, the majority of housewives of the Nation use more uncolored margarine for cooking than they do for table spread, and I am confident they will admit that they do not care whether the margarine is white or yeollow for cooking purposes. This explodes the time-saving theory in half. Now to dispose of this argument as it applies to table spread. If the housewife insists upon oleo's being yellow—why not green or sky-blue, or palatable pink—there is no law against margarine manufacturers coloring oleo any color except yellow—true she has to color it. But the very fact that this law exists is the only protection that the housewife has in knowing whether she is buying butter or buying oleo. The Pure Food and Drug people have no authority, except over interstate traffic, to regulate and prevent the sale of margarine as butter. The housewife may have to color some of her margarine for the table, but at least she knows that when she buys butter, it is butter and is not a colored substitute sold to her fraudulently.

The housewife has been sold on this proposition thinking that the elimination of this 10-cent tax on oleo will reduce the cost of margarine 10 cents and also give her the product in yellow form. She has not been informed—she has been misinformed. The cost will not be lowered more than one-quarter of a cent per pound, for that is all the tax she is paying today on uncolored margarine.

If this margarine is such a great product, why do not the oleo manufacturers pay the 10-cent tax? It would still sell for half the price of butter. This cost-of-living and color argument is so shallow that it is hard to understand how so many well-informed people could entertain it for a moment. We might fool a few housewives today who have read the oleo ads and propaganda, but we will encounter their wrath on the morrow when they find out just what we did accomplish if we are so foolhardy as to remove this necessary protective tax.

The color argument is simply a camouflage, a colored and false argument which has led us today to the precarious position of threatening one of our greatest industries, and the welfare of the Nation. The basic question is this: Is the dairy industry worth our continued support, or should we render it a knock-out blow?

EFFECT OF TAX REPEAL

Is our dairy industry worthy of protection? This is the question to be

answered and you cannot answer it unless you understand the following facts.

The dairy industry, not alone butter, but cheese, milk, and all other phases of it, will suffer if we take this protective tax off oleo. People think milk is good for them. And they are right. But knock butter off the market and what will happen to the milk industry?

A cow gives milk in different quantities at different times of the year. Humans want a set amount of milk throughout the year. How can we satisfy the demands of humans, with the erratic milk production of cows? Only if we have a surplus of cows in seasons of high production can we have enough milk in seasons of low production. Say one cow provides enough milk for your family part of the year, but two cows are required during the low-milk season. You have to keep two cows or go without enough milk during the latter season. What will you do with the extra milk from the extra cow during the high milk-production seasons? That will be the problem facing the fluid-milk industry if you push butter off the market. Butter is the perfect outlet for extra milk in seasons of high production, for it provides a concentrated form of butterfat which can be safely stored in seasons of high production for consumption during seasons of low milk production. It is a part of the dairy cycle. Will you maintain, at present feed prices, an extra dairy cow half of the year when you have no outlet for that extra butterfat? You will not, and you do not expect the industry to. Dairy herds will naturally decrease to the point to meet set human consumption during the high productive period of the herd. The price of milk will skyrocket in times of low production. Who, then, will complain loudest? The housewife, the mother of children, your consuming public, they will demand a subsidy for dairy herds. The Government will be buying butterfat, because the butter market will be gone. The housewife will not thank you for voting to destroy the dairy industry today.

Consider the dairy industry from another important standpoint to the entire Nation. Diversified farming is important to the welfare of the people of North Dakota, as it is important to any agricultural community. The dairy industry provides this opportunity for diversified farming. In bad crop years the farm population, one-fifth of the Nation's population, the majority of whom have at least a few dairy cows, will need to depend largely upon dairy herds to manage to eke out an existence.

Not only is it important from this standpoint, but the fertilizer problem is solved to a large extent through the use of dairy herds in North Dakota. The maintenance of livestock on our farms is essential to restore organic matter to the soil. Without a market for butter the dairy industry in North Dakota would cease to exist, and this soil-conservation practice would soon be discontinued. This is true throughout the Nation and is not limited to my State.

The dairy industry is more important as a means of revenue to the farmers of every State than will be the sale of vegetable oils to margarine manufacturers even if they triple or quadruple their sales, completely pushing the use of butter from the market. Every Congressman should seriously consider this fact. In fact, the dairy farmer is a better source of outlet for soybean and cotton byproducts than the oleo industry will ever be, a better source of revenue. Action destroying the dairy industry will prove short-sighted, indeed.

I urge that every Congressman read and study the letter I received from the Cudahy Packing Co., which is one of the Nation's largest producers of margarine. This letter appears on page A2415 of the Appendix of the RECORD. Here is one margarine producer who has stuck to facts, who recognizes the threat to the dairy industry and sees the folly of the action contemplated today. As a margarine producer Cudahy has every reason to join the propaganda campaign of the other producers who have precipitated this crisis today. Do not take my word for this, read the story as written by Mr. F. W. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co., of Chicago, Ill. It is truly revealing, and certainly without prejudice.

Remember the issue before you today is: Should we protect our dairy industry? If you give this your honest evaluation today, I am certain you will agree, our dairy industry is worth protecting. It will be a tremendous mistake to repeal present taxes, and I urge with all the strength at my command that Congress defeat the bill now being considered and avoid the calamity of seriously crippling our important dairy industry.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman I am opposed to the Rivers bill. So far as I can see, it will accomplish very little good for anyone and will do very positive harm to certain groups and to the country as a whole. In spite of the great propaganda to the contrary, the repeal of the law providing a 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine will accomplish very little for the consumer. In the first place, it is the general opinion that the repeal of the tax will be followed by an increase in the price of oleomargarine substantially equivalent to the tax.

In the second place, some 23 States now have laws either prohibiting the sale or manufacture of colored oleomargarine or putting very drastic restrictions on the sale or manufacture. Those State laws will, of course, not be affected by any action taken in this Congress.

Any benefit that the repeal of the tax would bring to the cotton States would be lost when competition begins in earnest with certain foreign oils. The cottonseed people cannot compete with these imported oils on any basis favorable to cottonseed.

Of course, the Rivers bill would be very injurious to the dairy sections of the country for reasons which have been so well outlined thus far in this debate. The principal objection to the Rivers bill, however, it seems to me, is its effect on our soil-conservation program. We all agree that the conservation of our soil is a necessary program in this country. Every year we appropriate substantial sums to carry out that objective. The dairy industry contributes largely to the conservation of the soil. If for no other reason, that is sufficient justification for the legislation now on the statute books designed to protect the dairy industry.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, when I first approached the butter-versus-oleomargarine issue several months ago, my first inclination was to vote for the repeal of the oleomargarine tax and get this long-standing sore out of the way.

But, as time has passed and as I have studied this issue most carefully, reading literally everything that I could get my hands on concerning the fight, I have learned many startling facts that give me an entirely different attitude about which side I shall take. On the surface, this seems like a very simple issue, but the more you learn of it, the more you see that what seems to be true in regard to the oleo situation really is not the truth at all.

For example, I had been led to believe that the tax on a pound of oleomargarine, purchased at the store by a housewife, was 10 cents—that it really was an important item in the cost of living. The fact is, this tax is only one-fourth of a cent a pound. Even more important than this is the fact that no oleomargarine manufacturer has come forward to state unequivocally, so far as I know, that he will not raise the price of oleo if the tax is repealed. In other words, we might be voting the oleo manufacturer more profits without helping a single housewife who purchases oleo.

The more I studied this issue, the more I learned about our dairy industry. And, the more I learn about the importance of our dairy industry in the scheme of our agricultural and industrial life, particularly in the North and in the great Middle West, the more I see that any tinkering with the present Federal laws regarding oleo could prove disastrous to the dairy farmer and the whole dairy industry. If the results of such action were sure to stop there, and the measure seemed to be in the public interest, I still might be persuaded to vote for oleo repeal. But the truth is, Mr. Chairman, we have no assurance that the results of our action here might not have even more far-reaching consequences in our closely knit economy.

As you know, the business interests in the typical little city and town, throughout the North and the Middle West in particular, are dependent upon the cash income of the farmers who live in the rural areas. If the income of these farmers—and most of them are dairy farmers, in one way or another—is cut, then business in town suffers proportionately. We cannot divide the interests of the city man from those of his rural neighbor. So, if the dairy farmer is injured, the city folks will be injured.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this issue is nearly as important to the average consumer or even to the cotton farmer as certain pressure groups, through a whipped-up and expensive propaganda campaign, have tried to make it seem. Actually, the average housewife would not save 25 cents a year if this tax were removed from oleo by the Federal Government, but to hear

some of them talk, you would think the average family would save hundreds of dollars annually. Twenty-five cents a year. That is what this thing could mean to an average family, if the mother were to buy no other kind of spread except oleo. That is a very little bit of savings to kick up such a storm about, even if the savings were to come about. But as I have stated before, not a single consumer can guarantee me, or anyone else, that the oleo manufacturers will not raise the price of their product so that they can get that additional two bits every year. And when you put it on that basis, you begin to see why these oleo manufacturers have put up so many millions of dollars to take this tax off.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that not all oleomargarine manufacturers support this bill to repeal the so-called burdensome tax of one-fourth of 1 penny a pound.

I have here a letter from Mr. F. W. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co., which manufactures and sells both oleo and butter in great quantities. He states the case against repeal of the oleo tax clearly and concisely. I quote his letter:

THE CUDAHY PACKING CO.,
Chicago, April 20, 1948.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our company is engaged not only in the business of slaughtering, processing, and selling meat and meat products but also in the production and sale of butter and oleomargarine. We are, in fact, one of the largest manufacturers of margarine in the United States today. Our interest in the controversy over the present oleomargarine laws is therefore not one sided. We stated in a communication to Congressman ANTON J. JOHNSON of Illinois, several weeks ago that we are not asking for repeal of any of the present laws relating to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. In our opinion, looking at the laws from the standpoint of the welfare of all segments of our economy, no change need be made. In order that you may know the reasons for our position we shall set them forth. They are as follows:

1. The present laws are not unfair or unjust.

(a) The dairy farmer is entitled to the protection of these laws. They protect his market for butterfat against unfair competition from an imitation product. Any businessman is entitled to protection against imitation of his manufactured merchandise.

(b) The consumer is not hurt by these laws. The tax of one-fourth cent per pound on oleomargarine not colored yellow is small. The license fees which must be paid by the retailer, wholesaler, and the manufacturer are also small when passed on to the consumer, as they undoubtedly are. Applying the total of all these taxes to a family that consumes 3 pounds of oleomargarine per week, every week of the year (156 pounds per year), the total amount of taxes does not exceed 40 cents per year—less than 1 cent per week.

By comparison, the cost of adding vitamin A to oleomargarine is more than three times the amount of the tax, and the cost of advertising the leading brands of oleomargarine normally runs from four to seven times the amount of the tax.

There is no reason why oleomargarine cannot be served white, which is its natural manufactured color, but if the consumer desires to color it, modern packaging enables her to do so without waste of time or product.

Nor have the present laws had any detrimental effect on our national diet or nutrition. Our per capita consumption of fats has increased steadily during the past several decades, rising from 39 pounds in 1912 to 51 pounds in 1941. It declined slightly during the war, but since then has been rising again.

When all elements are carefully considered it can be stated with fairness that these margarine laws have helped the consumer rather than hurt him. Among other things, we can thank these laws for placing the oleomargarine industry on its good behavior, and prompting it to use American-produced oils and to improve its product to a point where it approximates the palatability and nutritional equivalency of butter.

(c) The oleomargarine industry has not been hurt by these laws. Over the past several decades sales have been on a gradually ascending curve. If any hurt has come to the oleomargarine industry it has been self-inflicted. During the past several decades the industry has encouraged rather than discouraged the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice. Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dollars encouraging the consumer to serve oleomargarine white, she would probably have become accustomed to using it that way today.

Other industries in food, drugs, clothing, and shelter have gotten us to change our living habits without resorting to a complete imitation of competing articles and the oleomargarine industry could and should do the same without imitating the color of butter.

(d) Our general economy would be seriously affected by a change in these laws. The uncertain benefits that might accrue to cotton and soybean farmers are so insignificant compared with the certain disastrous effects that would be produced for dairymen by reducing the tax on yellow oleomargarine that we should all pause and examine carefully the implications of these laws before tampering with them. In 1946, only two-tenths of 1 percent of farm income was attributable to oleomargarine. On the other hand, farm income from dairy products was over a hundred times farm income from items attributable to oleomargarine. Even if farm income attributable to oleomargarine were doubled or trebled, it would be small—less than 1 percent. Even for farmers who raised only cotton, but 1.45 percent of their cash farm income in 1946 came from cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine. In the 10 leading cotton States, income to farmers from dairy products was 27 times as great as income from oleomargarine in the same year.

Farmers in certain States now raise soybeans. Taking this segment of the farming industry alone, but 5 percent of the income they enjoyed from soybeans came from oleomargarine in 1946.

To sum up, actually oleomargarine is not an important outlet for any farm product.

The following is an interesting extract from the booklet entitled "Oleomargarine and the Farmer," recently published by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation:

"During 1946, American consumers spent over $2,000,000,000 for the primary edible fats—butter, lard, vegetable shortening, and oleomargarine. Out of this $2,000,000,000 of consumers' money, the American farmer received over 60 percent, or $1,231,747,000, which was divided as follows:

	Cash farm income in 1946
Butter	$638,011,000
Lard	429,647,000
Vegetable shortening	124,712,000
Oleomargarine	39,377,000
Total	1,231,747,000

"Historical facts prove beyond a doubt that the quantity or poundage of fats used by the average American consumer stays about the same from year to year. Fluctuation occurs in the per capita consumption of the individual fats but an increase in the consumption of one fat generally results in an offsetting decline in another."

Twenty-five percent of our dairy farmers depend largely upon the sale of cream for butter manufacture to maintain their dairy cows. If the oleomargarine laws were repealed, over a million of this type of farmer would, in our opinion, be forced to sell most of his cows. The permanent reduction in this segment of our cattle population would affect not only our supply of milk and cream but also our supply of meat.

Inasmuch as butter traditionally has served as the outlet for all surplus supplies of milk after all other milk products (including bottled milk, ice cream, evaporated milk, dried milk, and cheese) have been supplied with their requirements, it is quite apparent that any action adversely affecting butter could create chaotic conditions in the supply and cost to the consumer of all other dairy products. It might well be that in the event that the price of butter were unduly depressed, bringing about substantially reduced production of milk in the over-all in this country, the price of bottled milk and all manufactured dairy products would at times be increased substantially to the consumer.

2. Butter alone is entitled to the yellow color because it alone is always naturally yellow, in varying shades thereof. It is morally entitled to make the claim: "Yellow is the 'trade-mark' of butter," Oleomargarine, on the other hand, if processed from vegetable oils from American farms (as it is largely today) cannot be made a natural yellow. These oils are bleached, not because of the Federal laws, but because it is necessary to remove undesirable colors. There has been a great deal of misinformation and misleading propaganda put out on this subject, and the record should be set straight.

3. The present 10-cent tax on the sale of yellow oleomargarine reduces the incentive for fraud and assists the Federal authorities in detecting the presence of any considerable quantities that might be palmed off as butter. The monetary incentive to sell yellow oleomargarine at the price of and in the guise of butter is unique in our economy. No other kind of product affords a parallel for comparison. With the quantities of butter sold being so huge and the price spread between butter and oleomargarine so wide, the incentive for fraud is unparalleled. Fraud would undoubtedly be practiced if the present laws were repealed. The frauds which existed when the sale of oleomargarine in this country was unregulated demonstrate this. Oleomargarine being more palatable and nutritious today, deception would be easier.

We should like to make clear at this point that in our opinion the regulatory tax on the retailer is scarcely necessary to effect proper regulation. It could well be removed.

4. Wherever large and healthy farm economies are in existence throughout the world, oleomargarine is under some form of government restriction and regulation. This is true of practically all of the countries of western Europe. In Canada its threat to a healthy economy is considered so serious that the sale of oleomargarine is completely prohibited. It is only during periods of high prices like the present that Canada ever seriously considers modification of its extreme position on oleomargarine.

5. It has been claimed that present oleomargarine laws are a misuse of the Federal taxing power. Actually only by levying Federal taxes can the Federal Government effectively watch the sale of oleomargarine. The

pure food and drug laws are helpless in this regard because they have no jurisdiction over intrastate traffic. However, the Revenue Department can and does enforce the present laws.

We hope that you will study the considerations involved in this butter-oleomargarine controversy and that your decision will not be based upon the exigencies or pressures of the moment, which are transitory.

Sincerely,

F. W. HOFFMAN,
President, the Cudahy Packing Co.

Also, Mr. Chairman, as we know, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] hit the nail on the head the other day when he declared:

This is not a butter-oleomargarine controversy. This is a controversy as to the system of agriculture we are going to have in America. Are we going to have a system of landed aristocracy, where the people work at slave wages, carrying on generation after generation, or do you believe in the American farm, where the people of this country can have family-sized farms and own a little piece of America themselves? I am not going to engage in the business of dividing anybody's land up, but, in my opinion, the time has come for the people of this country to recognize the fact that the great bulk of the people who want to live on our land have a right to own some land and farm it the American way—like real Americans.

We all know of the system of agriculture which prevails in the section from whence this proposal comes—the cotton country. A lot of the agriculture people even in those States do not want to see dairying destroyed and Coca-Cola take the place of milk and oleomargarine take the place of butter.

I cannot make my stand against this legislation too strong, Mr. Chairman, after reading and hearing the facts which I have read and heard in the past several weeks. To me the case is crystal clear, and there is only one way for me to vote—that is, against repeal of this tax. To do otherwise would be to injure in a very real way every farmer in my district and, indirectly, every businessman and consumer in my district. The farmers, busy with their work, particularly in this spring season, have a right to know that I and my colleagues are here to represent them and to stand firm against the oleomargarine manufacturers, with millions to spend to put on a high-pressure campaign. That is why this proposal has advanced as far as it has—because a few oleo manufacturers had millions to spend to convince consumer groups through a sustained advertising campaign that this tax ought to be repealed. The dairy farmers, who, altogether, represent much more wealth and much greater value to this country, are not as well organized as these few oleo manufacturers; but we who know of the value of the dairy industry should stand firm. The righteousness of our stand will become apparent as time passes, and our farmers will know without a doubt the Congressmen who really have the interests of all the people at heart.

I call on my colleagues who have gone astray and those who have indicated a weakness in favor of this oleo-tax repeal to think again and to ponder the long-time results of their action. If they will think this thing through, I am sure they will come to the same stout rejection of the idea as I have.

We cannot be for our American farmer and against him at the same time. We have to take a stand. This is the issue which is vital to the farmers and I am proud to be counted among those who are on his side.

Mr. Chairman, there are many, many reasons why this Congress should vote down this oleo-tax repeal, in addition to those cited by Mr. Hoffman, the president of the Cudahy Packing Co. Many of these reasons are contained in a letter from Mr. W. A. McDonald, president of the McDonald Cooperative Dairy Co., of Flint, Mich., which many of you have received. I challenge supporters of this bill to answer Mr. McDonald's 11 pertinent questions, which I quote:

1. If oleo is good to substitute vegetable fats for butterfat in the spread for bread, should it also be substituted in ice cream, cheese, and evaporated milk?

2. If you destroy the market for the butterfat portion of the milk, how do you get the solids-not-fat, since the cow produces fat and solids together?

3. If we allow oleo to drive butter out, what will happen to soil fertility?

4. Where will you get the 40 percent of beef now coming from dairy cattle?

5. Since there is little relationship between the cost of ingredients and the selling price of oleo, what will prevent the sale of colored oleo for very little less than the cost of butter? (Witness the history of vegetable fats and lard, and the consequent higher price on the meat portion of pork.)

6. How to prevent fraud in the sale of colored oleo as butter?

7. How to maintain American stamina on a Hindu diet resulting from legislating the dairy business and 40 percent of the beef business out of existence?

8. If imitation butter is desirable, why not encourage all other imitation and deception—for instance, horse meat for beef?

9. Were the legislation proposed by the oleo lobby adopted and the enormous population depending on milk production pauperized, what would you then do for or with these millions of people?

10. When you have abolished the dairy industry what becomes of the market for soybeans, oil meal, and cottonseed meal used for feeding milk cows? In 1946 cotton farmers received $21,000,000 from oleomargarine manufacturers for cottonseed oil, but received $31,000,000 from dairy farmers who fed cottonseed meal. In the same year soybean growers received $23,000,000 from oleo manufacturers, and $55,000,000 for soybean products fed to dairy cattle. To turn these feed producers into oleo boosters is certainly clever fifth-column work.

11. Why have oleo prices advanced much more above prewar levels than butter prices? Why does the price of oleo follow the price of butter instead of the cost of oleo ingredients?

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe repeal of the oleomargarine tax which will permit colored oleo to be marketed as butter will destroy the dairy industry and the economic security of millions of farmers and workers dependent on it. It is certain to create shortages with the result that we will see increasingly higher prices at grocery stores and meat markets in the coming months.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the Rivers bill. If it passes—as it is indicated it will—this will be a black day for the people of the dairy industry, who must work 365 days out of the year in the great dairy industry.

I am against the bill because in my opinion it will accomplish little good and will do certain and substantial harm to the great dairy industry.

I prophesy that the repeal of the law which provides a 10-cent tax on colored margarine will do little for the consumer. It is the general consensus of opinion that repeal of the tax will be followed by increase of the price of oleomargarine; thus the consuming public will be paying the bill.

I have always endeavored to not be provincial in my thinking. The dairy industry is a great industry. It is not necessarily confined to any one particular section of the country. Any votes in favor of this legislation will be either upon a sectional basis or upon a basis that it will be of aid to the consumers. Both of these reasons are short-sighted and in some respects entirely erroneous.

Any presumed benefit that the repeal of this tax might bring to the States producing cottonseed will be affected by the importation of cheap oils.

It is further to be recognized that in certainly most of the States—more than 20 in number—which now have laws prohibiting the sale or manufacture of colored margarine or imposing restrictions on the sale or manufacture, such State laws will of course not be changed or affected by the action taken by this Congress.

The consuming public are entitled to protection. Let those who want to eat oleo eat it in the natural state or color it after it is purchased. For the purpose of protection of the public from deception, the present tax should be continued.

To repeal the law would be not only a severe blow to the dairy industry but it would be a removal of the protection which should be maintained for the consuming public.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose, during the few minutes which I have at my disposal, to try to show the House just what the passage of this legislation would mean to the average dairy farmer who produces butter in southwestern Minnesota. The Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota is the largest butter producer of the nine districts in our State. Because of the fact that we are approximately 200 miles from any large city, we farmers in that district cannot sell our milk as whole milk. We put it through a cream separator and skim it and then take the cream to our local village, where our cooperative creamery manufactures butter out of it and ships this butter by the carload to the eastern markets of the United States. On the farms, we

utilize the rest of the milk—the skim milk—as feed for hogs and calves.

Our dairy economy is different from that of the farmers in the dairy business within operating radius of the large milk sheds such as those in the Twin Cities, Chicago, and New York. In those milksheds the entire production of milk is shipped to the cities, and nothing is left to use on the farms. The price paid these people for their whole milk depends, of course, upon the butterfat content of that milk, and the money obtained for this whole milk is considerably higher than we receive in southwestern Minnesota for our butter and its by-product, skim milk.

The dairies near the large cities cannot afford to feed dairy calves and grow and develop them for future service as producing cows. In our territory, we can do so and we do furnish the areas near the cities with replacement stock for the cows that are disposed of.

I am trying to show you how the passage of this legislation will dislocate the dairy economy. First of all, it will tend to lower the price on butter, and if that is done it will mean that those farmers on the dairy farms who produce butter in my district will just simply sell their herds on the block—perhaps keeping one or two cows for their home use. My farmers cannot afford—when labor is costing $150 per month plus board and room—and when feed prices are as high as they are—to produce butter at a price under what they are receiving today.

Members of the House, there is no worse drudgery on a farm than in milking dairy cows 14 times a week—we have to have some reasonable profit therefrom if farmers are to continue milking cows. Through the war years, I have watched four of my nearest neighbors become disgusted and sell out their dairy herds simply because the OPA decided that 71 cents a pound for butterfat was a fair payment for their production. I urged the foreman on my farm to keep our dairy herd although we did cut it in half in size because of the fact that we were actually losing money during the war years on our butter production. When OPA was discontinued, the price of butterfat shot up immediately to approximately $1 a pound where it should have been all through the war if production meant anything whatsoever and was desirable. The butterfat sold from my farm during January brought $1 a pound—while that sold in February brought 94 cents a pound. These prices are not at all out of line when you consider the fact that good alfalfa hay is worth at least $15 a ton—oats sell for over $1 a bushel and the care which these cows must have is paid for at the rate of approximately $200 a month when board and room is taken into consideration. Nor when you consider that the average workingman today spends a smaller proportion of his wages on food than he did in 1939.

If Congress today discourages further—through the passage of this legislation—the production of dairy products throughout the United States—it will have an immediate and inevitable result. Farmers—like myself—in southwestern Minnesota—will immediately begin to ask ourselves—why should we continue the drudgery of milking cows if we are faced—in the near future—with uncontrolled and ruthless competition from a low-cost product sold in almost complete imitation of butter. It will be easy for my farmers to reach a decision—when they consider the present high prices of meat—and they will decide to go out of the dairy business entirely. The 16 dairy heifers which are on my farm and which my foreman is developing for the future expansion of the herd, will bring a very good price for beef on the markets in South St. Paul. We can sell the milk cows as they become dry later in the season and by fall there will be no dairy herd on that farm and the production of butter and other dairy products will go down just that much. Multiply this occurrence by 200,000 or 300,000 and you can readily see what the effect of the passage of this legislation will mean to the dairy industry of the United States. The children of America will either drink higher-priced milk in the future or do without it entirely.

May I call to your attention the fact that it is not necessary for us in southwestern Minnesota to maintain dairy herds to produce butter and also to produce the heifer calves which will be needed for replacements in the larger dairies near the cities where children get the whole milk to drink that they must have to thrive on. We can go into other lines of endeavor on our farms and this coming fall and winter I would be able to dispense with the services of one of the two men we always keep on the farm to maintain a good dairy herd, if this legislation passes and the price of butter is drastically reduced.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me reiterate that the passage of this legislation would not be in the best interests of the United States. Passage of this legislation would reduce the supply of meat in our Nation. It would reduce the supply of whole milk and all dairy products.

I will close with a reference to a statement made by Dr. Charles Mayo, of the renowned Mayo Clinic. For years Dr. Mayo stressed the vital need our Nation has for sufficient whole milk to insure the proper development of the children of America—our country's greatest asset.

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

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

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true as these herds go away and pastures are plowed up and soybeans are grown that the soybean is the greatest drainer of soil we have? I have never seen a good crop of soybeans. Has the gentleman?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have seen many good crops of soybeans but have never produced any myself, so I cannot speak as to the effects of growing soybeans upon the fertility of our soil. I do know, however, that Minnesota needs the dairy cow and that the South needs millions of good cattle. Yet, here we find Representatives from the great South, who should be here fighting to bring more dairy cattle into their South, so that their children down there, who today lack sufficient vitamins, could have all the milk they want to drink. I repeat, we see these same Representatives attempting to pass this legislation. Yes, they will pass it. I know they will pass it, but I do not think the other body, upon reflection, is going to be foolish enough to pass any such legislation as this when they hear from the people of America; when they hear, for instance, evidence to the effect that the dairy cow eventually is going to go out of business, and that eventually the people in the great milk sheds, such as Washington, D. C., will go without sufficient milk. Unfair competition from oleo will eventually take away so many of our dairy herds that scarcities of milk and butter will inevitably ensue.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true that the State of Minnesota last year produced milk for $3.43 a hundred, the cheapest of any milk that was produced in the United States, and that these people who are chasing up here signing that petition come from States that are getting from one to two dollars more for their milk than the farmers in Wisconsin or Minnesota?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is a fact that the workingman today is paying a lesser percentage of what he earns for his food, including butter, than he did in 1939, and those are the statistics brought out by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending bill to repeal taxes on oleomargarine. This bill is brought to the floor by a discharge petition placed upon the Speaker's desk by the gentleman from South Carolina, that champion of the New Deal and of cottonseed oil [Mr. RIVERS] from the historic cotton district, once represented by John C. Calhoun. Two hundred and eighteen Members of the House, a majority, have signed this petition. The signers for the most part are from the cotton-growing areas of the South or from big cities. The House Committee on Agriculture, after exhaustive hearings on the subject, refused to report this bill. It thus comes before the House without the benefit of a committee report. Of course, this subject is not entirely unknown to the membership. But, by way of background, it may be appropriate, however, to state just what these taxes are. I will also summarize, as I have heard them here, the arguments for and against the bill and would like to make special reference to the harmful effect it will have on the Sixth Missouri Congressional District which I represent.

Present Federal oleomargarine laws provide for a quarter cent per pound tax

on the uncolored product and a 10-cent-per-pound tax on the colored. They also provide for occupational taxes of $600 a year on manufacturers; $480 on wholesalers and $48 on retailers of colored and uncolored oleo. On wholesalers of only uncolored oleo the taxes are $200 per year. The retailer of uncolored oleo pays a tax of $6 per year. People who must pay these taxes demand that they be repealed. They are joined by a vast horde of housewives who object to the bother of coloring their oleo. The claim is not made that repeal of the taxes would lower the cost of oleo. The oleo industry has been careful not to go on record about that.

In the last half of the nineteenth century, Napoleon III of France, offered a prize to anyone who could develop a substitute for butter that would be practical commercially. As a result of this offer, a French chemist developed a product he called margarine. It made its debut in Paris in 1872. Two years later it was introduced in the United States.

The use of oleomargarine has spread into various parts of the world, but everywhere its manufacture and sale have been subject to regulation of one type or another. In Canada, its use is completely prohibited. In those countries permitting its use, the people and their public officials have found it necessary to exercise some degree of control over this product. The need for such regulation was occasioned by the fact that oleo was artificially made to look like butter and it became a common practice to pass off oleo for butter. Public sentiment against misuse of this artificial food reached such proportions that by 1886 Congress had enacted its first Federal oleo legislation and 24 States and the District of Columbia had established laws governing the sale of this butter substitute. Today, 44 States have such laws.

For 74 years the oleo and butter interests have battled bitterly for the vast, rich market in bread spreads. As fast as the oleo makers improved their product or made any encroaching move toward the butter stronghold, the dairymen counterattacked. Their powerful State, regional, and national associations enlisted the support of legislators, who, in turn, threw up legalistic road blocks to thwart oleo. Caught in the middle of this struggle is the frustrated housewife, thwarted from buying ready-colored oleo. And, in 17 States, public institutions cannot even serve the stuff, colored or not. Eying her family budget, the housewife must choose between paying up to a dollar a pound for butter or half as much for oleo. With the cost of living going up, oleo interests, backed by a $6,000,000 advertising campaign in 1947, managed by the Nation's top public relations and advertising firms, have the butter crowd "on the ropes." The House will probably repeal the oleo taxes. The Senate's action in the matter is hard to forecast.

One of the arguments made by the oleo people is that oleo is made from farm products, soybeans and cottonseed, and therefore anything that helps oleo should help the farmers.

The butter or dairy interests reply that only two-tenths of 1 percent of farm income is traceable to oleomargarine and cite Census and Department of Agriculture reports to prove it.

The dairy interests also advance a host of other arguments. Some of these are:

First. Trivial benefits that might be derived from repeal of oleo taxes would be far outweighed by the damage to our agricultural economy and consumers' interests. Proof that the laws are not restrictive to the oleomargarine industry is the fact, they claim, that since 1941 oleo sales have more than doubled; retail outlets have increased 64 percent. These are figures of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. As for consumers' interests, no one pays the 10-cent tax unless oleo is purchased yellow. The old contention that the home coloring of oleo is tedious and wasteful no longer holds water for modern packaging in plastic bags enables a housewife who wants yellow oleo to color it easily, quickly, and without waste.

Second. Repeal of the laws would open the doors to fraud on the consuming public.

Third. Oleomargarine is not entitled to the color yellow, which is butter's historic trade-mark.

Fourth. Repeal of the oleo laws would set the precedent for other imitation foods.

Of all these arguments, and others which could be mentioned, I imagine that the one of greatest importance to the Sixth Missouri Congressional District pertains to what effect repeal of oleo taxes would have on the dairy industry.

The Missouri Resources and Development Commission, an agency of our State government, has published a booklet entitled "Milk." This booklet says that there are 154,000 dairy cows in the 11 counties of the Sixth District.

They are divided by counties as follows:

	Dairy cows
Barton County	10,000
Bates County	14,000
Cass County	18,000
Cedar County	8,000
Greene County	30,000
Henry County	10,000
Johnson County	12,000
Polk County	16,000
Pettis County	12,000
St. Clair County	10,000
Vernon County	14,000
Total dairy cows in Sixth Missouri District	154,000

This official publication of the Missouri State government says further, on page 16, and I quote:

Within a radius of 75 miles of Springfield there is a daily milk production of 3,500,000 to 5,000,000 pounds, making this area the greatest milk-producing area of comparable size in the United States. Milk production and manufacture of millions of pounds of milk products annually has made the dairy industry the most important agricultural industry in southwest Missouri. Greene County, of which Springfield is the county seat, registers more Jersey cattle with the national purebred office than any other county in the United States. Thousands of purebred and high-grade Holstein and Guernsey cows also help to make up a large dairy-cow population. The area has 52 modern milk-products plants. There are 3 evaporated-milk plants, 2 dry-milk plants, 11 creameries, 22 cheese factories, 5 milk plants, 9 ice-cream plants, 2 whey-drying plants, and 2 process-cheese factories. One dairy plant at Springfield has processed over a million pounds of milk daily. It is the largest of its kind.

During the war the dairy industry of southwest Missouri contributed mightily to victory. Missouri is the eighth State in the Nation as a dairy State, with 1,148,000 dairy cows. Southwest Missouri alone had a cash income of $37,422,000 from dairy products last year, according to A. G. Anderson, assistant director of agricultural development for the Frisco. Milk production of the southwest Missouri area would fill an 80-car train of oil tank cars every day. Southwest Missouri's 14 creameries produce 15,000,000 pounds of butter, or 25 percent of the State total.

Now, as to the importance of dairying in the 11 counties of the Sixth District, which runs from southwest Missouri, north to Kansas City and central Missouri, official Government reports, from the Census and Department of Agriculture, state that dairying provides the cash income on nearly 18,000 farms of the Sixth District. In addition, there are 26 milk manufacturing plants in the district producing butter, cheese, and other manufactured dairy products, whose operations create income for residents of the district. More than half of the dairy farms sell farm-separated cream, which is used almost exclusively for butter making. The 17,936 farms that sold dairy products in 1944, in my district, realized a cash income of nearly $12,000,000. The economic significance of dairying here is reflected not merely in the incomes of the dairy farmers, but also of milk haulers, plant employees, office and sales forces, and feed and equipment dealers. Where would the merchants and grocers be without the many millions of dollars spent from dairies' profits in the district? There is no oleo at all produced in the district. Farmer interest in oleo is represented by soybean growers in the district. Soybeans were grown on 1,233 farms in 1944, the last year on which figures are available. The value of the harvested crop, which included a substantial proportion fed to dairy cows, was $629,513. This was only 5.3 percent as large as the value of sales of dairy products. Studies show that the value of soybean oil used in oleomargarine represents only about 5 percent of the total farm value of soybeans, Nationwide.

The effect which elimination of taxes on colored oleo would have on various groups in the sixth district, can be estimated roughly. Assuming per capita consumption of butter and oleo equal to the United States average for 1947, and using 1947 prices, the cost of these table fats would have been $3,210,000 in this district. If oleo were freely colored, it would have been no cheaper than the uncolored oleo which consumers actually bought. Not even oleo makers claim otherwise. Butter, on the other hand, would have had to be sold at a lower price. A 5-percent reduction in dairy prices is conservative. Ignoring the fact that a 5-percent drop to consumers would result in a somewhat larger percentage drop to farmers, the change would cost the sixth district dairy farmers about

$600,000 or $470,000 more than the amount by which the cost to the sixth district consumers would have been lowered.

In the position which I occupy, I have learned to appreciate and respect the importance of agriculture to the economic well-being of my district. The farm population, according to the last census, is almost half the population of the district. All of the towns in the district are dependent in whole or part on farm prosperity for their very existence. Dairy farming is the principal type of farming in the district. Of the 29,667 farms in the district, 25,866 produce dairy products, with 17,936 devoted to dairying, and selling such products. The total value of these products sold in the district is, I repeat, $11,826,268 annually. That is the bigest farm industry in the district, and its profits are plowed back into the district.

In contrast, I repeat, only 1,233 district farms grow soybeans. Their sales value is $629,513 annually, or 5.3 percent as large as the value of sales of dairy products.

Yes; butter is high. What the farmer has to buy is high, too. Feed is high. The drouth and foreign exports have seen to that. But, I am one representative who knows that the economic "bread" of his district is spread with butter and not oleo, which is to say that the well-being and prosperity of my district is dependent on the welfare of the dairy farmer, and I am on his side. To be otherwise would be to betray not only the majority interests but the best interests of my district. No vote of mine will destroy or impair the biggest supports in the foundation on which that district and the happiness of its people is built. That is a frank and honest statement on a controversial subject. With all due respect to the friends of oleo, which is a good product, I must say, look elsewhere for your champion. The welfare of the sixth district is not for trade for a few pennies tax per pound and a few minutes of oleo mixing time. Not if it is up to me to trade it. I will not sell out a $12,000,000 farmer-built industry in my district for 600,000 pieces of silver.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose at this time to discuss some of the testimony that was adduced before the Committee on Agriculture.

A member of the United States Wholesale Grocers Association testified that in a poll of distributors many said they did not handle margarine—even though it enjoyed a position of preference to butter, in many cases—because of first, the taxes; second, the high license fees; and third—I will quote from his testimony here—"the bother, worry, and expense of making out monthly reports."

One member of the association reported that it cost him $100 a month just to fill out the required Government forms.

It was brought out that another wholesaler discontinued selling margarine because of the fact that small retailers back away from handling it for the reason that the Federal Government puts into them the mortal fear of not abiding by the regulations and of fines for possible infractions.

Let us see what the Government requires of wholesale distributors who have the courage to handle margarine. The regulations on wholesalers set forth 7 specifications of record keeping, 11 specifications for handling monthly reports and more than 9 penalties of fines and imprisonment for various violations. The regulations occupy six printed pages of an Internal Revenue Bureau pamphlet.

As one harassed wholesaler put it, you might think the wholesaler was handling a poisonous drug or lethal concoction or was trying to dispose of dynamite, TNT or atomic bombs or was on the point of being lured into some form of supplying a black market or smuggling. Was anything ever more ridiculous and outlandish?

Now, let us take a look at the retailer who offers his customers oleomargarine.

The independent retail grocers of the country favor the repeal of these taxes on oleomargarine. In their opinion, it is tax persecution.

In 1947, 270,000 grocers paid a license to sell margarine in their stores. To many thousands of these dealers, a saving of $6—of the amount of the Federal tax on sales of uncolored margarine—represents the net profit on about $200 in sales. In other words, in order to pay the tax alone, a retail merchant must first sell $200 worth of margarine.

In addition—and this is the most important aspect that we have to consider here—the tax operates in such a manner as to prevent thousands of retailers from selling margarine at all. This situation, therefore, denies millions of consumers who cannot afford to pay the high prices for butter an opportunity of purchasing the more reasonably priced margarine.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the grocers who cannot afford the tax and cannot afford the office assistance which is required to fill out the forms are not located in the neighborhoods of the well-to-do consumer. The majority of these grocery stores are located in the poorer neighborhoods, the neighborhoods of the laboring man and woman, the neighborhoods where the saving of 1 cent on a food item is a matter of grave importance.

The license fees for the retail grocers impose still another inequity. The small, independent merchant pays the same tax and license fee as the large chain store. While to a chain grocer doing a large volume of business, the fee of $6 or $48 may be a mere trifle, to the corner grocery store, it means much as he struggles against overwhelming competition.

As I have said, the burden of paying the license fee is not the only expense and hardship for the retailer. There is also the mystic and maddening maze of highly technical regulations and requirements which he must follow.

First of all, the retailers must file a special tax return on his magarine transactions; then he must be sure to display conspicuously his tax stamp or pay a fine of $10. If one of his partners die or withdraws or additional partners are taken into the firm or if he changes his name or relocates his place of business—(whew, gentlemen, is there ever any end?) he must remember to file another form with the collector or pay a penalty.

Not only does he have to do all of that, but this unique law, this daisy of a duty, requires still more: listen to this: If a customer enters his store and buys over 10 pounds of margarine and the grocer fails to have the customer make payment in at least two separate transactions the grocer will, under the regulations, be classified as a wholesaler and required to pay $200 or a license, plus a penalty for failure to file a return.

Why, an innocent mistake like this, it has been testified, would cost the small grocer his profits for many months.

Let me give you just one more aspect of this ridiculous tax. He must be sure at all times that all sales of margarine are conducted and completed in his place of business. Thus, we have been told by one retailer, that his delivery boy cannot deliver a pound of margarine at the home of Mrs. Jones unless she included this item in her grocery order. The grocery boy may have the margarine in his truck, but he cannot sell it to Mrs. Jones—because the transaction must be under the roof of the grocery store.

I hold that under no conceivable circumstances of justice and equity can we any longer countenance these outrageous margarine taxes, taxes which penalize the storekeeper and the consuming public.

It almost defies the imagination to realize how many years we have been forced to tolerate these taxes on a major food product. Has there ever been such an example of gross inattention on the part of our democratic Government to the fundamental needs of so many of its citizens as this penalty which is imposed on a nutritious and wholesome food? Has there ever been such a glaring instance of the power and influence of one industry to strangle a competing industry?

I ask you today to consider these Federal taxes on margarine, particularly colored margarine, from two points of view: First, I want you to look at these taxes from the angle of business discrimination which the law is permitting within the framework of our highly cherished system of free enterprise. Then I hope you will consider these tax laws from the standpoint of their utter ridiculousness and stupidity.

Your attention at all time, I trust, will be directed toward the injustices these taxes play upon the consuming public, particularly that segment where every penny counts when it comes to setting a health-giving table.

Now let me touch briefly on the unhealthy discrimination in business competition which these tax laws permit. In the hearing on the pending measure before the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Archibald L. M. Wiggins, the distinguished Under Secretary of the Treasury, revealed some startling conclusions which the Treasury Department holds regarding the margarine taxes.

Said Mr. Wiggins—and I quote:

The legislative history of these taxes and the considerations advanced in their defense during their long history indicate that their purpose is to buttress the competitive position of the dairy industry by discouraging the consumption of a substitute commodity.

It could not be conveyed in better words. Is that the sort of statement that upholders of the system of free enterprise can take with equinamity?

But let me further quote from the testimony of the Under Secretary. Mr. Wiggins declared before the committee—I am quoting his testimony:

The basic issue raised by the oleomargarine taxes—

He said—

is the propriety and desirability of using the tax laws to affect the relative position of competing industries, both of which use domestic agriculture raw materials. In the case of oleomargarine—

And I am still quoting Mr. Wiggins—

the taxing power is used as a punitive measure against one industry to advance the interests of another. In the process, the public is deterred from the free exercise of its consumer preferences. It is the view of the Treasury Department—

Mr. Wiggins continued—

that the use of the taxing power to distort the normal development of competing industries and to deprive them of the full benefit of the free enterprise system conflicts with the public interest, and in the absence of compelling consideration, should be avoided.

While I am dealing with the testimony from the Treasury Department, I should also like to add an additional thought: It is the view of the Treasury Department, that the tax burden alone reflects only part of the cost of these taxes to the consumers. In other words, aside from running up the price of oleomargarine, a fundamental burden, the tax, by preventing most merchants from carrying the product, therefore forces a consumer to pay, say, 90 cents a pound for butter when the housewife may prefer to buy 41-cents-a-pound margarine.

The present situation has resulted in all but one out of every hundred grocers from stocking colored margarine. And under the prevailing conditions only one merchant out of fifty has the courage and the resources to stock uncolored margarine.

There are, to be sure, numerous other logical and water-tight arguments which could be brought out to show the discriminatory and unjust nature of these taxes, but, for the moment, I believe views of the Treasury Department—the agency which has the duty of collecting the taxes—will suffice. Before passing on, I want to remind you that these oleomargarine taxes, which the dairy interests would have you retain have, in the words of the Treasury Department, little revenue significance.

The taxation on margarine dates originally from 1886 and the present schedule of rates, from 1902. Speaking of modernizing tax laws, perhaps we had better start with these taxes which have remained unchanged for nearly half a century.

I trust that this legislation will be enacted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if we will hark back just a few years we will remember, as I was reminded by a farmer from my district today, Mr. Wayne Anderson, of Stanton, Iowa, who is here in the interest of good farming and good government, that the substitutes for lard were first put on the market at a lower price than real lard. But the price of those substitutes are now higher than lard. That is what is going to happen if this bill goes through. The price of this substitute for butter is lower than lard now, but when the fellows who are concocting and processing and marketing this artificial butter get through, in a few years it will be higher than butter, because they will propagandize it to the end that they will finally get a lot of American people believing that real butter is unhealthy and bad stuff. To listen to some of the propaganda going out over the air today, that is about what we can expect.

Sooner or later this thing will be taken care of in this way: We in Iowa and the farm States, especially the hog States, and dairy States have the real McCoy. We produce butter and we have the real pure lard, and we have the other things that are the real McCoy. We do not have to mix a lot of junk together and squirt it full of a lot of stuff to make it marketable. So this is what we will do if this bill goes through, and it may be well if this bill does go through because this is what we will do without a question of a doubt. We will take about 30 percent good butter, good, pure cow's butter, we will take about 70 percent good, pure hog's lard, and we will put some good, rich juicy bacon juice in it to give it just a little extra flavor, and rich, creamy, appetizing color, and we will outsell oleomargarine by about 10 cents a pound.

How can we do that? Well, here it is, 30 percent of 85 cents, the average butter price, is 25½ cents, and 70 percent of 30 cents, the price of lard, is 21 cents. Add those together and you have 46½ cents. It will be better and in far greater demand than any of this concocted stuff you folks are trying to wish off on the American housewife. It will be real food, not a substitute. So you are not going to outfox the hog farmer and the dairy farmer and the corn farmer for one minute. If you think you are, you have another guess coming. If you will remember back in 1932, a candidate for the Presidency of the United States—and he was elected—said that our old tried-and-true system of government was wrong—too expensive. He said it was costing 25 percent too much. So he concocted a substitute for the American people. You know what happened. The minute the New Deal spending outfit got in with their artificial program and their substitutes for our time-tested American way of doing things, the price of government went up, up, up. That is what happens when you substitute and when you try something artificial. Certainly this Government today is just a substitute for the real thing, just as oleo is for butter.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the impassioned pleas for the dairy farmers of this great country. I have heard Members of the House say that the dairy farmers will no longer be in existence if this tax or these restrictions are removed from the manufacture, sale, or consumption of margarine. I will go back to 1886 when the first restrictions were placed on the sale of margarine, and then I will bring you back to 1902 and 1903 when the dairy lobby successfully imposed upon the housewives of America the extra 10-cent tax on colored margarine and additional restrictions on wholesalers, retailers, and so forth. In 1902 and 1903, the dairy lobby told the committees of the House in charge at that time that unless these taxes were imposed upon this margarine product, it would be a very short time before the dairy farmers of this country would be out of business and bankrupt. At that time the people of this great country consumed almost 70,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine. That was in 1902 and 1903. Butter was selling at that time for 23 cents a pound. Forty-five years have gone by since the butter lobby was successful in selling that bill of goods. What do we have now? The consumers of oleomargarine have consumed as of last year 750,000,000 pounds of margarine or 10 times that amount which was consumed in 1902 and 1903. The price of butter has gone from 23 cents a pound to a dollar a pound. The dairy farmers of the United States of America have enjoyed the greatest income that they have ever enjoyed in the history of this great country of ours. I maintain that that proves conclusively that in spite of these taxes the margarine industry has gone ahead, multiplied by 10 times. The butter industry has not suffered, the price of butter going up three times. The income of the dairy farmer has not suffered, in spite of these taxes. The only person who has suffered because of the imposition of these taxes is the American housewife. The tax has not hurt the margarine business; it has not helped the dairy farmer; it will not hurt the dairy farmer by its removal. It will not aid the margarine business any more if it is removed. It will aid the housewife in getting rid of one more pain in the neck. It is about time we took it off.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

ERSATZ BUTTER

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, during the war years the people of the State of Iowa produced 10 percent of our Nation's food supply. That is a lot of production. One of the reasons why the people of my State were able to achieve this remarkable record is the fact that for more than

100 years they had developed a fine balance between dairying on the one hand and corn-hog production, stock feeding, and poultry raising on the other. The proposal before us is designed to throw a monkey wrench into our farm-production set-up and destroy this fine balance.

The Federal margarine taxes have helped us to protect our dairy farmers against unethical competition and the consuming public against fraud and deception. It is a matter of genuine regret to me that today it is proposed that this protection be repealed. The principal argument that has been advanced for this proposed action is based on the fallacious assumption that it would materially reduce the cost of living. As a matter of fact, the present tax of one-fourth cent per pound on uncolored margarine plus the license fees would not cost the average family as much as a penny a week if margarine were substituted exclusively for butter on the American table. And color may be added to this product by the purchaser easily, quickly, and at no cost, if desired.

Mr. Chairman, I do not object especially to the removal of the tax on uncolored margarine. I do, however, strenuously oppose the removal of the tax on butter-colored margarine. Margarine is now retailed in the image of butter. The package simulates butter as to shape, weight, and size. The wrapping is similar. It is alleged that the vitamins known to be present in butter have been added in approximately the same amount to margarine by artificial methods, and the flavor of butter has been imitated. All that remains to make the deception complete is the adoption of the butter color. It is pertinent to note that the natural color of butter is yellow and that the natural color of margarine made from cottonseed oil or soybean oil is not yellow. Surely it is not unreasonable for the dairy industry to protest the sale of butter substitutes that march under false colors.

Approximately one-quarter of the milk which is processed in this country is normally made into butter. Consequently, any action that affects the demand for butter affects the entire dairy industry. Should the demand for butter be curtailed, the production of milk unquestionably would be reduced. In this connection, I should like to point out that Iowa is the leading butter-producing State. Much of the butter is produced from cream separated on thousands of farms throughout the State. The skimmed milk which remains after the cream is separated makes a nourishing feed for hogs, calves, and chickens—the quantity of the skimmed milk on the average farm being too small to make it practical to collect for human consumption. Thus the production of butter is closely related to the production of hogs, cattle, and poultry; and a decrease in butter production will result in a decrease in meat and poultry production, with corresponding price increases all along the line. Furthermore, our agriculture would undergo a transformation. The trend would be to reduce dairy and livestock farming and to increase crop farming. And it is all too obvious what effect the resulting loss of natural fertilizer would have on soil fertility and soil conservation.

Mr. Chairman, on April 1 the Fairmont Foods Co., of Omaha, Nebr., issued the following memorandum to its stockholders:

FAIRMONT FOODS CO.,
Omaha, Nebr., April 1, 1948.

To All Fairmont Stockholders:

A great deal has found its way into print recently regarding Federal taxes on oleomargarine and the relative merits of that product and butter. As we have had several requests for information concerning these matters, we have concluded to furnish to all stockholders such facts as will give a basic understanding of the issues involved in the attempts being made by the manufacturers of oleomargarine to have the taxes removed.

Most of the claims of the oleomargarine manufacturers are along the lines of yellow color, taxes, and nutrition. As the famous Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record."

Yellow is the natural color of butter. In the spring and summer all butter has a pronounced yellow color. There is no color added and it is impossible to reduce that color. The color gradually becomes a lighter yellow toward the fall and winter seasons, so for the sake of uniformity the creameries add just a slight amount of color during those seasons. This has Government approval and is legalized by an act of Congress.

Oleomargarine manufacturers say that they want the yellow color because it is an appetizing color. But, there are other appetizing colors, such as chocolate brown, strawberry red, mint green, and so forth. The manufacturers could use any other color except yellow without having to pay the 10-cent tax. Why do you suppose they want yellow? Would they want to color oleomargarine yellow if the natural color of butter were pink?

Many spreads are used on bread in their natural color. Cream cheese is white, peanut butter is a nut brown, and jams and jellies vary in color.

The agitation for yellow oleomargarine springs from the manufacturers and not from the customers or the Government. The consumer who buys it and uses it knows that it is oleomargarine regardless of whether it is white or some other color. Color does not make it taste different.

Food and drug regulations are designed to prevent the manufacture and substitution of one food product to resemble another. Oleomargarine is sold in packages of the same weight, size, shape, inner-wrapper, and paraffined carton as butter. The manufacturers have added flavoring to the margarine. With the entire field of flavors to choose from, they have picked butter flavor. They have added artificial vitamins; not all vitamins but just the ones found in butter and in approximately the same amount. If they wanted to make a more healthful product, why not add all the vitamins? Next, if they add butter color, the deception would be complete.

There have been many frauds due to yellow colored oleomargarine. At various times, FBI, Internal Revenue, Food and Drug, State and city officials have had to cope with big-time racketeers, as well as small fry, in oleomargarine frauds in various parts of the country. Convictions and imprisonments are a matter of court records. In 1916 the Treasury officially reported, "Since 1902, more than 200,000,000 pounds of colored oleomargarine have been manufactured and fraudulently sold. * * * It is believed that a great portion of this product reached the consumers as butter."

Just a few weeks ago a man went into a restaurant in Tulsa, Okla., to get a meal. On the menu were listed the following: Cakes and butter, toast and butter, buttered peas.

When they were served, the spread looked like oleomargarine, so he asked the head waiter whether they had any butter and the waiter said, "No, we do not have any butter in the place."

The 10-cent tax is only on yellow oleomargarine. No other color would be taxed 10 cents. The tax goes to the Government and helps pay for policing and discouraging of such fraud. Tax repeal would let down the bars.

Oleomargarine has a proper place in our economy. People who want it should have it. But like any other merchandise, from beans to Ford automobiles, it should be sold on its own merit.

Uncolored oleomargarine or margarine colored any color except yellow is taxed only one-fourth cent per pound. Certainly that is not discriminatory. Many things people use every day are taxed much higher and there is no complaint.

Oleomargarine is advertised as the poor man's spread. If so, its price should be in proportion to the cost of its ingredients and not in proportion to the price of butter. Professor Thomsen, of the University of Wisconsin has kept a record of the wholesale prices in Chicago for butter and margarine, and also the approximate cost of the raw materials used in margarine. The figures show that the price of margarine tends to follow the price of butter. In 1942, Professor Thomsen's figures showed that since 1929 the price of margarine has been from 32 to 70 percent the price of butter, but the wholesale price of margarine had been from 40 to 350 percent over the cost of the ingredients. During the same period the selling price of butter, even when selling at depression prices, was never 20 percent over the ingredient cost and was usually less than 10 percent over the ingredient cost.

The manufacturers claim that oleomargarine is nutritionally equal to butter. Vitamin A is now added to oleomargarine in about the same quantities as found in butter.

Recently, another valuable element in butter has been discovered which promotes growth. This is contained in butterfat and is not found in oleomargarine or vegetable oils. It makes butter much better for children than oleomargarine would be.

Butter comes from milk, the food which nature provides to nourish the young and give them a start in life. It is a question if scientists will ever learn all there is to know about it. It cannot be proved that oleomargarine is nutritionally equal to butter. Therefore, such claims should not be made for it.

Aside from the relative merits of butter and oleomargarine, it should be borne in mind that butter has a pronounced influence on employment in this country. The raising of feed and the caring for cows, the transportation of the cream to the creameries, the manufacture of the butter, the making of the containers in which it is packed, the shipping to market, and the hauling to the stores—all furnish jobs for a lot of people. Butter is made in thousands of creameries scattered throughout the land, whereas oleomargarine is made in a relatively few factories.

Oleomargarine is not as good as butter, and the manufacturers should not be allowed to color it in imitation of butter without paying the 10-cent tax. That does not compel the consumer to pay 10 cents more, for he can get the uncolored product on which there is no 10-cent tax.

D. K. HOWE,
Vice President.

A copy of this memorandum was brought to the attention of one of Iowa's outstanding educators, Dr. Samuel N. Stevens, president, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa. Dr. Stevens was so im-

pressed with it that he dispatched the following letter to the Fairmont Foods Co.:

GRINNELL COLLEGE,
Grinnell, Iowa, April 13, 1948.

Mr. D. K. HOWE,
Vice President, Fairmont Foods Co.,
Omaha, Nebr.

DEAR MR. HOWE: I have just read with great interest your memorandum to the Fairmont stockholders concerning oleomargarine. I think it is the most intelligent discussion of this matter which I have read. I would like for each member of my faculty and some of my friends to have copies of this. I wonder if you would be willing to send me a hundred copies for distribution.

I want you to know that I have communicated with our Senators and Congressmen from Iowa telling them that I hope they will not yield to the pressure of this oleomargarine group and thereby expose the people in this country to another period of fraud in regard to the sale of this commodity. Most people have never thought critically about this matter. Your memorandum gives them a basis for thinking about it.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL N. STEVENS,
President.

Incidentally, Grinnell College boasts one of the oldest and foremost departments of home economics in the Nation, and it follows that the president of that great institution speaks on subjects relating to food with considerable knowledge and authority.

It is significant, Mr. Chairman, that in about half of the States our dairy farmers and the consuming public are protected against the sale of colored imitations of butter. In my State, Iowa, the applicable statutes are as follows:

CODE OF IOWA (1946) SECTION 1-194.13

SEC. 190.6. Coloring not permitted. No imitation butter or imitation cheese shall be colored with any substance and no such imitation product shall be made by mixing animal fats, vegetable oils, or other substances for the purpose or with the effect of imparting to the mixture the color of yellow butter or cheese. (Ch. 97, sec. 2518; chs. 24, 27, 31, 35, 39, sec. 3063.)

SEC. 191.3. Placard where imitation sold: Every person owning or in charge of any place where food or drink is sold who uses or serves therein imitation butter or cheese, as in this title defined, shall display at all times opposite each table or place of service a placard for each such imitation with the words "Imitation ——— served here," without other matter, printed in black roman letters not less than 3 inches in height and 2 inches in width, on a white card 12 by 22 inches in dimension. The blank after the word "Imitation" in the above form shall be filled with the name of the product imitated. (Ch. 97, sec. 2517; chs. 24, 27, 31, 35, 39, sec. 3069.)

SEC. 192.32. Oleomargarine not used in State institutions: Oleomargarine, butterine, or other products made in the imitation or semblance of natural butter produced from milk or cream or both, shall not be used as a food in the college for the blind, the school for the deaf, or any State institution under the management of the board of control. (Chs. 27, 31, 35, sec. 3043-a1; ch. 39, sec. 3043.1.)

Tax

SEC. 194.1. Amount of tax imposed: There is hereby imposed, levied, and assessed, an inspection fee and excise tax of 5 cents upon each pound of oleomargarine sold, offered, or exposed for sale, or given or delivered to a consumer, said fee and tax to be paid to the Secretary of Agriculture prior to any such sale, gift, or delivery. (Chs. 31, 35, sec. 3100-d1; ch. 39, sec. 3100-07.)

SEC. 194.3. Stamps affixed before disposal: Before any such package or carton is broken or is offered or exposed for safe, gift or distribution to a consumer, there shall be securely affixed thereto, a suitable stamp or stamps denoting the fee thereon.

SEC. 149.9. Stamping by manufacturer: The payment of the inspection fee and tax and the stamping and cancellation of any carton or package of oleomargarine by the manufacturer or importer of any oleomargarine, shall exempt all other persons from the requirements of this chapter, relative to the stamping of, and cancellation of stamps on cartons and packages of oleomargarine.

Mr. Chairman, the laws of Iowa and of other progressive States will continue to prohibit the sale of butter-colored substitutes regardless of any action the Congress may take. But, in all fairness, the Federal Government should continue to tax these products. This is little enough protection for the dairy farmer and the housewife.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, as one who comes from a deep Southern State, I am compelled to reply to the remarks made a short while ago. It is most regrettable that some of my colleagues have seen fit to threaten the farmers of that section of the country, who already have the lowest income of any people in the United States, with further poverty.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I do not yield. The gentleman cannot contribute anything, so I do not yield to him.

Mr. GROSS. I might say——

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not yield to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman. I hope I have made myself clear. I regret very much that I cannot yield to him.

I repeat, it is regrettable that some of my colleagues have seen fit to threaten a certain group of people—one of the lowest income groups in the country—with further poverty. Think of it; with further poverty only because they plead for a fair market; not an advantage, but a fair market for their products. If 75 or 80 years ago there had been a little UNRRA, ERP, or something similar passed in our direction, maybe we would not have been left so impoverished; nevertheless, none was forthcoming, although this Congress now sends billions to its former enemies in Europe while a South, bled white, got nothing but carpetbaggers, and now is threatened with impoverishment. But I am not too concerned. I have the greatest confidence in Members of the House of Representatives as a whole for fair play. May the day never come when we will have to go home to our people and tell them that sitting in Washington, representing 143,000,000 people, is a jury which will not give them a fair trial. I just do not believe that situation exists in the House of Representatives, or that it will ever exist, but should I ever come to the conclusion that it does, then I do not want to sit longer in this body. I will be ready to take up and go home; not only ready to leave the House of Representatives but ready to leave the country—and so will you.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Much has been said about who favors and who opposes repeal of the margarine taxes.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. No.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is not resigning, is he?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No; I am not resigning, neither am I declaring war on any section of the country as has been done several times here today.

Who favors removal of the taxes? Let us call the roll and see.

The consumers, generally, throughout America favor removal of the taxes. Do you represent any of them?

The Retail Grocers' Association of the United States favors removal of the taxes.

The Wholesale Grocers' Association of the United States favors removal of the taxes. I would like for some of you to keep score as I go along.

The housewives of the United States favor removal of the taxes; and the husbands, who by some of the wives are forced to mix the margarine, also favor removal of the taxes. If you check your mail you will find that that is true.

The hospitals of the United States, which are forced to pay a $600 manufacturers' tax if they use colored margarine, favor removal of the taxes.

The restaurants and dining rooms of the United States favor removal of the taxes.

The labor organizations of the United States, all of them, favor removal of the taxes.

The women's organizations of the United States favor removal of the taxes. I do not remember a single one appearing before our committee in favor of their retention.

One of the veterans' organizations appeared before our committee and favored removal of the taxes. None appeared in opposition.

The American Association of Small Business appeared before the Agriculture Committee and favored removal of the taxes.

The people who use butter only were polled by the Atlantic Monthly and they favored removal of the margarine tax. The people who use margarine only were polled by the Atlantic Monthly and they favored removal of the taxes. The farmers of the country were polled by the Atlantic Monthly and the Gallup poll and a majority of them favored removal of the taxes.

The press of the country favors removal of the taxes.

The radio and radio commentators favor removal of the taxes.

Well, who does that leave favoring retention of the taxes? Only the Cudahy Packing Co. Why do they favor the retention?

The answer is that until a few months ago Cudahy had a monopoly on a new mixing package invented by a man named Peters. Through this monopoly Cudahy leaped from one of the lowest of 26 margarine manufacturers to either

third of fourth position. In the letter which Cudahy recently distributed among you, they said not one word about their monopoly or their contract with Peters. Oh, no; they said nothing about that but they sent a witness before our committee from whom the facts were evoked. I charge that Cudahy's position is entirely a selfish one and they are in a class by themselves as no other margarine manufacturer to my knowledge opposes this legislation.

Oh, yes; I was about to forget Mr. Peters. He, too, appeared before our committee and favored retention. Of course this only means a matter of near on to a million dollars each year for him, for once the taxes are repealed and manufacturers are permitted to manufacture colored margarine, then his little capsule will not be worth 15 cents. I do not blame him. Certainly not. But the facts are that a majority of the people of this land in each and every group favor removal of the taxes. Everyone is out of step but the Cudahy Packing Co. and Mr. Peters.

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, let us keep the record straight. Let us find out just what all this oleomargarine fuss is about. The truth is that a few large manufacturers of oleo wish to deceive the public. They wish to steal the trademark of butter. They wish to color their oleomargarine the same color as butter so that the unsuspecting public may be fooled, and fed oleo in place of butter.

Of course, these manufacturers have succeeded in fooling people and arousing a false emotional sentiment. They spent thousands in advertising. However, the time has arrived that Members of Congress help shape a legitimate and honest public opinion, rather than blindly accept and follow false propaganda.

I am sure that a majority on this floor will not permit themselves to be stampeded into becoming an accomplice in the perpetration of a fraud. There is only one reason why some of the manufacturers of oleo want to steal the trademark of butter, and that is to perpetrate a fraud upon the public. They want to color their product yellow so that the consuming public will not know the difference between it and butter.

The natural color of oleo, if made from soya beans, is brown—if made from cotton seed it is green, unless infested with sufficient pink boll weevil worms, and then it may become pinkish. I have no objection to oleo provided it is offered in its natural color, or any other color except the trade-mark of butter—yellow. If anyone wishes to deceive themselves, and do not like the color white, let them have brown, green or pink oleo, or any other color, but let this Congress not become an accomplice to a fraud—to deception.

I am confident that if a majority of the members of this House permit themselves to be stampeded into assisting a few manufacturers to perpetrate deception upon an unsuspecting public, that the Senate will not follow in their steps. You will then find yourselves in the embarrassing position of explaining your vote when the truth becomes known, and remember that the truth will out.

May I also call the attention of the Members of this House, and the public to the fact that we must not be foolish enough to cut off our noses to spite our faces. It has been incorrectly stated that the farmer gets 76 cents out of every dollar you pay for butter. That is not true.

The farmer pays for the raising of the calf until it becomes a cow. He pays for the parent stock producing the calf. He feeds and houses the calf until it becomes a cow. Then, he pays for the labor and the feed to produce the milk that produces the butter. The same cow also produces the calf that produces the veal cutlets and veal roasts you so much desire. The same cow also produces the milk that you drink, as well as the butter you eat.

It is a balanced economy, and the farmer and his family get less for providing you with this balanced economy than you who work in the cities and towns. Why should you now, because of a false hysteria created by paid advertisements, permit yourselves to be fooled and to destroy this economy upon which you and your families depend?

No, we must not become the victims of false hysteria. Some leading manufacturers of oleomargarine have sense enough to know that this kind of legislation is dangerous, and may even spell disaster for oleomargarine.

Here is the position of the Cudahy Packing Co., one of the largest manufacturers of oleomargarine. This company feels that from the standpoint of the welfare of all segments of our economy, no change need be made. It feels that the present laws are not unfair or unjust, and that the dairy farmer is entitled to the protection of these laws against unfair competition, and imitation products. This, the same as any businessman is entitled to protection against imitations of his manufactured products.

The Cudahy Co. feels that the one-fourth cent per pound on oleo not colored yellow is too small to make a fuss about, and is necessary for protection. It also feels that the license fees, paid by the retailer, wholesaler, and manufacturer, are small because they are passed on to the consumer, and amount to less than 40 cents per year to the consumer—less than 1 cent a week.

This company feels that other industries in food, drugs, clothing and shelter have gotten us to change our living habits without resorting to imitations of competing articles, and that the oleomargarine industry could and should do the same without imitating the color, or stealing the trade-mark of butter.

This company shows that the benefits that might accrue to cotton and soyabeans farmers are so insignificant, compared with the certain disastrous effects that would be produced for dairymen by reducing the tax on yellow oleomargarine, that we should pause and examine carefully the implications of these laws before tampering with them.

It shows that these margarine laws have helped the consumer rather than hurt him, and that it has placed the oleomargarine industry on its good behavior, and that, because of these laws, the margarine industry has been compelled to improve and produce a palatable and nutritious product dressed up in snow white.

It is the contention of the Cudahy Co. that the oleomargarine industry has not been hurt by these laws. Over the past several decades sales have been on a gradually ascending curve. If any hurt has come to the oleomargarine industry it has been self-inflicted. During the past several decades the industry has encouraged rather than discouraged the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice. Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dollars encouraging the consumer to serve oleomargarine white, she would probably have become accustomed to using it that way today.

APRIL 22, 1948.

Hon. W. LEMKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Why are oleomargarine manufacturers so insistent upon demanding that they be given the unrestricted right to color their product yellow?

They say it's because custom has made the consumer expect the spread upon her bread to be colored yellow. But what created that custom? Butter, of course; yellow butter. And so the oleomargarine manufacturer, himself, admits that he wants to foist his product upon the American people in the guise of something that it is not.

The consumer readily accepts the purple of grape jelly, the rich red of current jelly, and the gold of orange marmalade as a spread upon her bread, just as she accepts the green of mint sauce for her lamb roast, and finds nothing objectionable in the greenish tinge of applesauce.

The foods upon our tables are of every color and hue—from the deep red color of meat to the white stalk of celery. And none does the housewife find objectionable. There is, then, solid background for almost any color that the oleo manufacturer may care to use (and which the dairy industry has no objection to his using—tax-free), but he insists that only one color will serve his purpose: the color of the product he is trying to imitate.

Our neighbors to the north prohibit the manufacture of oleomargarine; we ask only that the tax on yellow margarine be continued. Do not retard the growth of agriculture in our great Midwest and Northwest by voting for repeal of the tax.

Sincerely,
WISCONSIN BUTTERMAKERS ASSOCIATION,
R. V. EIRSCHELE, *President.*

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ARENDS). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Committee will rise at 4 o'clock. It is also my understanding of the rules that this Committee should meet tomorrow in order to have continuous consideration of the pending legislation.

I would like to have a ruling of the Chair as to whether or not the rules provide that a day may intervene so that this legislation may be taken up on Wednesday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that is a matter for the Speaker of the House and the House itself to determine. It is not something within the jurisdiction of the Chair to decide.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, those of us who propose the repeal of the punitive taxes and regulations now levied and imposed on the manufacture, distribution, and sale of margarine do not ask special favors for any product of the American farm, and I do not believe that any group in this country has any right to deny a food produced by another group a right to openly and honestly compete for the consumers' patronage. And that, Mr. Chairman, is the heart of the present controversy.

Those of us who ask the repeal of these discriminatory taxes and license fees believe in free enterprise, and we believe that every group has the same right to enjoy a free market for its products. We believe in the freedom of the consuming public to buy the product they want. We believe that Government exceeds its proper function when it tells the housewife that if she desires to buy yellow margarine that she must pay a penalty to the Government, but that if she is willing to pay twice as much for a pound of butter artificially colored with the same yellow coloring that her Government will assess no penalty.

The effect of such a policy is nothing more than to license the butter manufacturers to collect from the consumer the penalty which the Government imposes upon a competitor's product. That is, this was the effect when the consumer could get butter. But, to aggravate an inexcusable piece of favoritism, the original beneficiaries of this tax-created quasi monopoly have smugly accepted all of the benefits of Government favoritism with no recognition of any responsibility toward the public to even supply the needed table spread. This utter disregard for the needs of the public is readily shown by the failure of the butter industry to supply the butter the public needs. In 1901, the last year the American people were free to buy colored margarine, they consumed 19.9 pounds of butter per capita and 1.6 pounds of margarine. In 1902, the first year of the tax against colored margarine, the consumption of margarine fell off to nine-tenths of a pound per person, but either the demand or the supply of butter also fell off, because in 1902 we consumed only 17.5 pounds of butter.

Certainly no butter producer profited by this attack on margarine. As a matter of fact, butter producers never have gained anything from the dog-in-the-manger attitude, and I propose to show conclusively that it has been exactly that—a dog-in-the-manger attitude—which has helped no one, but which has lowered the whole standard of American living, especially the living standards of those least able to pay the exorbitant prices charged for tax-protected butter in the retail stores of the great cities.

In 1901 the American people enjoyed 21.5 pounds of spread per capita. Never since this punitive tax was placed on yellow margarine by the butter interests has there been so much spread. Never has there been so much butter available. Last year the American people were able to buy only 11.2 pounds of butter per capita—less than 60 percent of what they were using when the butter interests secured this legislative quasi monopoly. Is that fair play? Is that free enterprise? Do we not recognize that where public utilities are given monopolies or partial monopolies that in turn they owe the public a duty to supply the public needs and at reasonable prices? Certainly the butter industry has shamefully failed to supply the public need. On the other hand, margarine, laboring under the handicap of the most vicious and undemocratic punitive taxes ever levied against a wholesome food product in our country, has increased its production from 1.6 pounds per capita in 1901 to approximately 5 pounds last year.

And what about price? What has the butter industry done to carry out its obligations as a governmentally favored quasi monopoly? Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not believe in price controls in peacetime, and surely I would not complain of any price the butter people saw fit to establish in a free competitive economy, but since they have seen fit to take themselves out of such a free competitive economy, and to invoke the strong arm of the Federal Government in behalf of their monopolistic position, they must, in good conscience, be willing to assume some degree of public responsibility in return. I think I have shown that they have either failed terribly in their duty to provide the public with an adequate supply of butter, or worse, they have used their governmental protection to deliberately reduce the supply of butter in an effort to increase their profits at the expense of the very American citizens who gave them their favored position. Surely no one will contend that present prices of butter are such as to encourage the widespread use of the product. Actually, what is happening is that the distributors are letting their greed destroy the long-time interests of the dairy farmer, just as governmentally favored groups always do.

The very next day after the majority of the Agriculture Committee voted not to consider any repeal of the taxes on margarine, the price of butter went up 8 cents, and the next day it advanced another 5 cents right here in Washington. After this spectacular evidence that the butter processors were committed to a policy of charging the consumer all the traffic would bear, I undertook to find out just what benefits the producer, the man who milks the cows, received from this gouge of the consuming public. I called five of the leading processing dairies of Washington. These were all wholesale establishments who buy milk from the farmer. I asked how much they had increased the price they paid for milk. Not one claimed to have increased their payments to farmers by a single cent. No, my friends, it is not the actual farmer who profits by this monopoly.

In the long run, the farmer makes far more out of the sale of fluid milk than he does out of the sale of butter. The Nation gets far more nutritional value out of fluid milk. We do not produce nearly enough fluid milk to meet our minimum needs. Only high retail prices prevent the consumption of far more fluid milk in this country to the mutual benefit of the dairy farmer and the consumer. Who is today sabotaging the increase in the use of fluid milk? Surely the farmer does not receive too much, but clearly the public is often charged too much. I have recently returned from the great milk-producing State of Wisconsin, where on my trip I paid 20 cents for a glass of milk on the railroad diner. Of course, people rather expect to be gouged on dining cars, but when I had to pay 13 cents per glass in a restaurant, I wondered if the same people who have reduced America's butter supply in order to gouge the consumers might not be now applying the same tactics to the dairy farmers who have so long supplied the farmer interest which these distributors have claimed to represent. My suggestion to my dairy farmers is to cut loose from a distribution system that is based on the monopolistic principles of scarcity and prices as high as the traffic will stand and join up with the more modern and more successful principle of abundance at fair prices.

Coca-Cola has done a better job of selling its product in competition with Pepsi-Cola, and a whole host of other drinks that look and taste like it, without any special tax on its competitors, than the butter monopoly has in expanding any market for the dairy farmers. If I were a dairy farmer, I believe I would be looking for some new leadership, and maybe that is what the dairy farmers of Wisconsin have decided who recently asked for repeal of their State's almost prohibitive taxes against margarine.

We ask no advantage for margarine. We are willing to provide strict penalties for any fraud or deception. We agree that anyone who tries to sell margarine as butter should be punished just as we believe that anyone who tries to sell cotton as wool should be punished, but just as we are unwilling to tax all cotton cloth just because someone might at some time try to pass it off as wool, so we are unwilling to impose a tax on a wholesome food product because there are dishonest people in the world. On the contrary, we say, "Punish the dishonest dealer, not the innocent public."

I am not going to impose on your time to rehash the old arguments of the relative food value of butter and margarine. Today every informed person knows that there is no significant difference on this score. Margarine is required to state the fact that it contains artificial color if it does. Butter is not required to disclose the presence of artificial coloring. As far as I know, it is the only food product which can use artificial color without revealing that fact.

I do not want to take your time with a discussion of the question of the relative purity of the two products. Suffice it to say that while the propaganda package of the butter industry contains a second edition of a booklet entitled "Colored Oleo Sold as Butter," this book recites the history of only six such cases and conveniently forgets to state the pe-

riod of years covered. Evidently it goes back a number of years, but I have seen the record of seizures of both margarine and of butter by the United States Food and Drug Administration for the past 17 years. Since 1930 there have been only 32 seizures of margarine. Only two of these involved filth. During the same time there were 2,910 seizures of butter, and 652 of these involved filth. Last year there were 127 seizures of butter and not one of margarine. Who does it look like should be policed?

Now, there is just one more feature of this question of monopoly that I want to discuss. That relates to the remarkable attitude of the Cudahy Packing Co., which company holds a license for the use of a bag or container for margarine which the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation states makes it "actually fun" to mix coloring into margarine. Of course, the sincerity of this organization might be open to question. If they sincerely believe their statement that it is actually fun to mix coloring into margarine by the use of the Cudahy Packing Co. bag, why do not they put the coloring in a pill and sell it to the public along with their winter white butter rather than to mix it before offering it to the public? There is no law or tax to prevent it. Why do they deny to their butter customers the "actual fun" which they say Cudahy Packing Co. offers with margarine?

To go a little further, on April 22, 1948, Mr. Charles W. Holman, secretary of this association, addressed a communication to every Member of this House in which he states:

> As for the contention that the housewife is entitled to yellow oleo—she may certainly have it if she wants it. Modern packaging permits her to color it easily, quickly, and without waste.

I submit that the experiences of most of the 31,000,000 American families who use margarine is not in keeping with Mr. Holman's statement.

Actually, all of this free advertising that the butter people have given to the patented package used by Cudahy Packing Co. is rather easy to understand when we recall that Cudahy has within recent years bought the franchise to use this package and with it the company has had a change of heart in regard to colored margarine. The entire value of Cudahy's franchise and of Mr. Leo Peters' patent depend on the maintenance of the present tax prohibiting manufacture of colored margarine.

Today only a few margarine manufacturers are licensed to use Mr. Peters' bag—Cudahy is the only really large producer. If the manufacturers of margarine were allowed to color their product before it was distributed, Cudahy would have to meet competition on price and quality and Mr. Peters would have an absolutely worthless patent. I think it may, therefore, be understood why Mr. Peters is so ready to make almost any sacrifice to prevent coloring of margarine at the factory, and why Mr. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co. has gone to such lengths to urge each Member of this House to retain these taxes. Mr. Peters and Mr. Hoffman are but the lesser leeches who suck the livelihood of the American consumers under protection of the larger monopoly which the butter interests have so long enjoyed. What could be more natural than for the beneficiaries of legislative favoritism to get together.

Mr. Chairman, America is a big land. It is a land of opportunity, but it is not big enough to grant any group a monopoly or a partial monopoly on any of the essentials of ordinary living.

If you want the butter industry to be regulated as a public utility; if you think it is entitled to a monopoly, you should be frank enough to say to this body that you look upon the butter industry as a public utility and that you will accept the responsibilities of public utilities that go with the privileges and quasimonopoly position which it has enjoyed for nearly 50 years.

It has failed to accept those responsibilities. It is giving the public only about 60 percent of the butter that the public was getting before the passage of these restrictive laws against margarine.

It has not kept faith with the butter producers of America because it has reduced their market. It has taken away from the dairymen themselves the opportunity to sell to the American people 19.6 pounds of butter as they were selling before these laws against colored margarine were passed.

There has never been a year since the passage of these laws that the dairy people of America have sold as much butter per capita as they sold before the laws. They have not increased the production of butter. They have not helped the dairy producer.

They have not put any money into the pockets of the man who milks the cows. They have enabled a monopoly, a monopoly established and maintained by the laws of this Nation, to milk the dairy farmers at the expense of the dairy farmers and at the expense of the consuming public. They have done it with utter disregard for the rights of millions of other American farmers, many more, who produce cottonseed and who produce soybean oil. They have said to those people that even though you have a wholesome product and the American people want to buy it, still it will be taxed.

I only ask that we wipe out monopoly and favoritism. Let the people of America decide for themselves what spread they want on their tables and how they want it colored.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the discharge of the Committee on Agriculture from further consideration of the bill to repeal oleo taxes is one of the few instances in the history of Congress when such a step has been taken. The basis of the discharge was a petition signed by 152 Democrats and 66 Republicans, a bipartisan combination formed to swell the profits of the vegetable oil interests to the damage and destruction of the butter trade of the Northwest.

The tactics of this bipartisan combination are further in evidence by the limited time allowed for debate upon the bill for the repeal of all oleomargarine taxes introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. These laws for the protection of the dairy industry were enacted nearly 60 years ago, and with but slight amendment have continued in force until the present day. No other form of protection for the dairy farmer has been suggested, much less advanced. Now that the success and the consequent exuberance of the proponents of this movement are so firmly fixed, even the representatives from dairy districts will have but limited opportunity to enter their protests. Backed by the same bipartisan combination, the bill may pass.

For months the propaganda financed by the vegetable oil monopolies and their associated industries has been carried on. People have been led to believe by extensive advertising that they are being taxed unjustly, while the fact is that of the more than 600,000,000 pounds of all oleo made in this country last year, less than 18,000,000 pounds were taxed the 10 cents per pound on colored oleo. Only 18,000,000 pounds were sold. If this scheme works out, as its promoters hope that it will, it will only be a little time until oleo will have an increased price in the markets. For the month of February this year, oleo production totaled 80,418,000 pounds or 12,668,000 pounds over February of last year. Butter production had fallen off by 20,000,000 pounds in a single year to 77,545,000 pounds. It is the ambition and the purpose of those fostering this legislation to continue the increase in oleo production, and that decrease in the butter made from the farms of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and other Northwestern States.

It is alleged that over 40 percent of all the oleo made in this country is produced in plants owned by a British cartel, which has monopolistic control over the palm oil, coconut oil, and other vegetable oils of the world. Fortune magazine is authority for these facts. Some few cotton planters may imagine that this measure will serve their interests by an increased price on cottonseed oil. Peanut growers of the South may think that they will profit in the peanut-oil markets. Both have been especially favored by a recent enactment of Congress providing for the purchase of vegetable oils, among others, for shipment to foreign lands. Included in the first shipment will be 40,000 tons of peanut oil, and 10,000 tons of cottonseed oil. But the vegetable-oil dealers of our own country will discover that within the course of a few months, if not in a few weeks, foreign oils produced, owned, and controlled by the vegetable-oil monopolies, will commence to flow into our ports. Possibly even now reciprocal trade manipulators may be sitting behind closed doors preparing for such importations, and listening to the same lobbyists whose voices have been so potent in the attack on the butter industry.

Millions of dollars have been spent on advertising and propaganda, and many householders have been led to believe that they are paying a tax of 10 cents a pound on oleomargarine, when as a matter of fact, a very small portion of oleo has been sold in colored form. The purpose of this law is to permit colored oleo, possibly made from palm oil, coconut oil, babassu oil, and so forth, to be sold in competition with butter, and to be

actually sold as butter. It was that unfair competition, the selling of oleo as butter, which led to the enactment of the original law. The oleo manufacturers want to make their product yellow in order to imitate butter, and take over the table-spread market in America. The consumers will not gain, but the farmers will lose.

The dairy people of Wisconsin are strongly aroused by this bipartisan attack on their great butter industry. There are nearly 600 cooperative creameries in Wisconsin. Those cooperatives have the fear that their creameries will soon follow the 600 cheese factories which have been closed in the past few years by monopolistic competition, and be forced out of business.

The demand of the consumers which has been whipped up by the powerful propaganda and advertising of the oleo interests will then find another side of the picture that has been painted. Practically all of the dried skim-milk powder comes from the sections of the West which produce butter. It is made from the dried-milk solids after the cream has been removed from the whole milk. Dried skim-milk powder has become an important factor for household use as well as for industrial purposes. Last year over 700,000,000 pounds of powdered skim milk was sold. The Department of Agriculture claims that at this time there is such a scarcity of dry-milk powder that they are unable to fill the demand for it. If the dairy farmers lose because of this legislation, they will naturally reduce their dairy herds. In doing so, we shall lose not only their production, but also we shall lose in the meat supply which comes from the annual sale of calves which forms a big part of our meat supply. The householder is going to find in many ways that this measure is more destructive to his household than is stated in any of the talks heard here.

There will be amendments offered to this measure, none of which should be adopted. It is a straight-out issue of the protection of the farmers and the dairymen as against the profits of the margarine makers. The public pays a tax of only one-quarter cent on uncolored oleo. Nobody objects to the people buying and eating oleo if they prefer it. The tax is a mere incident so far as uncolored oleo is concerned, as no consumer feels the burden. It is only when oleo is colored an imitation of butter that objection is raised.

I have received hundreds of communications of protest from the dairy people of Wisconsin relative to the repeal of oleo taxes. It is impossible to include all of the protests in my remarks. I shall, however, under permission previously granted, insert in the RECORD communications from the Pigeon Falls Cooperative Creamery, Pigeon Falls, Wis., representing 352 patrons; the Twenty-fourth District Cooperative Association, Wis.; the Wisconsin Buttermakers Association, which is a large organization; also that of the Wisconsin Restaurant Association, protesting that the passage of such a measure as this will put honest hotel and restaurant proprietors in competition with those who will use oleo instead of butter on the tables of their establishments. Also a letter from John D. Wuethrich of the John Wuethrich Creamery Co., Greenwood, Wis., expressing the alarm of the independent creameries over the dangers involved in permitting oleo to come into the markets and permitted to be sold as butter. These are only a few of the hundreds of protests I have received, and other members of the Wisconsin delegation have likewise been flooded with protests from their constituents over this proposed legislation.

Over 2,000,000 farm boys from the great dairy districts of the Northwest are veterans of the late war. While their fathers were laboring from 70 to 80 hours a week on the farms to respond to the demands of the Government for increased production, those young men were serving in the fox holes and trenches of the battlefields in all parts of the world. Only 3 years ago the endeavors of those dairy farmers were highly commended by the Government, and here in Congress, for the great and severe endeavors they were making. Now in less than 3 years of the close of the war these farmers and their veteran sons are being attacked by the selfish interests of one of the world's greatest cartels and monopolies. It is unfair, and it is unjust to all the people, as well as to the farmers involved.

PIGEON FALLS COOPERATIVE CREAMERY,
Pigeon Falls, Wis., April 20, 1948.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The board of directors of the Pigeon Falls Cooperative Creamery, representing 352 patrons, are opposed to a law permitting the addition of yellow coloring to oleomargarine. Oleomargarine must be regulated by law and sold on its own merits but not as an imitation of butter.

CLARENCE KAAS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES,
TWENTY-FOURTH DISTRICT,
COOOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
April 15, 1948.

HON. MERLIN HULL,
Congressman, State of Wisconsin:

The Twenty-fourth District Cooperative Association of Galesville, Wis. is comprised of 12 large cooperative creameries who are members of Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., having a total patron membership of 2,500 farmers. They manufactured a total of seven and one-half million pounds of butter for the year 1947 and are very much concerned in regard to the present oleomargarine tax bill that is being now presented to the Congressmen and Senators in Washington.

We urge you as our Representative from the State of Wisconsin to do all you can with the other Members of both the House and Senate to protect the dairy industry against the coloring of oleomargarine tax free.

We believe as dairymen that the soybean raisers and the cotton people benefit far more by the use of their products to the dairy farmers than they would be permitting the oleomargarine manufacturing people to get their influence to repeal the coloring of oleomargarine-tax law.

We further feel that once oleomargarine can be colored that it would be a greater benefit to the oleomargarine manufacturers to forget about the soybean farmer and cotton farmer and use as much of the coconut oils from the islands to be put on our market in competition with butter.

We know how you stand in the great dairy State of Wisconsin, but we want you to urge your coworkers in the Senate and House to protect the interest of the dairy farmer. This resolution was adopted by the entire district board and operators present at a meeting held on April 13, 1948, at Cochrane, Wis.

A. G. BENJAMIN,
Secretary, Twenty-fourth District Cooperative Association.

WISCONSIN BUTTERMAKERS ASSOCIATION,
Chippewa Falls, Wis., April 22, 1948.

HON. M. HULL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Why are oleomargarine manufacturers so insistent upon demanding that they be given the unrestricted right to color their product yellow?

They say it's because custom has made the consumer expect the spread upon her bread to be colored yellow. But what created that custom? Butter, of course; yellow butter. And so the oleomargarine manufacturer himself admits that he wants to foist his product upon the American people in the guise of something that it is not.

The consumer readily accepts the purple of grape jelly, the rich red of currant jelly, and the gold of orange marmalade as a spread upon her bread, just as she accepts the green of mint sauce for her lamb roast, and finds nothing objectionable in the greenish tinge of applesauce.

The foods upon our tables are of every color and hue—from the deep red color of meat to the white stalk of celery. And none does the housewife find objectionable. There is, then, solid background for almost any color that the oleo manufacturer may care to use (and which the dairy industry has no objection to his using, tax free), but he insists that only one color will serve his purpose—the color of the product he is trying to imitate.

Our neighbors to the north prohibit the manufacture of oleomargarine—we ask only that the tax on yellow margarine be continued. Do not retard the growth of agriculture in our great Midwest and Northwest by voting for repeal of the tax.

WISCONSIN BUTTERMAKERS ASSOCIATION,
R. V. EIRSCHELE, *President.*

RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION PROTESTS

Resolution on oleomargarine

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation to repeal the tax on oleomargarine which, if adopted, would have the effect of reducing the price of oleomargarine to below that of butter and be a temptation to serve oleomargarine in restaurants; and

Whereas experience in the food-service industry in Wisconsin has established that the public will be opposed to the serving of oleomargarine in public eating places; and

Whereas the proposed measure will have an unfavorable effect upon the dairy industry in the State of Wisconsin and upon the State economy as a whole by reason thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the association opposes the repeal of such tax; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to all of the Wisconsin Senators and Representatives in Washington.

WISCONSIN RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION.

A LETTER TO SECRETARY ANDERSON

ARCADIA, WIS., *April 5, 1948.*

Secretary of Agriculture CLINTON ANDERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There is considerable pressure being used to take off the oleo tax.

For the past 15 years your Department has been interested in soil conservation. Never-

theless, at the rate we are losing our topsoil we can only last another 50 years or so. Now, why can't your Department put more emphasis on saving our topsoil than they are?

We are all very much stirred up about some foreign people absorbing us. Well, why should we have the use of this great fertile land when we do not take more interest in caring for it? After the topsoil is gone the farmer and city man alike will be in the same boat. Then, after it is too late we will cry: "O God, save us." It is a blessing the Almighty gave us this last resort—the Garden of Eden to care for. But, oh, what a miserable job man has made of it. He has commercialized the world where God meant for man to care for it. Without contradiction, I believe we will all admit that.

Dairying is the best conservation that can be practiced. Therefore, why do we, and by "we" I mean all city people as well, want an oleomargarine product; a product that will spell ruination to our country? By raising soybeans to produce the oil for oleo, we loosen our soil and it becomes an easy prey to rain and wind. You may say that education will remedy this among the producers, but by the time you educate the producer to do this, the soil will be gone. Why can't your Department put out some literature that our dairy Congressmen can use to show Congressmen from other parts of our country that this is a wrong way to use our soils?

Furthermore, the oleo people are encroaching upon butter's natural color. Is there not protection to this encroachment? Also, they say that vitamins can be added to oleo which will make oleo equal to butter in value. Maybe after 25 years this can be proven but then it will be too late.

For sake of argument we will say the dairy factories will go to manufacturing oleo instead of butter. We may do it. Would it be healthy for our Nation in more ways than one?

I wish you would do something along these lines.

A-G COOPERATIVE CREAMERY,
A. C. SCHULTZ.

JOHN WUETHRICH CREAMERY CO.,
Greenwood, Wis., March 6, 1948.

The Honorable MERLIN HULL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HULL: We are very much concerned over this matter of oleomargarine, and we know that you are very active in the fight for butter. We wish you well in your efforts.

We in the dairy business are particularly concerned because if this oleomargarine consumption keeps on increasing, eventually it is going to raise "cain" with our whole dairy economy. You know the story as well as I or perhaps better. They are trying to imitate butter in every sense of the word. The color factor is about the only protection we have had, and if oleo is so good, why then don't they make it a distinctive color of its own, say black or purple, and not try to pull a fraud on the American public by making them think in many instances that they are getting butter—particularly in restaurants and hospitals as well as other places.

I quote the following information from a letter that Professor Thomson from the University of Wisconsin sent us:

"Now as to some of the special nutritional constituents: Butter contains on an average 15,000 international units of vitamin A. It varies from about 12,000 to 18,000. Since about two-thirds of the butter is produced during the summer months, it is natural to assume that it will approach the 18,000 figure for the above percentage of butter. Summer butter contains vitamin E in an amount equal to that found in green vegetables for the same weight. It seems that the vitamin E protects the vitamin A from destruction. For this reason the vitamin A with which oleomargarine is fortified has a tendency to be destroyed almost 50 percent when oleomargarine is stored for periods of 5 months or longer. Even though the oils from which oleomargarine is made contain appreciable quantities of vitamin E, this vitamin is destroyed in the process known as hydrogenation when oleomargarine is manufactured.

"More recently it has been shown that summer butter contains a growth-promoting substance which is distinct from the known fat soluble vitamins and the essential fatty acids. The new factor has been identified as vaccenic acid. Vaccenic acid appears to be present only in fats of animal origin. Butter has been found superior to other animal fats which have been tested. Oleomargarine apparently contains no vaccenic acid.

"Apparently there is still another growth-promoting nutrient present in butter. It apparently is in the nonfat or curd portion. The vegetable oils from which oleomargarine is made do not contain this substance, but I presume it might be added along with the skim milk which oleomargarine manufacturers use. Butterfat has been shown to exert a favorable influence on vitamin producing intestinal flora of animals. A similar favorable effect was not found in the case of the vegetable oils which have been tested."

Of course, we realize the main thing that is causing the present disturbance is the high price of butter and the customer acceptance of it. If butter were plentiful, the fight would be easier. Now, with the present high cost, they try to bring out that the customer is being penalized by using oleomargarine. There is no product that returns as much of the customers' dollar to the farmer as butter. Oleomargarine is decidedly a big profit item for the manufacturer and he is doing a swell job of making the customer think these taxes are hurting him. When cheaper oils and fats are available, they will be imported, and the soybean and cottonseed growers will not enjoy the favorable position they hold today.

It was indeed discouraging last night to pick up the Life magazine and see them come out flatly in favor of repealing the tax presently on oleomargarine.

The growth factor particularly in small children is very important and nothing supplies these elements as they are put up in the form of butter.

We hope that these taxes will not be removed and the customer hoodwinked into thinking he is getting something he is not. If a fellow wants to buy this over a counter as oleomargarine, that is his own privilege, but when he is sick in a hospital or eating out, he should know what he is getting.

We believe the dairy people will have to put forth every effort to show the consumer why he should use only butter.

Yours truly,
JOHN WUETHRICH CREAMERY CO.
JOHN D. WUETHRICH.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ARENDS, 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. 2245) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Since this is the pending business, suppose the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] determines not to move tomorrow that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the pending bill; would that jeopardize his chances of making that motion on Wednesday?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, my only purpose in saying anything now is that we are establishing a precedent here that is most important. I think it is clear that the House can do almost anything by unanimous consent, but I am just as convinced that a special privilege created by a special rule like the discharge rule, is entirely different from a privilege under the general rules attaching, for instance, to appropriation bills. It is my thought that when this discharge rule was written, as amended, the rule was specific in providing that when by discharge petition the ordinary procedure of the House was changed and interfered with, and the House voted to discharge the committee, those in favor of considering the legislation affected by the discharge petition, may immediately—and I stress the word immediately—bring the matter before the House, and the House shall immediately proceed to a conclusion of the consideration, and if the conclusion is not reached on the first day, then this legislation shall be the unfinished business until it is completed.

I am wondering whether, as a matter of reason and logic and parliamentary procedure, if other business intervenes, that special discharge rule privilege is not lost. If that were not true, the bill could be put over in the discretion of those who were responsible for the petition and who had changed the rules of the House temporarily. If the bill can be called up Wednesday instead of the following day, as unfinished, then it can be called up Thursday, or the next Thursday, or the last day before the session ended, and this bill would have a special privilege the rest of the session, conditioned only upon the general rules of the House affecting privileges like those of appropriation bills and bills from the Committee on Ways and Means.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that my only interest in this matter is as to the precedent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is interested in the valued comments of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. Of course, the Chair is unaware of the intent or purpose back of the rule when it was first formulated. All he has to guide him is the rule itself as it appears before him in print. The Chair agrees with the gentleman from Michigan that the House can immediately consider the legislation after the motion to discharge the committee is agreed to, but the rule states "and if unfinished before adjournment of the day on which it is called up,

it shall remain the unfinished business until it is fully disposed of."

That provision does not state definitely that the bill must come up on the following day, but that it shall remain the unfinished business. The gentleman's point that the bill could be postponed indefinitely of course is correct, in a sense, but after all the rules are based on common sense, and no one would anticipate that the side that procured enough signatures to a discharge petition to bring a bill before the House would filibuster their own bill.

While the rule perhaps is not quite as definite as it might be, it is the opinion of the Chair that the consideration of the bill could go over until Wednesday if the proponents of the bill do not call it up on tomorrow, and that it would be in order on Wednesday as the unfinished business.

The Chair believes that unless the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] or someone on his side of the issue, calls it up on tomorrow, it can be called up on Wednesday and will be the unfinished business on that day. The Chair also wishes to state that he will not recognize anyone on the affirmative side of this matter unless the gentleman from South Carolina is absent. It is not necessary to call it up on tomorrow and it can be called up on Wednesday, at which time it will be the unfinished business.

The Chair will also remind Members that it is always within the control of the majority of the House to determine what should be done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Must it be called up by unanimous consent on Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. No. It remains the unfinished business and can be called up by the gentleman from South Carolina or someone delegated by his side to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Then I might add further, since the Speaker mentioned a filibuster, I think I sat in on a conversation where this filibuster was well planned and it is being worked out just fine for the Wednesday meeting.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. No. It is just a comment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I am informed by the Public Printer that the extension exceeds the regular amount allowed. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Carl H. Wilken, an economic analyst, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on Friday, April 23.

LOAN TO UNITED NATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the loan of $65,000,000 to the United Nations for the construction of a permanent headquarters on the site contributed by the city of New York and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., along the East River in the Borough of Manhattan. The loan is repayable in annual installments commencing with June 1, 1951, over a period of 32 years, the average installments being $2,500,000 a year. This loan will become the obligation of the members of the United Nations through their responsibility to meet the regular budget of the United Nations of which the annual installments will become a part. The bill recalls that the Congress of the United States by House Concurrent Resolution 75, adopted in December 1945, invited the United Nations to settle here, and that largely inspired by our leadership the United Nations was conceived of as the necessary postwar machinery for peace.

The occasion of the introduction of this bill properly raises two major policy questions: Do we want the United Nations? Do we want it in the United States?

It is entirely appropriate that the legislation should be made a vehicle for the discussion of these two questions. Assuming that they are answered in the affirmative, there should be no objection to the bill itself which provides for a suitable permanent home of the United Nations in the world's greatest port where, by democratic expression of the members of the United Nations themselves, its headquarters have been located. It deals also with intolerable conditions of inadequacy of space which I found to exist by personal inspection of UN's temporary headquarters at Lake Success.

For myself, I want the UN and I want it here. All of us in considering the world's machinery for peace always make the comparison with the League of Nations which failed to preserve the peace. But the United States did not belong to the League. It does belong to the UN. The United Nations, mankind's best hope for peace, should not be interred before it has a chance to live.

Our people believe the UN to be our best hope for peace, and we must make it good or confess our inability to lead the world in the way in which our prestige, our resources, and the character of our people require.

It is my hope that this bill could be made the occasion for considering how best to implement the UN and to make it more effective. The situation which the United Nations has been unable to resolve in Palestine and Greece, the frustration which it has encountered in Korea, Trieste, Indonesia, and Spain, as well as its inability to deal with the problem of respect for treaty obligations in the Soviet satellite countries and in occupied Germany make certain shortcomings all the more apparent.

We may recall at this time that it was the United States which itself insisted on the veto. There is now considerable sentiment in the United States for removing the veto power of the permanent members of the Securtiy Council, in order to bring about the creation of an adequate security force so that the UN may not be impotent to enforce its determinations, and so that the international control of atomic weapons should be made possible. There is sentiment also for giving up the veto power when it comes to action to punish aggressors, but whether our people want as yet to give other powers the ability to commit them to war is an open question.

There are some matters in our presently complex world in which national may have to give way to international sovereignty. There seems to be a disposition in the United States to make a start along these lines. We should not permit this start to be thwarted by the veto power in the UN Charter. This sentiment may lead to consideration of international regulation free of the veto, of international communications, international aspects of health and agriculture, and international law. The subject bill may afford an opportunity to crystallize ways and means by which the gradually maturing concept of international government in certain spheres may be effectively initiated.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include a short letter from the Buttermakers' Association of Wisconsin.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Elmer G. Peterson.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include certain material.

DR. EDWARD U. CONDON

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 24, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In obedience to its provision, the Clerk transmitted to the Secretary of Commerce on April 23, 1948, an attested copy of House Resolution No. 522 of the Eightieth Congress.

The letter of the Acting Secretary of Commerce, dated April 23, 1948, in response to said resolution, addressed to the Clerk and received in his office at 11:25 o'clock a. m., on April 24, 1948, is transmitted herewith for the information of the House.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the letter from the Secretary.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, April 23, 1948.

Hon. JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: I refer to your communication of today transmitting an attested copy of House Resolution 522, the receipt of which I have already acknowledged. My action in response to the resolution is governed by the President's directive of March 13, 1948, which provides as follows:

"The efficient and just administration of the employee loyalty program, under Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, requires that reports, records, and files relative to the program be preserved in strict confidence. This is necessary in the interest of our national security and welfare, to preserve the confidential character and sources of information furnished, and to protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations. It is necessary also in order to insure the fair and just disposition of loyalty cases.

"For these reasons, and in accordance with the long-established policy that reports rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the executive branch are to be regarded as confidential, all reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees (including reports of such investigative agencies) shall be maintained in confidence and shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business.

"Any subpena or demand or request for information, reports, or files of the nature described, received from sources other than those persons in the executive branch of the Government who are entitled thereto by reason of their official duties, shall be respectfully declined, on the basis of this directive, and the subpena or demand or other request shall be referred to the Office of the President for such response as the President may determine to be in the public interest in the particular case. There shall be no relaxation of the provisions of this directive except with my express authority."

The letter referred to in the resolution is part of the Loyalty Board files of the Department, and I must, therefore, respectfully decline to transmit the document to the House of Representatives. In further compliance with the directive, I am referring the matter to the President.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

The communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

SUBPENA DUCES TECUM

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIRS: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received 11 subpenas duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court on the 26th day of April 1948 at 10 o'clock a. m., as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Dalton Trumbo* (No. 1353–47 Criminal Docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

Your attention and that of the House is respectfully invited to a resolution of the House adopted in the Forty-sixth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 680), upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary as follows:

"*Resolved*, That no officer or employee of the House of Representatives has the right, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, to produce any document, paper, or book belonging to the files of the House before any court or officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony given or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied and such as the House itself may have made public, to be taken without the consent of the House first obtained."

And to a resolution adopted by the House in the Forty-ninth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1295), from which the following is quoted:

"*Resolved*, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission.

"That when it appears by the order of a court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House."

These resolutions result from the issuance of subpena duces tecum upon the Clerk of the House to produce certain original papers in the files of the House.

Permission to remove from their place of file or from the custody of the Clerk, any papers, was denied by the House but court afforded facilities to make certain copies of papers to be secured from the House. This seems to be the uniform procedure in the case of subpenas duces tecum served upon the Clerk of the House of Representatives to produce original papers from the files of the House.

The subpenas in question are herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A, attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, including but not limited to:

Author	Date	House Report Nos.	Congress	Session
Wood	Mar. 28, 1946	1829	79th	2d.
Do		1936	do	Do.
Do	May 10, 1946	1936	do	Do.
Adamson	May 29, 1946. Report to Wood. Citations by official Government agencies and private organizations regarding the character of organizations named.			
Wood	June 26, 1946	2233	79th	Do.
Do	June 26, 1946. Corliss Lamont	2354	do	Do.
Do	July 31, 1946, George Marshall	2707	do	Do.
Do	July 31, 1946, Richard Morford	2708	do	Do.
Do		2742	do	Do.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1945: Executive hearings that were released by the committee December 15, 1944;

September 20, 1939–April 19, 1943; volumes 1 through 7.

1946: September 26–October 19, 1945, Communist Party; June 20–27, 1945, OPA; January 30, 1945, G. L. K. Smith; April 4, 1946, E. B. Jarg (JAFRC).

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, which are allegedly subversive or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, which are alleged subversive or un-American.

9. For the period from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

10. Copies of letter sent by KARL E. MUNDT, member of the committee, to Gov. Thomas E. Bailey, of Mississippi, and approximately 99 others on or about January 20, 1945, relating to a suitable and working criterion to determine what does and what does not comprise un-American propaganda activity, together with the data and material mailed therewith and all replies received thereto, and all further correspondence with the same individuals in connection therewith and such additional correspondence received from other individuals and/or organizations pertaining to the establishment of the working criterion above set forth as to the definition of the term un-American and/or subversive; all stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee and all its members and other memoranda relating to the said letter.

11. Copies of all letters sent by or on behalf of the committee or by any members thereof to the Brookings Institution between January 3, 1945, and April 15, 1945, relating to a working criterion for determining what constitutes un-American propaganda activity, or relating to an analysis of letters received purporting to define un-American propaganda; together with all letters received from the Brookings Institution in connection therewith.

12. The report or memorandum submitted to the committee by the Brookings Institution between January 3, 1945 and April 15, 1945, relating to or entitled "Suggested Standards for Determining Un-American Activities," and all stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee and all its minutes and other memoranda relating to the said report or memorandum.

13. Memorandum of six paragraphs sent to the committee or to KARL E. MUNDT, committee member, by the American Civil Liberties Union during February 1945, relating to Un-American activities, and letter accompanying same.

14. Minutes and transcripts of meetings and executive sessions, not limited to but including, committee action on or about February 21, 1945, relating to a request to the Brookings Institution to analyze the replies to MUNDT's letter of January 20, 1945, concerning the working criterion of what comprises an Un-American propaganda activity, and to suggest standards for determining un-American propaganda activities.

15. Copy of letter sent by the counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism in which it was stated that the said National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism is engaged in solicitation of money for the purpose of controlling the thoughts of American citizens, and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto, said letter being referred to in CRA, March 1, 1946, at page 1120.

16. Copy of letter sent by counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Veterans Against Discrimination in which letter it was noted that the Veterans Against Discrimination had referred to democracy several times and in which it was called to the attention of the Veterans Against Discrimination that the United States is a Republic and not a democracy, which letter was referred to in CRA, January 29, 1946, at page 740, and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY H. HULL,
Clerk.
MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenney and David Carliner attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same since October 20, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members since October 20, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1948: September 24–26, 1947, October 20–30, 1947, Hans Eisler, Hollywood.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee since October 20, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee since October 20, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, which are allegedly subversive or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, which are alleged subversive or un-American.

9. For the period since October 20, 1947, to date, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and Reports of Investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion-picture industry from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, group, or individuals between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by

any of its investigators and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the committee considered and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk*,
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion-picture industry from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, at which the committee considered, and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between October 30, 1947 to date, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion picture industry from October 30, 1947 to date.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from October 30, 1947 to date.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between October 30, 1947 to date, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947 to date, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between October 30, 1947, to date concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators, H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period October 30, 1947, to date.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from October 30, 1947, to date, at which the committee considered, and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947, to date.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947, to date.

11. Transcripts of hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 20 through October 30, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry and all exhibits and applications and motions of counsel for all witnesses who appeared before the said committee at the said hearings.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorney, for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between January 1, 1947, and October 20, 1947, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion picture industry from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, whether to the press or otherwise, between January 1, 1947, and October 20, 1947, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between January 1, 1947, and October 20, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, at which the committee

considered, and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

11. Transcripts of the hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or a subcommittee thereof, in Los Angeles, Calif., concerning the motion-picture industry on of about May 1947, including specifically the testimony of Louis B. Mayer and all other executives in the motion-picture industry.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES v. DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk*,
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommitte of the same from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including but not limited to:

Author	Date	House Report Nos.	Congress	Session
Dies		2	76th	1st.
Starnes	Jan. 3, 1940	1476	do	3d.
Dies	Apr. 8, 1940. Contempt—Albert Blumberg	1937	do	Do.
Do	Mar. 29, 1940. Contempt—James H. Dolsen	1900	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940. Contempt—Philip Frankfeld	1936	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940. Contempt—Thomas F. P. O'Dea	1938	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 2, 1940. Contempt—George Powers	1904	do	Do.
Starnes (pt. I)	June 25, 1942	2277	77th	2d.
Voorhis (pt. II)	July 7, 1942	2277	do	Do.
Do	Sept. 3, 1942. Report of FBI, House Doc. 833		do	Do.
Dies	Jan. 2, 1943	2748	do	Do.
Costello	Sept. 30, 1943	717	78th	1st.
Dies	Peace Now	1161	do	2d.
Do	CIO-PAC	1311	do	Do.

Report of a subcommittee of the committee to the full committee publicized on October 30, 1944, relating to a reinvestigation of PAC and an investigation of the National Citizens PAC.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1938: August 12–23, 1938, September 15–17, volume 1; September 28–October 6, October 11–13, volume 2; October 17–22, October 24–November 21, volume 3.

1939: November 19–December 14, volume 4; December 15, supplement to volume 4; May 18–June 1, 1939, volume 5; August 16–29, volume 6; September 5–27, volumes 7 and 8.

1940: September 28–October 14, volume 9; October 16–28, volume 10; October 28–December 3, volume 11; February 7–April 4, 1940, volume 12.

1941: April 11–May 21, volume 13; August 29, 1940–August 11, 1941, volume 14.

1943: June 8–July 7, 1943, volume 15.

1944: November 29–December 20, volume 16; September 27–October 5, 1944, volume 17.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including a report published in 1938 by investigator for the committee, Edward E. Sullivan, containing a statement, "Evidence tends to show that all phases of radical and Communist activities are rampant among the studios of Hollywood, and, although well known, is a matter which movie moguls desire to keep from the public."

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which are allegedly subversive or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which are alleged subversive or un-American.

9. For the period from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

10. Transcripts of all meetings held by individual committee members and specifically including transcripts of a meeting held by Congressman J. PARNELL THOMAS with officials of the State of New Jersey published by the committee in 1939 or 1940.

11. Copy of letter sent by counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to Drew Pearson in which letter a demand was made for an explanation of the phrase "make democracy work," which letter is referred to in C. R. A., February 11, 1946, at page 1257, and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES v. DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk*,
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk,

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, at which investigation of Dalton Trumbo was considered, referred to, or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, which referred to or discussed Dalton Trumbo.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communciations relating to Dalton Trumbo and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Dalton Trumbo.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Dalton Trumbo by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES v. DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, at which investigation of Dalton Trumbo was considered, referred to, or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which referred to or discussed Dalton Trumbo.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to Dalton Trumbo and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Dalton Trumbo.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Dalton Trumbo by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d of April, A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner, attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between January 1, 1947, and October 30, 1947, at which investigation of Dalton Trumbo was considered, referred to, or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from January 1, 1947, to October 30, 1947, which referred to or discussed Dalton Trumbo.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to Dalton Trumbo and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between January 1, 1947, and October 30, 1947.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions fom January 1, 1947, to October 30, 1947, at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Dalton Trumbo.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Dalton Trumbo by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* DALTON TRUMBO, NO. 1353–47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 26th day of April, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 22d day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and David Carliner attorneys for Dalton Trumbo.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, including but not limited to:

Author	Date	House Report Nos.	Congress	Session
Thomas	AYD	271	80th	1st.
Do	CP	209	do	Do.
Do	The Communist Party of the United States as an agent of a foreign power.		do	Do.
Do	Southern Conference	592	do	Do.
Do	Civil Rights Congress	1115	do	Do.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1947: November 22, 1946 (revised 1947), Budenz; February 6, 1947, Eisler; bills to outlaw CP, March 24–28, 1947; April 9, 1947, Eugene Dennis; July 7, 1947, Walter S. Steele; February 27, July 23–25, 1947, Communists in Labor Unions; July 22, 1947, Kravchenko.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, which are allegedly "subversive" or "un-American."

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947 to October 20, 1947, which are alleged "subversive" or "un-American."

9. For the period from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the commitee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

PERMANENT BASIS FOR NURSERIES AND NURSERY SCHOOLS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5808) to continue on a permanent basis a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes", approved July 16, 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "and until June 30, 1948, and no longer."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act of July 16, 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for each fiscal year thereafter, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "longer", insert "and inserting 'and until June 30, 1949'."

Page 2, line 6, after the figure "1949" strike out "and for each fiscal year thereafter."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in order to interrogate the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee on this day nursery. Has the gentleman gone into this matter carefully enough to draw the bill in such form that people who are able to take care of their own children will have to pay for that care.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that this is on a fee basis in the case of everybody who can afford it.

Mr. STEFAN. Based on a net income of how much? The gentleman will recall the people whose combined earnings were as much as $10,000 or $12,000 a year have had their children taken care of by this organization, whereas there are a lot of widows whose salaries are very, very low who cannot get their children in at all. What do you do about that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That has been carefully corrected. I think the average income here is $1,840 in the case of families running from one and two in some cases to as many as five in others.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows there were some who were earning as much as $10,000 a year combined earnings who had their children in these day-care schools, whereas widows earning very meager salaries were unable to get their children in at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is exactly so. I gave attention to that some time ago. Those faults have been corrected.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amended title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to continue a system of nurseries and nursing schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amended title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 2 in the amended title which follows line 10, strike out the words "nurseries and nursing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue a system of schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL FOUNDATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6209) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia," approved January 6, 1893, as amended, is hereby amended with respect to the number of trustees authorized therein and the method of providing for a quorum of such trustees, by adding at the end of the first section the following paragraph:

"The present board of trustees of said corporation is hereby authorized to choose additional trustees, so that the board shall hereafter consist of such number of trustees as the board may from time to time determine, not exceeding a total of 30, which board as hereafter constituted shall succeed to and exercise all of the powers heretofore granted to the board as heretofore constituted, subject to all of the provisions and limitations in such act, as amended, and shall be authorized to fill any vacancies which may occur and to prescribe, by bylaws, such number as shall constitute a quorum to do business."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], whose subcommittee handled this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation, which was incorporated a number of years ago, to increase the number of trustees to 30. This will allow the corporation to facilitate and assist the formation of subcommittees and provide better supervision of the foundation's activities, which have grown and increased considerably in the 50 years that have elapsed.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that I know of no objection of any kind to this bill.

I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

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

TO INCORPORATE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF WASHINGTON A CORPORATION SOLE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6203) to incorporate the Roman Catholic archbishop of Washington a corporation sole, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Patrick A. O'Boyle, Roman Catholic archbishop of Washington, and his successors in office, in accordance with the discipline and government of the Roman Catholic Church, hereby is created and declared to be a corporation sole.

SEC. 2. The corporation—

A. shall have perpetual succession;

B. may contract in the same manner and to the same extent as a natural person and may sue and be sued;

C. may have and use a corporate seal and may alter and change the same at pleasure;

D. may acquire real and personal property by purchase, devise, bequest, gift, or otherwise, and hold, own, use, lease, assign, convey, or otherwise dispose of the same in like manner and to the same extent as a natural person;

E. may borrow money, issue notes or other negotiable paper, and secure the money borrowed by mortgage or by deed of trust on said real or personal property or any part thereof;

F. and may perform such other acts in the furtherance of the objects and purposes of the corporation that are not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States or the law in force in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be religious, charitable, and educational.

SEC. 4. In the event that a vacancy should occur in said archbishopric and an administrator shall be elected or appointed in accordance with the discipline and government of the Roman Catholic Church, such administrator shall, until the installation of a successor archbishop, be authorized to do and perform all acts which the corporation is authorized to do and perform. The election and appointment of such administrator shall be evidenced by a certificate signed by the chancelor of the Archdiocese of Washington, duly acknowledged and filed with the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as changing any law relating to taxation or exemption from taxation of any real or personal property.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to vest the same powers in the recently established archdiocese of Washington as those vested in the archbishop of Baltimore.

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 2, line 24, strike out the word "and" following the word "election" and insert in lieu thereof the word "or."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

AMENDING THE ACT TO PROVIDE REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2409) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph lettered (h) of section 4 of title I of article I of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph, inserting a colon, and the following: *"Provided, however,* That the words 'trade or business' shall not include, for the purposes of this article, sales of tangible personal property whereby title to such property passes within or without the District, by a corporation or unincorporated business which does not physically have or maintain an office, warehouse, or other place of business in the District, and which has no officer, agent, or representative having an office or other place of business in the District, during the taxable year. For purposes of this proviso, the words 'agent' or 'representative' shall not include any independent broker engaged independently in regularly soliciting orders in the District for sellers and who holds himself out as such."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of title X of article I of said act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the section, inserting a colon, and the following: *"Provided further,* That income derived from the sale of tangible personal property by a corporation or unincorporated business not carrying on or engaging in trade or business within the District as defined in title I of this article shall not be considered as income from sources within the District for purposes of this article."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of title XIV of article I of said act is repealed.

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall apply to the taxable year or part thereof beginning on the 1st day of January 1948, and to succeeding taxable years.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That paragraph lettered (h) of section 4 of title I of article I of the act entitled 'An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved July 16, 1947, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph, inserting a colon, and the following: *'Provided, however,* That the words "trade or business" shall not include, for the purposes of this article—

"'(1) Sales of tangible personal property whereby title to such property passes within or without the District, by a corporation or unincorporated business which does not physically have or maintain an office, warehouse, or other place of business in the District, and which has no officer, agent, or representative having an office or other place of business in the District, during the taxable year; or

"'(2) Sales of tangible personal property by a corporation or unincorporated business which does not maintain an office or other place of business in the District and which has no office, agent, or representative in the District except for the sole purpose of doing business with the United States, but such corporations and unincorporated businesses shall be subject to the licensing provisions in title XIV of this article.

" 'For purposes of this proviso, the words "agent" or "representative" shall not include any independent broker engaged independently in regularly soliciting orders in the District for sellers and who holds himself out as such.'

"SEC. 2. Section 1 of title X of article I of said act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the section, inserting a colon, and the following: *'Provided further,* That income derived from the sale of tangible personal property by a corporation or unincorporated business not carrying on or engaging in trade or business within the District as defined in title I of this article shall not be considered as income from sources within the District for purposes of this article, with the exception of income from sales to the United States not excluded from gross income as provided in title III, section 2 (b) (13) of this article.'

"SEC. 3. Paragraph lettered (b) of section 2 of title III of article I of said act is amended by adding thereto the following subparagraph:

"'(13) Income derived from the sale of tangible personal property to the United States by corporations and unincorporated businesses having their principal places of business located outside the District, which property is delivered from places outside the District for use outside the District: *Provided, however,* That the taxpayer shall furnish to the Assessor a statement in writing of the amount of gross sales so made and, if required by the Assessor, a list of the names of the agencies of the United States through which such property was sold.'

"SEC. 4. Section 4 of title XIV of article I of said act is repealed.

"SEC. 5. The amendments made by this act shall apply to the taxable year or part thereof beginning on the 1st day of January 1948, and to succeeding taxable years."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the Revenue Act of 1947 as it applies to the District of Columbia some confusion has arisen concerning the taxation on income from sales in the District of Columbia by outside firms that maintain no representation here. The same question arose in connection with sales of the Federal Government, notably the Navy operating through an independent broker.

It was agreed that ought to be clarified, which is the purpose of the pending bill. It has the concurrence of the Commissioners, the Corporation Counsel's office and the unanimous report of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

TREATMENT OF SEXUAL PSYCHOPATHS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6071) to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

INDECENT EXPOSURE

SEC. 101. Section 9 of the act of July 29, 1892, entitled "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia," as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 22–1112), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" before "That it shall not be lawful" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any person or persons who shall make any obscene or indecent exposure of his or her person or their persons, as described in subsection (a), knowing he or she or they are in the presence of a child under the age of 16 years, shall be punished by imprisonment of not more than 6 months, or fined in amount not to exceed $500."

IMMORALITY—INVITING FOR PURPOSE OF, PROHIBITED

SEC. 102. The first section of the act of August 15, 1935, entitled "An act for the suppression of prostitution in the District of Columbia" (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 22–2701) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That it shall not be lawful for any person to invite, entice, persuade, or to address for the purpose of inviting, enticing, or persuading any person or persons 16 years of age or over, in or upon any avenue, street, road, highway, open space, alley, public square, enclosure, public building or other public place, store, shop, or reservation or at any public gathering or assembly in the District of Columbia, to accompany, go with, or follow him or her to his or her residence, or to any other house or building, enclosure, or other place, for the purpose of prostitution, or any other immoral or lewd purpose, under a penalty of not more than $100 or imprisonment for not more than 90 days, or both. And it shall not be lawful for any person to invite, entice, or persuade, or address for the purpose of inviting, enticing, or persuading any such person or persons from any door, window, porch, or portico of any house or building to enter any house, or go with, accompany, or follow him or her to any place whatever, for the purpose of prostitution, or any other immoral or lewd purpose, under the like penalties herein provided for the same conduct in the streets, avenues, roads, highways, or alleys, public squares, open spaces, enclosures, public buildings or other public places, stores, shops, or reservations or at any public gatherings or assemblies."

INDECENT ACTS—CHILDREN

SEC. 103. (a) Any person who shall take, or attempt to take any immoral, improper, or indecent liberties with any child of either sex, under the age of 16 years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions of sexual desires, either of such person or of such child, or of both such person and such child, or who shall commit, or attempt to commit, any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, of such child, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions or sexual desires, either of such person or of such child, or of both such person and such child shall be imprisoned in a penitentiary, not more than 10 years.

(b) Any such person who shall, in the District of Columbia, take any such child or shall entice, allure, or persuade any such child, to any place whatever for the purpose either of taking any such immoral, improper, or indecent liberties with such child, with said intent or of committing any such lewd, or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, of such child with said intent, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary not more than 5 years.

(c) Consent by a child to any act or conduct prescribed by subsection (a) or (b) shall not be a defense, nor shall lack of knowledge of the child's age be a defense.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to the offenses covered by section 104 of this act or by section 808 of the act of March 3, 1901, entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," as amended and supplemented (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 22–2801).

SODOMY

SEC. 104. (a) Every person who shall be convicted of taking into his or her mouth or anus the sexual organ of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of placing his or her sexual organ in the mouth or anus of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of committing any other unnatural or perverted sexual act with any

other person or animal, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or be imprisoned for a period not exceeding 10 years. Any person convicted under this section of committing such act with a person under the age of 16 years shall be fined not more than $1,000 or be imprisoned for a period not exceeding 20 years. And in any indictment for the commission of any of the acts, hereby declared to be offenses, it shall not be necessary to set forth the particular unnatural or perverted sexual practice with the commission of which the defendant may be charged, nor to set forth the particular manner in which said unnatural or perverted sexual practice was committed, but it shall be sufficient if the indictment set forth that the defendant committed a certain unnatural and perverted sexual practice with a person or animal, as the case may be.

(b) Any penetration, however slight, is sufficient to complete the crime specified in this section. Proof of emission shall not be necessary.

TITLE II

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. For the purpose of this title—

(1) The term "sexual psychopath" means a person, not insane, who by a course of repeated misconduct in sexual matters has evidenced such lack of power to control his sexual impulses as to be dangerous to other persons because he is likely to attack or otherwise inflict injury, loss, pain, or other evil on the objects of his desire.

(2) The term "court" means the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, the criminal branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, or the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, as the case may be.

(3) The term "patient" means a person with respect to whom there has been filed with the clerk of any court a statement in writing setting forth facts tending to show that such person is a sexual psychopath.

(4) The term "criminal proceeding" means a proceeding in any court against a person for a criminal offense, and includes all stages of such a proceeding from (A) the time the person is indicted, charged by an information, or charged with an offense in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, to (B) the entry of judgment, or, if the person is granted probation, the completion of the period of probation.

FILING OF STATEMENT

SEC. 202. (a) Whenever it shall appear to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia that any person within the District of Columbia, other than a defendant in a criminal proceeding is a sexual psychopath, such attorney may file with the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia a statement in writing setting forth the facts tending to show that such person is a sexual psychopath.

(b) Whenever it shall appear to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia that any defendant in any criminal proceeding prosecuted by such attorney or any of his assistants is a sexual psychopath, such attorney may file with the clerk of the court in which such proceeding is pending a statement in writing setting forth the facts tending to show that such defendant is a sexual psychopath.

(c) Whenever it shall appear to any court that any defendant in any criminal proceeding pending in such court is a sexual psychopath, the court may, if it deems such procedure advisable, direct the officer prosecuting the defendant to file with the clerk of such court a statement in writing setting forth the facts tending to show that such defendant is a sexual psychopath.

(d) Any statement filed in a criminal proceeding pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) may be filed only (1) before trial, (2) after conviction or plea of guilty but before sentencing, or (3) after conviction or plea of guilty but before the completion of probation.

(e) This section shall not apply to an individual in a criminal proceeding who is charged with rape or assault with intent to rape.

RIGHT TO COUNSEL

SEC. 203. A patient shall have the right to have the assistance of counsel at every stage of the proceeding under this title. Before the court appoints psychiatrists pursuant to section 204 it shall advise the patient of his right to counsel and shall assign counsel to represent him unless the patient is able to obtain counsel or elects to proceed without counsel.

EXAMINATION BY PSYCHIATRISTS

SEC. 204. (a) When a statement has been filed with the clerk of any court pursuant to section 202, such court shall appoint two qualified psychiatrists to make a personal examination of the patient. The patient shall be required to answer questions asked by the psychiatrists under penalty of contempt of court. Each psychiatrist shall file a written report of the examination, which shall include a statement of his conclusion as to whether the patient is a sexual psychopath.

(b) The counsel for the patient shall have the right to inspect the reports of the examination of the patient. No such report and no evidence resulting from the personal examination of the patient shall be admissible against him in any judicial proceeding except the proceeding under this title to determine whether the patient is a sexual psychopath.

WHEN HEARING IS REQUIRED

SEC. 205. If in their reports filed pursuant to section 204, both psychiatrists state that the patient is a sexual psychopath, or if both state that they are unable to reach any conclusion by reason of the partial or complete refusal of the patient to submit to thorough examination, or if one states that the patient is a sexual psychopath and the other states that he is unable to reach any conclusion by reason of the partial or complete refusal of the patient to submit to thorough examination, then the court shall conduct a hearing in the manner provided in section 206 to determine whether the patient is a sexual psychopath. If, on the basis of the reports filed, the court is not required to conduct such a hearing, the court shall enter an order dismissing the proceeding under this title to determine whether the patient is a sexual psychopath.

HEARING; COMMITMENT TO ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

SEC. 206. Upon evidence introduced at a hearing held for that purpose the court shall determine whether or not the patient is a sexual psychopath. Such hearing shall be conducted without a jury unless, before such hearing and within 15 days after the date on which the second report is filed pursuant to section 204, a jury is demanded by the patient or by the officer filing the statement. The rules of evidence applicable in judicial proceedings in the court shall be applicable to hearings pursuant to this section; but, notwithstanding any such rule, evidence of conviction of any number of crimes the commission of which tend to show that the patient is a sexual psychopath and of the punishment inflicted therefor shall be admissible at any such hearing. The patient shall be entitled to an appeal as in other cases. If the patient is determined to be a sexual psychopath, the court shall commit him to St. Elizabeths Hospital to be confined there until released in accordance with section 207.

PAROLE; DISCHARGE

SEC. 207. Any person committed under this title may be released from confinement when the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital finds that he has sufficiently recovered so as to not be dangerous to other persons, provided if the person to be released be one charged with crime or undergoing sentence therefor, the Superintendent of the hospital shall give notice thereof to the judge of the criminal court and deliver him to the court in obedience to proper precept.

STAY OF CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 208. Any statement filed in a criminal proceeding pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of section 202 shall stay such criminal proceeding until whichever of the following first occurs:

(1) The proceeding under this title to determine whether the patient is a sexual psychopath is dismissed pursuant to section 205 or withdrawn;

(2) It is determined pursuant to section 206 that the patient is not a sexual psychopath; or

(3) The patient is discharged from St. Elizabeths hospital pursuant to section 207.

CRIMINAL LAW UNCHANGED

SEC. 209. Nothing in this title shall alter in any respect the tests of mental capacity applied in criminal prosecutions under the laws of the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 7, line 2, insert comma after word "proceeding."

Page 9, line 1, strike "the" and insert "a."

Page 10, line 5, strike "tend" and insert "tends."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska, chairman of the subcommittee that handled this very important matter, would like to be heard.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to strengthen the laws of the District of Columbia relating to sex offenses and the treatment of persons charged with sex crimes. The present laws of the District of Columbia do not seem adequate to handle sex crimes against children.

This matter of sex crimes was considered very thoroughly in the committee which held rather searching hearings and consulted with the district attorney's office, the Corporation Counsel's office and psychiatrists. We feel this bill is a step in the right direction to set up legislative authority for handling some of the sex crimes that occur within the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Will the gentleman tell me just what the penalty is now? What was the penalty and what is the penalty now?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on page 2 of the report will be found the penalties for the different types of sex offenses. There is no provision in the code as it now exists for certain of these crimes. This increases the penalty for crimes against children. It about doubles those penalties.

In the main portion of the bill there is set up the treatment of chronic sex offenders.

I may say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] assisted us in the writing of this bill. Minnesota has a bill that has stood the court tests of the Minnesota Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court and a similar definition was written in this bill for the treatment of chronic sex offenders.

They are committed to psychiatric hospitals for their protection. We have thrown around it all of the ordinary safeguards.

Mr. CHELF. When it is found that a person is a sexual pervert and he ought to be confined, is there a penalty, and, if so, what is the penalty? What is the final punishment?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, title II of this bill does not deal with offenses of that character at all, except in extremely aggravated situations. In title I of the bill there are some provisions dealing with what may be classed as sex crimes. Title I strengthens the law with respect to such cases, provides for increased penalties, for presently specified offenses, and adds additional offenses and penalties therefor for breaches of public decorum that have not previously been covered by District statutes.

Title II of the bill is not aimed at the ordinary sexual pervert, nor is it limited to perverts. It is aimed at persons who are a dangerous menace to society and who by a repeated course of conduct have evidenced that they are a dangerous menace to society, because by a repeated course of misconduct in sexual matters they have demonstrated such lack of power to control their sexual impulses as to be dangerous to other persons because they are likely to attack or otherwise inflict injury, loss, pain, or other evil on the objects of their desire.

Title II does not provide for any criminal penalty. It provides that such persons shall be considered as sick persons, and they are to be handled in that way rather than as criminals.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The purpose of this bill is, of course, is to multiply the approach a little bit, and instead of calling him a criminal he is referred to as a patient, and if it is established that he is a sexual psychopath, then he will be sent to St. Elizabeths and treated by a qualified psychiatrist. It treats with a social problem that is evident everywhere in the country.

Mr. CHELF. I am very much in favor of the bill. I just wanted a little clarification.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is that all the protection the people of Washington may expect as in the case of the fellow who took a little 9-year-old girl and asked the direction, and he said he was lost?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, indeed. Some sections in this bill implement and fortify the criminal statute of the District of Columbia, and the rest of them are, of course, still in effect. But, this deals with a certain kind of case.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does it strengthen the protection or weaken it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It strengthens it very much.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF OPTOMETRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6087) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia" and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia," approved May 28, 1924, is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia is hereby declared to affect the public health and safety and to be subject to regulation and control in the public interest. Optometry is hereby declared to be a profession and it is further declared to be a matter of public interest and concern that the optometric profession merit and receive the confidence of the public and that only qualified optometrists be permitted to practice optometry in the District of Columbia. All provisions of this act relating to the practice of optometry shall be construed in accordance with this declaration of policy.

"(b) As used in this act, the term 'optometry' means the science and art devoted to the examination of the human eye; to the analysis of ocular functions; or to the prescribing, providing, furnishing, adapting, and employing of lenses, prisms, contact lenses, ocular exercises, visual training, orthoptics, and all preventive or corrective optometric methods for the aid, correction, or relief of the human eye; and the term 'optometrist' means a person who practices optometry, or any part thereof, as defined in this subsection."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person in the District of Columbia to engage in the practice of optometry or represent himself to be a practitioner of optometry, or attempt to determine by an examination of the eyes the kind of eyeglasses required by any person, or represent himself to be a licensed optometrist when not so licensed, or to represent himself as capable of examining the eyes of any person for the purpose of fitting glasses, excepting those hereinafter exempted, unless he shall have fulfilled the requirements and complied with the conditions of this act and shall have obtained a license from the District of Columbia Board of Optometry, created by this act; nor shall it be lawful for any person in the District of Columbia to represent that he is a lawful holder of a license as provided by this act when in fact he is not such lawful holder, or to impersonate any licensed practitioner of optometry, or shall fail to register the certificate as provided in section 13.

"(b) It shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any person to include in an advertisement offering to furnish to the public professional services relating to the examination of the human eye; or in an advertisement relating to the analysis of ocular functions; or in an advertisement relating to the prescribing, providing, furnishing, adapting, and employing of lenses, prisms, contact lenses, ocular exercises, visual training, orthoptics, and all preventive or corrective optometric methods for the aid, correction, or relief of the human eye; or in an advertisement relating to the furnishing to the public of spectacles, eyeglasses, lenses, mountings, or similar prosthetic devices, whether such advertisement is made by print, radio, letter, display or any other means: (1) the fee for such professional services, or any reference to such fee; (2) prices of such prosthetic devices, or any reference to such prices; (3) the terms of credit or payment for such professional services or prosthetic devices, or any reference to such terms; (4) an offer of such professional services or prosthetic devices at a discount, as a gift, or free of charge, or any reference to such an offer; or (5) a guaranty of satisfaction of such profession services or prosthetic devices, or any reference to such a guaranty.

"(c) It shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any persons to sell, dispense, or supply to any person an ophthalmic lens which is not of first quality, unless prior thereto such person is informed that such lens is substandard. For the purpose of this subsection, a substandard lens is defined as any ophthalmic lens which according to trade usages is not of first quality.

"(d) Any persons violating any of the provisions of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction for the first offense shall be fined not more than $500, and upon conviction for any subsequent offense shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $1,000 or be imprisoned in the District jail not less than 3 months nor more than 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court."

SEC. 3. Section 5 of such law is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The Board shall have authority and it shall be its duty to make necessary regulations which shall include restrictions prohibiting advertising by means of large signs, of large displays, of glaring light signs, or of displays or signs containing as a part thereof the representation of the human eye or any part thereof, and acts of unprofessional conduct by optometrists. All such bylaws and regulations shall, before they become effective, be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 4. Section 11 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. Any person over the age of 21 years, of good moral character, who has had a preliminary education equivalent to a 4 years' high-school course of instruction acceptable to the Board (which shall be determined either by examination or by certificate as to work done in an approved institution), and who is a graduate of a school or college of optometry in good standing (as determined by the Board and which maintains a course in optometry of not less than 4 years), shall be entitled to take the standard examination. Such standard examination shall consist of test in—

"(a) practical optics;

"(b) theoretical optometry;

"(c) anatomy and physiology and such pathology as may be applied to optometry;

"(d) practical optometry;

"(e) theoretic and physiologic optics."

SEC. 5. Section 16 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. (a) The Board may, in its discretion, after a hearing as provided in section 17, refuse to grant a license to any applicant for any of the following reasons:

"(1) That the applicant has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude.

"(2) That the applicant is a habitual user of narcotics or any other drugs which impair the intellect and judgment to such an extent as to incapacitate the applicant for the duties of an optometrist.

"(b) The Board may, in its discretion, after a hearing as provided in section 17, cancel, revoke, or suspend the operation of any license by it granted for any of the following reasons:

"(1) That such license was procured through fraud or misrepresentation.

"(2) That the holder thereof has been a habitual user of narcotics or any other drugs which impair the intellect and judgment to such an extent as to incapacitate the holder for the duties of an optometrist.

"(3) That the holder thereof has been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude.

"(4) That the holder thereof has been guilty of advertising professional superiority or the performance of professional services in a superior manner; advertising prices for

professional services; advertising contrary to regulations prescribed by the Board of Optometry in accordance with section 5 of this act; employing or making use of solicitors or free publicity press agents, directly or indirectly, or advertising any free optometric service or free examination; or advertising to guarantee optometric services.

"(5) That the holder thereof is guilty of unprofessional conduct as prescribed by regulations of the Board of Optometry in accordance with section 5 of this act.

"(6) That the holder thereof has been convicted of an offense in violation of section 2 of this act.

"(7) That such person has been guilty of practicing optometry while suffering from an infectious or otherwise contagious disease.

"(8) That the holder thereof has been guilty of using the title 'Doctor' or 'Dr.' as a prefix to his name without using the word 'Optometrist' as a suffix to his name."

SEC. 6. Section 17 of this act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 17. Any person who is the holder of a license or who is an applicant for a license against whom any charges are preferred shall be furnished by the Board with a copy of the complaint and shall have a hearing before the Board at which hearing he may be represented by counsel. At such hearing witnesses may be examined for and against the accused respecting such charges; the Board shall thereupon pass upon such charges. An appeal may be taken from the decision of the Board to the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 7. Section 20 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. The provisions of this act, except the provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 2, shall not apply—

"(a) to physicians and surgeons practicing under authority or license issued under the laws of the District of Columbia for the practice of medicine and surgery;

"(b) to persons selling spectacles and/or eyeglasses and who do not attempt either directly or indirectly to adapt them to the eye, and who do not practice or profess the practice of optometry."

With the following committee amendments:

Beginning at line 10, page 3, strike through line 7 on page 4.

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

Page 4, line 11, change period to comma and insert "and designate the particulars in which it is substandard."

Page 4, line 12, after the word "is", insert "one which has been sold by the manufacturer as substandard, or."

Page 4, line 15, strike "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Page 8, line 14, strike ", and (d)."

Page 8, line 14, strike comma between "(b)" and "(c)" and insert "and."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I simply observe that in connection with this optometry bill, while there has been a great deal of controversy about it, it has moved into all sections of the country. The revised bill which is now before the House was finally introduced and considerable work was done on it by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and his subcommittee. Other parts of the controversy have been met by amendment, together with amendments presently pending on the desk and printed in the report accompanying the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, which are pending at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DIRKSEN:

On page 7, line 5, strike after the word "of", "ad" and all of lines 6 and 7, including the words "for professional services" and the semicolon in line 8.

Place a period after the word "act" in line 10, page 7.

Strike out the balance of line 10 after the word "act" and all of lines 11, 12, and 13 on page 7.

Page 8, line 18, strike out all of paragraph (a) down to and including line 20 and insert: "(a) Persons licensed to practice medicine or osteopathy in the District of Columbia."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"(a) Any housing accommodations in hotels, which accommodations are used exclusively for transient occupancy, that is for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short-time basis;"

And the House agrees to the same.

GREGORY MCMAHON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

C. D. BUCK,
HARRY P. CAIN,
JAMES P. KEM,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The Senate bill decontrolled "any housing accommodations in hotels, which accommodations are used predominantly for transient occupancy, that is, for living quarters for nonresidents upon a short-time basis." The House amendment inserted a provision, in lieu of the Senate provision, decontrolling "any housing accommodations in hotels, as defined by this Act, used exclusively for transient occupancy." The Senate recedes with an amendment adopting the House provision that the accommodations must be used exclusively for transient occupancy, but using the language of the Senate bill with the word "predominantly" changed to "exclusively."

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: Under the Senate bill additional housing accommodations created by conversion after March 31, 1948, were decontrolled. These amendments would limit the application of the provision to conversion of buildings or facilities or both not heretofore used for housing accommodations. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment inserted a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 3. The prohibition against actions to recover possession of any housing accommodations set forth in section 5 (b) of the Act approved December 2, 1941, entitled 'District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act' shall not apply unless the tenant is actually occupying such housing accommodations as a home."

There was no corresponding provision in the Senate bill. The House recedes. It was the feeling of the conferees that the legal considerations involved in this amendment might better be considered in a separate legislative proposal.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6: These amendments make changes in section numbers and in conformity with the action of the conferees on amendment No. 4 the House recedes.

JOS. P. O'HARA,
GREGORY MCMAHON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 2195) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is really no difference between the House and the Senate on this matter. There were some amendments, but they were only for the purpose of clarification.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL CEREMONIES, 1949

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have three House joint resolutions that relate to the preparation for the inaugural ceremonies in January 1949. These are the customary joint resolutions that are passed every 4 years, and there is no controversy about them.

First, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 379) to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1949.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That $37,100, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia, is hereby authorized to be appropriated to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to maintain public order and protect life and property in said District of Columbia from January 15 to January 26, 1949, both inclusive, including the employment of personal services, payment of allowances, traveling expenses, hire and means of transportation, cost of removing and relocating streetcar-loading platforms; for the construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths, during the period aforesaid, and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners. Said Commissioners are hereby authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure such preservation of public order and protection of life and property, and to make special regulations respecting the standing, movements, and operating of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant, under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers and vendors to sell goods, wares, and merchandise on the streets, avenues, and sidewalks in the District of Columbia, and to charge for such privilege such fees as they may deem proper.

SEC. 2. Such regulations and licenses shall be in force 1 week prior to said inauguration, during said inauguration, and 1 week subsequent thereto, and shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia and in such other manner as the Commissioners may deem best to acquaint the public with the same; and no penalty prescribed for the violation of any such regulations shall be enforced until 5 days after such publication. Any person violating any of such regulations shall be liable for each such offense to a fine of not to exceed $100 in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and in default of payment thereof to imprisonment in the workhouse of said District for not longer than 60 days.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 380) authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, and for other purposes, and further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, and such other officers of the District of Columbia and the United States as control any public lands in the District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to grant permits, under such restrictions as they may deem necessary, to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies to be appointed with the approval of the President-elect for the use of any reservations or other public spaces in the District of Columbia under their control on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949: *Provided*, That in their opinion no serious or permanent injuries will be thereby inflicted upon such reservations or public spaces or statuary thereon; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate for such and other purposes, on the occasion aforesaid, such streets, avenues, and sidewalks in said District of Columbia under their control as they may deem proper and necessary: *Provided, however*, That all stands or platforms that may be erected on the public space, as aforesaid, including such as may be erected in connection with the display of fireworks, shall be under the said supervision of the said inaugural committee, and no stand shall be built on the sidewalk, street, parks, and public grounds of the District of Columbia, not including the area on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue directly in front of the White House, except such as are approved by the inaugural committee, the director of inspection of the District of Columbia, and the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency: *And provided further*, That the reservations or public spaces occupied by the stands or other structures shall, after the inauguration, be promptly restored to their condition before such occupation, and that the inaugural committee shall indemnify the appropriate agency of the Government for any damages of any kind whatsoever upon such reservations or spaces by reason of such use.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit the committee on illumination of the inaugural committee for said inaugural ceremonies to stretch suitable overhead conductors, with sufficient supports wherever necessary, for the purpose of connecting with the present supply of light for the purpose of effecting the said illumination: *Provided*, That if it shall be necessary to erect wires for illuminating or other purposes over any park or reservation in the District of Columbia, the work of erection and removal of said wires shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park or reservation: *Provided further*, That the said conductors shall not be used for conveying electrical currents after January 24, 1949, and shall with their supports, be fully and entirely removed from the streets and avenues of the said District of Columbia on or before January 31, 1949: *Provided further*, That the stretching and removing of the said wires shall be under the supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or such other officials as may have jurisdiction in the premises, who shall see that the provisions of this joint resolution are enforced, that all needful precautions are taken for the protection of the public, and that the pavement of any street, avenue, or alley disturbed is replaced in as good condition as before entering upon the work herein authorized: *And provided further*, That no expense or damage on account of or due to the stretching, operation, or removal of the said temporary overhead conductors shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense be, and he is hereby, authorized to loan to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies such hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, ensigns, flags, signal numbers, etc., belonging to the Government of the United States (except battle flags), that are not now in use and may be suitable and proper for decoration, and which may, in their judgment, be spared without detriment to the public service, such flags to be used in connection with said ceremonies by said committee under such regulations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the said Secretary in decorating the fronts of public buildings and other places on the line of march between the Capitol and the Executive Mansion, and the interior of the reception hall: *Provided*, That the loan of the said hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, ensigns, flags, signal numbers, etc., to the said committee shall not take place prior to the 11th of January, and they shall be returned by the 25th day of January 1949: *Provided further*, That the said committee shall indemnify the said Government for any loss or damage to such flags not necessarily incident to such use. That the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized to loan to the inaugural committee for the purpose of caring for the sick, injured, and infirm on the occasion of said inauguration such hospital tents and camp appliances, and other necessaries, hospital furniture, and utensils of all descriptions, ambulances, drivers, stretchers, and Red Cross flags and poles belonging to the Government of the United States as in his judgment may be spared and are not in use by the Government at the time of the inauguration: *And provided further*, That the inaugural committee shall indemnify the Government for any loss or damage to such hospital tents and appliances, as aforesaid, not necessarily incident to such use.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency be, and they are hereby, authorized to permit telegraph, telephone, radio-broadcasting and television companies to extend overhead wires to such points along the line of parade as shall be deemed by the chief marshal convenient for use in connection with the parade and other inaugural purposes, the said wires to be taken down within 10 days after the conclusion of the ceremonies.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 381) to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1949, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Illinois failed to advise the House that the three joint resolutions which we are now discussing have been unanimously approved by his committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency or head of any executive department or establishment is authorized to allocate such space in any public building under his care and supervision as he deems necessary for the purposes of quartering troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies to be held on January 20, 1949,

but such use shall not continue after January 22, 1949. Authority granted by this joint resolution may be exercised notwithstanding the provisions of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, approved April 28, 1902, prohibiting the use of public buildings in connection with inaugural ceremonies.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsidered was laid on the table.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1481) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District, and further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be an opportunity for discussion of the bill under this procedure.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If there is going to be discussion on the matter, I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STEFAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Minnesota mean he is opposed to the bill?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am definitely opposed to it.

Mr. STEFAN. Some more of us are opposed to it. I wonder if the gentleman does not want to object, to keep the bill off the floor entirely.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance the standard time applicable to the District 1 hour for a period of each year commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April and ending not later than the last Sunday of September. Any such time established by the Commissioners under authority of this act shall, during the period of the year for which it is applicable, to be the standard time for the District of Columbia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN:
Line 5, strike out "a" and insert "the."
Line 5, strike out "of each year."
Line 6, after "April" insert "1948."
Line 7, after "September" insert "1948."
Line 9, strike out "of the year."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, first let me express my appreciation to my good friend from Minnesota for not pressing his objection. It is a rather difficult matter. This daylight-saving bill passed the Senate of the United States on April 6, 1948, by a very substantial vote of about 3 to 1. It came before our committee and was reported out by the subcommittee and we have had some difficulty, as you may well understand, in trying to get the bill up for immediate action. I tried to call it up by unanimous consent some days ago. Now comes District Day, but by the supervention of a discharge petition, it appeared that it might be possible that we would not have any District Day at all. I am grateful to the leadership and the House that they have managed to find some time to dispose of this District business.

First, let me say that we have tried in every way possible to save the time and energy of Members of the House. I know the difficulty of getting around to District legislation, and as a matter of fact, we have only taken one District Day a month. There is one occasion this year when we only had a single District Day in 6 weeks. We have rather tried to package the bills, and then bring them to you all at once. Sometimes, of course, difficulties ensue.

The daylight-saving bill should have been called up before because in most—I should say not most—sections, but a very substantial portion of the country they went on daylight-saving time as of yesterday. This bill does nothing more than confer upon the District Commissioners, the executive heads of the District of Columbia, the authority to impose daylight-saving time if they see fit to do so. In that respect it is patterned upon the bill that we presented and had passed last year. The Commissioners held hearings, and rather extensive hearings, and then on the basis of their findings, decreed daylight saving in accordance with the way it obtains in all other sections of the country.

As I say, it passed last year in the House by a vote of 218 to 145. It passed in the other body last year by a vote of 56 to 17, and passed in the other body this year by a vote of 46 to 17. It is only for 1 year. It does not make it permanent. We hope if favorable action finally obtains on the District Reorganization Act, that it will then become a matter to be taken care of under the general authority delegated to the executive head and heads of the District of Columbia, and will not come on as an annual problem for Congress to dispose.

I think there are three reasons why the House ought to act favorably upon this matter. The first is that others have daylight saving and we ought to conform insofar as possible in order to eliminate and avoid unnecessary confusion. We find confusion on radio schedules, trains, bank clearances, and on the stock market, and many, many other places. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] said to me today, he came down from New York in 5 minutes for the very good reason that there was a disparity of 1 hour in time. New York is on daylight-saving time, and the District of Columbia is not.

When I say that other localities have it, that goes for Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Cleveland, New York, Baltimore, Annapolis, and most of the other metropolitan centers of the country. Because of the interdependence of business and the interrelationship of communications, the District of Columbia ought to conform since others do have daylight-saving time. Already I think it is a fair estimate to say that it applies to more than 50,000,000 people in this country where they are resident at the present time.

Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, Maryland, and Nevada, almost in their entirety, now have daylight-saving time. In addition, Tennessee, Michigan, West Virginia, Ohio, Missouri, Indiana, and Virginia have daylight saving in part. Those are contiguous areas and the confusion that has already manifested itself here springs from the fact that they have daylight saving and we do not. So the first reason is that others have it and the time in the District of Columbia should conform.

The second reason is that the District of Columbia wants it. There have been innumerable polls here, and when daylight saving was concluded last fall, they took a poll in Maryland, Virginia, and in the District of Columbia. I am not unmindful of the fact that there are certain trades and crafts and there are certain people in Government who object. Of course, the proposal was never born which, after examination, did not call for some objection. But in the main it can be said that nearly 70 percent of the people in the contiguous counties in Virginia and Maryland are willing to conform and are going to conform if we have daylight saving in the District of Columbia, and they are anxious to have it.

I think it is a safe estimate that about 70 percent of the people who have been polled are in favor of daylight saving. I have a long list of organizations, 30 or 40 in number, that I will not bother to put into the RECORD, but all of them, very prominent, are heartily in favor after the experience of last fall.

So the first reason is that others have it and it applies to fifty or more million people. The second reason why we should approve it is that the District of Columbia, through its people want it. The third reason is that they ought to have it.

A great contention was made on this floor last year that by virtue of the vagaries of time between our home constituencies and the District of Columbia the people back home could not get Members on the telephone when they wanted them. The fact of the matter is that Congress may adjourn some time in June. Then there is July, August, and September until the 29th day of September when that argument would not apply at all.

So would we be fair in penalizing the people who must remain here in the hot scorching season of the year when we have gone perhaps to cooler spots and to a little relaxation? They want it and for that reason they should have it.

Radio programs when remaining on the same time here that they have always been on are compelled to make transcriptions today. Last night they had transcriptions on the radio. Confusion and expense is involved. I said

there was confusion insofar as the markets are concerned because the markets close earlier in New York and Chicago than they do here.

The other night the former president of the District Bankers' Association said there would be considerable confusion on bank clearances because of the hour of difference where time is such an element.

That is the story. Others have it. The District of Columbia wants it as manifested by the polls and I think they should have it. I do not believe that because of considerations that obtain back home in Illinois or Missouri or Minnesota or California we should deny to them the right to have daylight saving.

This confers upon the Commissioners the authority to do it if they so see fit. That is in the spirit of a little home rule for the people who otherwise are voteless and without any representation except through the Congress.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the hour is late, but I have always opposed daylight saving time and I shall continue to do so.

In the first place, I am sure my good friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would agree with me that I have had no part in the delay which may have existed between the passage of the bill in the Senate and its being brought here for consideration, but I still say I feel very strongly that the greatest illusion, the greatest delusion I have ever met in my legislative experience is the theory of daylight saving time. In the first place, if the city of Philadelphia or the city of New York or the city of Chicago wants to go on daylight saving time, that is their business, but I say to you everything we do here in the city of Washington in a legislative way—and it is illustrative of the home-rule bill—affects the people of the country. Personally, I know our people are confused by the additional hour of daylight saving time that ensued last year.

While we are speaking of daylight saving time, you know we had it for 3½ years during the war. In 1945, this House and the Senate, without a dissenting vote, repealed daylight-saving time that existed during the war. Then, last year they came in with a bill for the Congress to authorize daylight saving in the District of Columbia. That bill was defeated last year. They finally came back with a nice little bill that authorized the District Commissioners to give them daylight saving time, and that bill was passed. That was sort of going up the hill and going down again.

The drive for daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia is not one which is agreed to by all people. While some of the organizations, it is true, have endorsed it, I do not know how many that represents in actual voice in either approval or disapproval, but certainly I want to say to you, in fairness to the people who have taken this matter up with me, that it is not in complete agreement. For example, I have a letter from the District Federation of Women's Clubs, signed by Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, in which she says this:

> I write to inform you that the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs having a membership of approximately 6,000, in 1947 went on record as opposing the principle of daylight saving for the District of Columbia, unless daylight saving was made uniform throughout the United States.

Then she states this, which I think is highly important:

> It seems to us that daylight saving for one isolated locality means great confusion and annoyance in traveling. At best daylight saving is an artificial expedient for young people to give them more time for outdoor exercise. It is not desirable for mothers with young children, or for housekeepers, who must serve the evening meal and put their offspring to bed in the heat of the day. It is extremely hard on farming people, adding an extra hour of work to their already crowded lives. So if we have to endure this artificial arrangement, to please the pleasure of loving youth of the country, it seems to us it ought to be as painless as possible by making it universal, as was done during the war.

Let me read to you a little item that was in the Star here a while ago from a doctor in Philadelphia. He states:

> Daylight-saving time is a menace to the health of school children.

This was a statement made by Dr. John P. Turner, a member of the Philadelphia Board of Education. He goes on to say:

> Students are getting only 6 or 7 hours' sleep and great numbers are suffering from nervous reaction because of daylight saving. Instead of getting up at 7 o'clock, our children are getting up at six after staying up late because you just can't make a child go to bed when the sun is still up.

While some people may think it gives them greater time to play golf or more time in the garden, what it is doing is cheating the rest of the people of this city who want to sleep in the cool of the morning out of that additional hour of sleep.

There has been a great deal of hysteria about daylight saving in the District of Columbia. I know the elements behind the movement for daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia. They are not considering that after all Washington is the Nation's Capital, not operated for just the few people who may live in the metropolitan area of Washington, but a city that should be representative of what affects all of the people in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am against this bill. I think it is a delusion, I repeat, because it does none of the things that it is supposed to do and does a great many things that are a nuisance and menace to the health of the people of the city of Washington.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 41; noes 21.

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 92, not voting 134, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—204

Abernethy	Goodwin	Nixon
Albert	Gordon	Nodar
Allen, Calif.	Gossett	O'Brien
Allen, Ill.	Grant, Ind.	O'Toole
Anderson, Calif.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Owens
Angell	Hagen	Pace
Auchincloss	Hale	Patman
Bakewell	Hall,	Patterson
Banta	Edwin Arthur	Peden
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	Peterson
Beall	Leonard W.	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Phillips, Tenn.
Blackney	Hand	Ploeser
Blatnik	Hardy	Plumley
Boggs, Del.	Harness, Ind.	Poage
Boggs, La.	Harvey	Potts
Bradley	Hays	Poulson
Bramblett	Hébert	Powell
Brehm	Herter	Preston
Bryson	Heselton	Price, Ill.
Buck	Holmes	Ramey
Burke	Hope	Rayburn
Burleson	Horan	Reed, Ill.
Busbey	Huber	Reeves
Butler	Isacson	Regan
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenison	Riehlman
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Rivers
Canfield	Jonkman	Robertson
Carroll	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Carson	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Case, N. J.	Keating	Rohrbough
Chapman	Kee	Rooney
Chelf	Keefe	Russell
Church	Kennedy	Sadlak
Coffin	Keogh	Sadowski
Cole, Kans.	Kersten, Wis.	St. George
Combs	Kilburn	Sanborn
Corbett	Klein	Sarbacher
Cotton	Landis	Sasscer
Crosser	Lane	Scott,
Crow	Latham	Hugh D., Jr.
Davis, Wis.	LeFevre	Seely-Brown
Dawson, Utah	Lesinski	Smathers
Deane	Lodge	Smith, Wis.
Devitt	Love	Snyder
Dirksen	Lucas	Spence
Domengeaux	Lyle	Stigler
Dondero	McDonough	Stockman
Donohue	McGregor	Teague
Doughton	McMahon	Thompson
Douglas	McMillen, Ill.	Tibbott
Durham	MacKinnon	Tollefson
Ellsworth	Macy	Towe
Elsaesser	Madden	Twyman
Engel, Mich.	Mahon	Vail
Engle, Calif.	Marcantonio	Van Zandt
Feighan	Mathews	Vursell
Fernandez	Meade, Ky.	Weichel
Fisher	Meade, Md.	Welch
Flannagan	Merrow	Whittington
Fletcher	Michener	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Mills	Wilson, Ind.
Folger	Mitchell	Wilson, Tex.
Foote	Morrison	Winstead
Forand	Morton	Wolcott
Gamble	Muhlenberg	Wolverton
Gearhart	Multer	Woodruff
Gillie	Murdock	Worley
Goff	Nicholson	Youngblood

NAYS—92

Abbitt	Cole, Mo.	Hobbs
Allen, La.	Cole, N. Y.	Hoeven
Andersen,	Cooley	Hull
H. Carl	Cooper	Jackson, Wash.
Arnold	Courtney	Jensen
Barden	Cox	Johnson, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	Crawford	Johnson, Tex.
Beckworth	Cunningham	King
Bennett, Mo.	Curtis	Knutson
Bishop	Davis, Ga.	Larcade
Brooks	Dolliver	LeCompte
Brophy	Dorn	Lemke
Brown, Ga.	Gary	Lewis
Brown, Ohio	Granger	Lusk
Bulwinkle	Gregory	McCulloch
Camp	Griffiths	McMillan, S. C.
Cannon	Gross	Mack
Case, S. Dak.	Gwynne, Iowa	Martin, Iowa
Chenoweth	Harris	Miller, Md.
Clark	Havenner	Miller, Nebr.

Morris	Redden	Simpson, Ill.
Mundt	Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.
Murray, Tenn.	Rees	Smith, Va.
Murray, Wis.	Richards	Stefan
Norblad	Riley	Stevenson
O'Hara	Rockwell	Talle
O'Konski	Sabath	Vorys
Passman	Schwabe, Mo.	Wheeler
Phillips, Calif.	Schwabe, Okla.	Whitten
Pickett	Short	Williams
Rankin	Sikes	Wood

NOT VOTING—134

Andresen, August H.	Gathings	McCormack
Andrews, Ala.	Gavin	McCowen
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillette	McDowell
Arends	Gore	McGarvey
Barrett	Gorski	Maloney
Battle	Graham	Manasco
Bell	Grant, Ala.	Mansfield
Bender	Harless, Ariz.	Mason
Bland	Harrison	Meyer
Bloom	Hart	Miller, Calif.
Bolton	Hartley	Miller, Conn.
Bonner	Hedrick	Monroney
Boykin	Heffernan	Morgan
Buchanan	Hendricks	Norrell
Buckley	Hess	Norton
Buffett	Hill	Pfeifer
Celler	Hinshaw	Potter
Chadwick	Hoffman	Price, Fla.
Chiperfield	Holifield	Priest
Clason	Jackson, Calif.	Rains
Clevenger	Jarman	Rich
Clippinger	Javits	Rizley
Colmer	Jenkins, Ohio	Ross
Coudert	Jenkins, Pa.	Scoblick
Cravens	Jennings	Scott, Hardie
Dague	Johnson, Ind.	Scrivner
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Okla.	Shafer
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Sheppard
Delaney	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Pa.
D'Ewart	Jones, Wash.	Smith, Maine
Dingell	Judd	Smith, Ohio
Eaton	Kearney	Somers
Eberharter	Kearns	Stanley
Elliott	Kefauver	Stratton
Ellis	Kelley	Sundstrom
Elston	Kerr	Taber
Evins	Kilday	Taylor
Fallon	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Fellows	Kunkel	Thomas, Tex.
Fenton	Lanham	Trimble
Fuller	Lea	Vinson
Fulton	Lichtenwalter	Wadsworth
Gallagher	Ludlow	Walter
Garmatz	Lynch	West
	McConnell	Whitaker

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Eberharter.
Mr. Taber with Mr. Kilday.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Judd with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Gavin with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Fenton with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Maloney with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Hoffman with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Arends with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Clason with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Kunkel with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Dague with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Colmer.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. McConnell with Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Meyer with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Miller of Connecticut with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Wadsworth with Mr. West.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Priest.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Rains.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Gorski.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lanham.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Thomas of Texas.
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Elston, with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Buffett with Mr. Gore.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Stanley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a telegram.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. Lane Webber.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include as a part of the remarks a table on ERP, an editorial from the Daily Express, London, of January 15, 1948, an article from the Economist of September 13, 1947, and also an editorial from the Economist of July 12, 1947.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the East Chicago (Ind.) Chapter of the American Christian Palestine Committee.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include newspaper excerpts.

Mr. LYLE (at the request of Mr. HAYS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

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

To Mr. RICH (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 3 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. REED of New York), until further notice, on account of illness.

To Mrs. NORTON (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

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

To Mr. SMITH of Ohio, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. TRIMBLE, for 3 days, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 866. An act 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 for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2158. An act to amend the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, so as to eliminate certain provisions of such Acts requiring the retention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times;

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 27, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1490. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $750,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 624); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1491. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1492. A letter from Charles E. Bohlen, Counselor, for the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Gervasio Artigas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

1493. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1494. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1495. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued Typical Electric Bills, Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Services, Cities of 50,000 Population and More, January 1, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5808. A bill to continue on a permanent basis a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 1793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6087. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 548. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5992, a bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; without amendment (Rept. No. 1795). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 549. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5963, a bill to authorize the construction of a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1796). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 550. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 4954, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington; without amendment (Rept. No. 1797). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1608. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1338); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1132. An act to amend section 40 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 728), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POTTS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1896. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows; without amendment (Rept. No. 1810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURKE: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5144. A bill providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 1811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; with amendments (Rept. No. 1813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 379. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 380. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 381. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1816). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TWYMAN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 371. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5053. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 810. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey; with amendments (Rept. No. 1800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader; without amendment (Rept. No. 1801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FOOTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2246. A bill for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2325. A bill for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1803). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Lester L. Elder; with amendments (Rept. No. 1805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5449. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson; with amendments (Rept. No. 1806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6251. A bill for the relief of Hans Kraney and Clare Felton Kraney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 744. A bill for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6333. A bill to facilitate the deportation of aliens from the United States, to provide for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of the

United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6334. A bill to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 6335. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 6336. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to lease to the Continental Southern Corp. the subsurface of the land on which is situated the United States post office at Long Beach, Calif., for the purpose of removing oil and other hydrocarbon substances therefrom; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 6337. A bill to amend the Social Security Act of 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 6338. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6339. A bill to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 6340. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6341. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6342. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 6343. A bill to grant military leave with pay to substitute employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 383. Joint resolution designating the first Tuesday of March of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Industrial Exposition, Inc., Atlantic City, N. J., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 386. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds of the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. J. Res. 387. Joint resolution to authorize $100,000 to provide adequate protection from flooding of the Susquehanna River in the Conklin-Kirkwood, N. Y., area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the final report of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, and authorizing the printing of 5,000 additional copies thereof; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 6344. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 6345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irmgard Erfurt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 6346. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jennie Gayle, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 6347. A bill for the relief of Huynh Ngoc Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6348. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria N. Laborde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6349. A bill for the relief of Osmore H. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6350. A bill for the relief of Angelina Gonzales y Soto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6351. A bill for the relief of S2c Joseph T. Sypko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON (by request):

H. R. 6352. A bill for the relief of Reno E. Stitely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 6353. A bill for the relief of Ion Stanescu and Catherina Stanescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 6354. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lelia E. Colvin; 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:

1831. By Mr. BROOKS: Petition of Ben E. Neal, Sr., of Shreveport, La., on behalf of Mrs. Clara L. Fetterhoff, Shreveport, La., widow of Sgt. Paul H. Fetterhoff, ASN33233021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1832. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. C. Michael, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1833. Also, petition of H. M. Barnhart, Mount Dora, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1834. Also, petition of W. S. Lincoln, Zephyrhills, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1835. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1836. Also, petition of Mrs. L. H. Anglemyer, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1837. Also, petition of the Gippe sisters, Montevideo, Minn., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution urging defeat of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1838. Also, petition of the Board of Aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Wagner-Taft-Ellender housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1839. Also, petition of Hughes R. Hilliard, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1840. Also, petition of the Best Foods, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the right to yellow margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O God, our eternal light, breathe Thy gracious power upon us and calm us with thought that reveals the way of wisdom. Purge us of all vanity and grant us a newer and clearer vision of the things we should do. Take from our lives intemperance and indulgence and fill every heart with fidelity to our Republic. As we consider our heritage, lift our heads and lead us to proclaim boldly those great moral and spiritual imperatives which give honor and vitality to a people. In our Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On April 17, 1948:

H. R. 358. An act for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia;

H. R. 387. An act for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;

H. R. 420. An act for the relief of Esther Ringel;

H. R. 421. An act for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;

H. R. 560. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz;

H. R 899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of William B. Moore;

H. R. 1859. An act for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizenga;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of John A. Dilboy;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;

H. R. 2213. An act for the relief of A. J. Sprouffske;

H. R 2250. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;