

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3907. A bill to authorize construction of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance; without amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6127. A bill to authorize the allocation of funds to Grant County, Ind., for payment of one-half the cost of a certain bridge across the Mississinewa River in Grant County, Ind., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6587. A bill to promote effectual utilization of the fishery resources of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6588. A bill to authorize payments to public-school district or districts serving the Hungry Horse Dam, Mont., area; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6589. A bill to authorize the interment in adjoining graves in national cemeteries of certain parents and their children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 404. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a statue of Simon Bolivar; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the methods by which international security and world peace may be attained through the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 600. Resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Resolution 595; 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. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6590. A bill for the relief of Isom Puckett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6591. A bill for the relief of Zdzislaw Seidl and Mrs. Margit Seidl; 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:

1939. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 7444, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging Hon. Jesse M. Donaldson, Postmaster General of the United States, to give consideration to the issuance of a special postage stamp sometime during the California centennial of 1948, 1949, and 1950 appropriately to commemorate the 21 missions of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1940. Also, Resolution No. 7445, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging the Senate of the United States to take early and favorable action with respect to H. R. 49 to the end that the Territory of Hawaii may be ad-

mitted to the Union as the forty-ninth State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1941. Also, Resolution No. 7424, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, giving full endorsement to, and memorializing the Congress of the United States to give early passage to H. R. 5004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1942. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the President's civil-rights program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1943. Also, petition of Edmund C. Fletcher, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to impeachment of the Honorable Sterling Hutcheson, judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, for gross misbehavior in office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1944. Also, petition of Milton Grunberg and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of the Mundt-Nixon bill; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1945. Also, petition of Maurice Goldberg and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1946. Also, petition of A. S. Dannenauny and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1947. Also, petition of F. Hollander and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1948. Also, petition of Olga Blattman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1949. Also, petition of J. Gayron and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1950. Also, petition of Rose Ridman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1951. By Mr. EATON: Joint resolution of Mr. Hess, New Jersey State legislator, memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation which will retain unto the States control over service, operations, and rates of any railroad which has been reorganized under the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, May 10, 1948)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

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

O Lord, in the midst of great activity today we ask Thee to remind us often of Thine invisible presence, that out of con-

fused issues may come simplicity of plan; out of fear may come confidence; out of hurry may come the willingness to wait; out of frustration, rest and power.

This we ask in Thine own name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 17, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3219) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1878. An act to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States;

H. R. 3510. An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 5193. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3350) relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

NOMINATION OF JESS LARSON TO BE WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATOR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation is as follows: Under the order of Thursday, May 13, 1948, as modified on May 14, the nomination of Jess Larson, of Oklahoma, to be War Assets Administrator is before the Senate in executive session, and the question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to recommit the nomination to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Under the order, a vote will be taken on the motion of the Senator from Maryland at 1 o'clock today, and the intervening time is to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the motion, and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Maryland [Mr.

TYDINGS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the absence of a quorum is now suggested and the roll is called, the time would be divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the motion, would it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct, provided the Senator from North Carolina agrees.

Mr. HOEY. That is satisfactory.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Maryland yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

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	Hatch	Moore
Ball	Hawkes	Morse
Barkley	Hayden	O'Connor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Revercomb
Buck	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Ives	Russell
Byrd	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Capper	Kem	Stennis
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Connally	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Lodge	Thye
Donnell	Lucas	Tobey
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Vandenberg
Eastland	McGrath	Wherry
Ecton	McKellar	White
Ferguson	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Magnuson	Williams
George	Malone	Wilson
Green	Martin	Young
Gurney	Millikin	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is a member of the committee on the part of the Senate having been appointed to attend the funeral of the late Senator John H. Overton, of Louisiana, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr.

TAYLOR], 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.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, for the benefit of those who would like to get additional light on the question before the Senate, I will continue the statement of the case I made on Thursday last.

There was a plant in Salt Lake City known as the Kalunite plant. The Government determined to sell that plant, and sent out invitations for bids. Not only did the Government send out invitations for bids, but it advertised in the daily newspapers of Utah asking those who had not received invitations to bid if they desired to do so, and to disseminate the information so that the widest possible field of bidders could be reached.

The following provision was inserted in the invitation sent to every bidder:

In the event that no acceptable bid is received, at the discretion of this administration either a new cut-off date will be set—

Which means that new bids would be asked for—

or negotiations will continue with only the highest bidder.

So every bidder was put on notice, first, that all the bids would be rejected and new bids would be asked for if no acceptable bid were received, or, as an alternative, that negotiations would be carried on with only the highest bidder.

Three bids were received. The highest was submitted by the American Potash & Chemical Corp., which bid \$752,000. The second bid was by Columbia Metals Corp., which bid \$635,000. The last bid was by J. R. Simplot Co., which bid \$625,000.

The bids were not rejected. New bids were not asked for. Negotiations were not carried on with the highest bidder; but the lowest bidder, the J. R. Simplot Co., was awarded the contract at the price bid by the highest bidder, the American Potash & Chemical Corp. So that if the American Potash & Chemical Corp., which was the highest bidder, were eliminated because it was a big concern and because the Government wanted to favor small plants, then that would leave the Columbia Metals Corp. as the highest bidder, and it would have been entitled to the award. But instead of that it was taken out of the picture, and the award was given to the Simplot Co.

What was the basis for the throwing out of the American Potash & Chemical Corp.? The Administrator wrote to the Commerce Department, as he is required to do under certain conditions in the sale of war assets property, and he said:

Is there any reason why any one of these concerns should not be awarded this property?

The Commerce Department wrote back—this is but a part of their letter, but is an exact quotation from the full letter which I have here—and told the Administrator as follows:

In answer to your interrogatory we advise as follows:

The American Potash Corp. and the Simplot Corp. propose to convert to the production of phosphatic fertilizers, whereas the Columbia Metals Corp. proposes to convert * * * to the production of nitrogenous fertilizer (ammonium sulfate).

We have been informed by * * * Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce—

And others, I might say, which I need not mention—

that there exists today an acute shortage of nitrogenous fertilizers—

Which was the commodity which Columbia Metals was going to make.

It is reported—

The letter continues—

that phosphatic and potassic fertilizers are virtually in balance with respect to supply and demand.

Only one * * * plant (Columbia Metals Corp.) proposes to manufacture ammonium sulphate, a nitrogenous fertilizer.

Therefore the Commerce Department advised the Administrator to award the plant to Columbia Metals Corp. and to throw out American Potash & Chemical Corp. because they said that was big business and the law required small business to be preferred. But instead of following the report sent him by the Commerce Department in pursuance to the law governing this matter, the Administrator awarded the plant to the Simplot Co., the lowest bidder, instead of to the Columbia Metals Corp.

When the Administrator came before the committee—I have had to learn about this as I went along—he left the committee and he left me under the impression that he had satisfied the Columbia Metals Corp. by letting them have a plant in Salem, Ore., and I assumed from his testimony that a deal had been made. I asked him the other day, since the hearings were held, whether or not that was true, and now I learn that the Columbia Metals Corp. had not been awarded the Salem, Ore., plant. True, they are operating it, but they have not yet completed negotiations for its ownership, whereas we were under the impression that the Columbia concern was going to get the Salem plant, and as a result Mr. Larson felt that he could award the Salt Lake City plant to the J. R. Simplot Co. I have the letter in my hand. I shall not read it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the date of it?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is not dated, as a matter of fact, but it came to my office on the 18th of May, and I assume was written either on the 18th or the 17th or the 16th. At any rate, Mr. Larson says that he is still negotiating with the Columbia Metals Corp. for the acquisition of the Salem, Ore., plant. They have not yet gotten title to it, and have not agreed on terms, but they are operating it under an interim agreement until they can arrive at some understanding, which has not been arrived at as yet. So Columbia Metals Corp. has not gotten the

Salem, Oreg., plant definitely, although it is expected they will eventually get it, but we were under the impression that they had been given it so as to get them to drop out of the situation.

Mr. President, that is no way to conduct a business. If the Columbia Metals Corp. was the highest bidder, the Administrator had no right to play one against the other and move them around like checkers on a board. Mr. Larson should have awarded the Utah plant to that corporation. First of all he should have awarded it to the American Potash and Chemical Corp., in my opinion, because he said that he would negotiate only with the highest bidder, and he sold the plant anyway for what was the bid of the American Potash & Chemical Corp. He did not say "If you are a big concern you cannot get the plant." He only said, "If you are the highest bidder you will get it, if your bid is satisfactory to me, and if it is not satisfactory I will reject all bids and ask for new bids, or I will negotiate only with the highest bidder."

I am not asking the Senate to reject Mr. Larson's nomination; I am asking that his nomination be recommitted to the committee, where a full investigation of the transaction can be had. I think I have shown sufficient already to prove pretty conclusively that it is a thing which should be investigated. It has been a matter that has been played with fast and loose all the way through, and I am satisfied, in the light of what I now know, plus what I knew at the time I originally appeared before the committee, that a good case can be made out to call into question the fitness of Mr. Larson to administer this great enterprise.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] is recognized.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, in connection with this entire proposition I think it is advisable to state a few facts which led up to the bidding on the occasion in question. The motion of the Senator from Maryland is to recommit the nomination to committee. I do not see any purpose to be served by that. Both a subcommittee and the full committee have conducted hearings, and we heard the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] for 2 days, along with the other Members of the Senate who wished to testify, and other witnesses. All sides have been heard, and all have had an opportunity to say any and everything which they wished to say in connection with this bid or with the confirmation of Mr. Larson's nomination.

Mr. President, in order to obtain a clear understanding of this matter I think it should be borne in mind that the Kalunite plant at Salt Lake City had been offered by the War Assets Administration for 2 years practically, and bidders had submitted bids on several different occasions. The bids were not satisfactory. The War Assets Administration had had this plant appraised in the usual method, and the appraisal was \$611,000. On the first bidding the highest bid was about \$150,000, and others ranged downward in different amounts.

The second time the bids were increased considerably, and the third time there was a still larger increase. The bidding now under consideration represents the final bidding.

Now it is complained by the distinguished Senator from Maryland that in sending out the bid the language was used, as quoted by him, that either the bid of the highest bidder would be accepted or that there would be another offering. He quoted the language shown on the chart before us. It is true that language was contained in the invitation advertisement for bids, and was sent to the different bidders. But it is also true that in the same notice the right was reserved by the War Assets Administration to reject any or all bids. So that the language used in this instance, while it is different from that used in a great many invitations to submit bids, still contained a provision reserving the right of the War Assets Administrator to reject any or all bids.

I think it should be said in this connection that Mr. Larson was not the Administrator at the time invitations for bids were sent out, and, of course, he had nothing to do with prescribing this language. I am not suggesting that as lessening his obligation or authority to comply with the language, but I am saying that even with the language which the invitations contained, it likewise contained a provision that the War Assets Administrator might reject any or all bids.

Invitations were sent out and three bids were received, as indicated by the chart. The three bids came from three different concerns, namely, the American Potash & Chemical Corp., which bid \$752,000; the Columbia Metals Corp., which bid \$635,000; and J. R. Simplot Co., which bid \$625,000.

In order to have a little clearer understanding, I think it would be enlightening to state that in all the bidding which had taken place theretofore the last two named companies had been bidding each time, but the first-named company, the American Potash & Chemical Corp., had never theretofore submitted a bid. Three bidders had been contesting for the property for some time, and the American Potash & Chemical Corp. had never previously submitted a bid. Before that time bids were submitted by the Sterling Co., the Columbia Metals Corp., and J. R. Simplot Co.

On this occasion the American Potash & Chemical Corp., which had not been sent any invitation to bid because it had theretofore shown no interest, did submit a bid. Notices were sent only to the three companies which had bid on previous occasions, but a bid of \$752,000 was submitted by the American Potash & Chemical Corp.

What did the Administrator do? He did just what the law required him to do. He communicated with the Commerce Department because, under the law enacted by the Congress, the Commerce Department was to advise the Administrator with reference to bids, in the interest of seeing that as many plants as possible came into the hands of small business. Therefore, under the law, he was required to communicate with the

Department. He did so and he received advice from the Commerce Department in which it stated that the last two named bidders—that is, the Columbia Metals Corp. and the Simplot Co.—qualified; in other words, that they were eligible. However, the Department held that the first-named bidder—the American Potash & Chemical Corp.—was not eligible by reason of the fact that it was big business and could not qualify as a small-business concern.

Incidentally, the American Potash & Chemical Corp. has a capitalization of \$21,000,000; the Columbia Metals Corp. of approximately \$800,000; and the J. R. Simplot Co. of approximately \$2,000,000.

After the bids were received and due consideration had been given, and after receiving the notice from the Commerce Department advising that the American Potash & Chemical Corp. was not eligible, what did the War Assets Administrator do? He did just about what one would expect him to do under the circumstances. He wrote a letter to each of the bidders notifying them about the conditions, and he used language in that letter to the effect that he was rejecting all bids. He then took the matter up with the two bidders who met the qualifications, namely, the Columbia Metals Corp. and J. R. Simplot Co. When he took the question up with them and discussed it, Mr. Gallagher, the representative of Columbia Metals Corp., stated that he was not ready to say whether or not he could raise his bid. In addition, there was discussion with reference to whether or not he could make the necessary financial arrangements.

There was another question involved. The Columbia Metals Corp. was also a bidder for the plant located at Salem, Oreg. The Administrator questioned whether or not this company would be able to deal financially with respect to both plants, and handle them adequately.

In connection with the Salem plant, the distinguished Senator from Maryland stated that that plant had not yet been awarded. That is true; but the Columbia Metals Corp. operated the Salem plant during the war, and since the war it has been operating it under lease. It is the only company that has ever submitted a bid for the purchase of the Salem, Oreg., plant. No other company manifested any interest in it. It submitted a bid, and I believe that a deal will be consummated with that company for the sale of the Salem plant. At any rate, that project was under negotiation.

After the Administrator had learned that it could not be determined from the Columbia Metals Corp. that it was willing to raise its bid to \$752,000, the amount of the highest bid, and after he had decided that probably it would not be able to make financial arrangements, in the light of the fact that it was also negotiating with respect to the Salem, Oreg., plant, and would probably buy it, he decided to confer with the other bidder, the Simplot Co. When he conferred with Mr. Simplot, Mr. Simplot agreed to raise his bid to the amount of the highest bid, \$752,000. That was \$141,000 above the valuation which the board of the War Assets Administration

had placed upon the property, and the Government would receive that figure.

I do not know upon what basis the nomination could either be sent back to the committee for reconsideration, or rejected. What is there to indicate that the subject has not been given full, thorough, and satisfactory consideration?

When this subject was under consideration last Thursday, a question was raised as to whether or not Columbia Metals Corp. had had a fair deal. The next morning after the discussion in the Senate last Thursday, I received an unsolicited telegram from the Columbia Metals Corp. Inasmuch as I had made a statement in connection with the explanation of the contract, the telegram was addressed to me. It reads as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., May 13, 1948.
The Honorable CLYDE R. HOEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Information has reached us that we are reported to be dissatisfied with the award of the Kalunite plant at Salt Lake City. We were surprised and puzzled by the decision at the time but upon our own further analysis our company concluded that the Administrator had made a wise and fair decision and in the best interests of all parties concerned, including the Government. We therefore have no complaint or protest to offer.

J. O. GALLAGHER,
President, Columbia Metals Corp.

It has been stated that it was recommended that the Utah plant be sold to the Columbia Metals Corp. because it proposed to manufacture a very scarce fertilizer commodity, sodium phosphate. It is true that that product is in scarce supply; but all fertilizers are in scarce supply. The Simplot Co. proposes to manufacture a very high grade fertilizer denominated as "12/48," meaning 12 percent nitrogen and 48 percent phosphate. That product is in scarce supply, especially throughout the area in which this plant would operate.

Mr. President, I have reviewed this subject very hastily, merely touching some of the points. There are other Senators who are familiar with the subject. I do not wish to consume too much time. At this time I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall support the action of the committee recommending confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Larson to be War Assets Administrator.

I have gone into this subject rather thoroughly since listening to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] last week. I had some information about it prior to the time Mr. Larson's name was submitted by the President.

One of the plants involved is located in the State of Oregon. I was interested in endeavoring to secure for the Western area of the United States as large and continuous a supply of fertilizer as it was possible to secure.

The plant at Salem, Oreg., while not constructed originally for the purpose of making ammonium sulphate, but rather for making alumina from clay, was so

constructed that a part of the original operation was that of the manufacture of ammonium sulphate. Consequently, after the plant had served its purpose during the war, we secured its operation thereafter for the purpose of manufacturing ammonium sulphate. When the Kalunite plant, which was also an experimental alumina-from-clay plant, became surplus, those who operated the plant in Salem were interested in securing the plant in Salt Lake City also for the purpose of manufacturing ammonium sulphate for fertilizer. Again, that was my interest. I wrote to General Littlejohn, the War Assets Administrator, who preceded Mr. Larson, when the first returns from the invitations to bid came in, and the bids were very low, suggesting that those operating the plant in Salem had indicated that they would bid the fair value of the plant at Salt Lake City if it were readvertised. It was readvertised. The group operating the plant in Salem, Oreg., bid some \$35,000 above the fair value of the plant, as found by the War Assets Administration.

I was interested only in securing for those businesses that were able to engage in manufacturing fertilizer an opportunity to continue such manufacture.

After the bids were opened in 1947, my office received notice that a hearing would be had on the whole subject. I was not interested in that hearing. The readvertising had taken place. Two bids had been secured. I did write to the War Assets Administrator, calling attention to the fact that the high bidder, the American Potash & Chemical Co., was alleged by the Alien Property Custodian, who had had some half million shares of the stock of that company for sale in 1945, to be the only manufacturer of potash on the west coast and to have a substantial monopoly of the market. I called that matter to the attention of the Administrator, and also called his attention to the fact that among some 20 provisions of the Surplus Property Act governing the disposal of plants there appeared the following:

(b) To give maximum aid in the reestablishment of a peacetime economy of free, independent, private enterprise, the development of the maximum of independent operators in trade, industry, and agriculture, and to stimulate full employment.

(d) To discourage monopolistic practices and to strengthen and preserve the competitive position of small-business concerns in an economy of free enterprise.

(p) To foster the development of new independent enterprise.

I suggested to the Administrator that in awarding a contract for the sale of this property to one of the competing bidders, those matters should be taken into consideration, as they were a part of the congressional policy.

Thereafter I took no part in the matter. The decision was made and I did not even know what it was, until months afterwards. I had received a telegram, like that which came to the Senator from North Carolina, from Mr. Gallagher, who was manager of the Salem plant of the Columbia Metals Co., suggesting that he has no quarrel with the decision which has been made. Of course, that is beside the point.

I wish to say with reference to the status of the Salem plant—and I call this to the attention of the Senator from Maryland, because it may be additional information which he does not have—that it may be that the negotiations have not been consummated solely because, again, the senior Senator from Oregon has called to the attention of the Administrator the fact that that plant is susceptible of further use in the case of another war emergency, and that, if possible, any disposal arrangement which is made of it should contain a provision requiring that it be continued to be used for the manufacture of ammonium sulfate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I yield myself half a minute of the time on my side of the case, although I shall take only 10 seconds. I should like to say that I have a letter from the Administrator, and the reason the deal has not been consummated is not the reason the Senator has stated. It is due to the fact that there has been a failure to agree as to the price at which the property is to be transferred. I have here a letter from the Administrator to bear me out in that statement.

Mr. HOEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have no special interest in this matter. I did not know Mr. Larson until after he became associated with the War Assets Administration. I have had some contact with him since. For some time he was general counsel for that agency. When I compare the quality of administration which that agency is now receiving with the quality of the administration it previously had, the comparison recommends Mr. Larson very highly to me, because this agency has been a difficult one to administer. In my opinion he is doing a good job of it, and I think he should be confirmed.

Since this issue was raised in debate last week, I took home with me the transcript of all the testimony adduced at the hearings the committee held. I have read the testimony through carefully. I was present at the committee hearings, and I listened carefully to the testimony as it was adduced there.

I cannot find that anything wrong was done in this transaction. I cannot even find a suspicion that anything was shady or that anything was prearranged or that any sort of negotiations were carried on in any way that was not open and aboveboard.

Had there not been in the invitation to bid the statement that in the event all bids were rejected or no acceptable bid was received, negotiations would be carried on with the highest bidder or another cut-off date would be set, there would not be any controversy here today. Mr. Larson did not place that

statement in the notice to bid. It did not come under his jurisdiction. He was not Administrator or Acting Administrator when that notice was sent out. But bear in mind that the American Potash & Chemical Corp., which became the highest bidder, did not receive one of the invitations to bid. It was not invited to bid. It had never before manifested any interest in bidding on that plant.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me briefly, let me say that I know he is not familiar with the fact that the War Assets Administration ran advertisements in the newspapers asking prospective bidders to bid. What the Senator meant to say, I am sure, is that the War Assets Administration did not send the American Potash & Chemical Corp. an invitation to bid.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, the War Assets Administration did not send it a special invitation to bid.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true, because the War Assets Administration did not know of this company's particular interest in the plant.

But after the American Potash & Chemical Co. became the high bidder, it was determined by the Department of Commerce that if that company could not meet the requirements of the act as an eligible bidder on this plant, then, it being an ineligible bidder, the War Assets Administration, regardless of what was in the notice or invitation to bid, no longer owed the American Potash & Chemical Co. any obligation whatsoever; and in the notice to bid it had reserved the right to reject all bids. What it did was simply, when the American Potash & Chemical Co. was held to be ineligible, it undertook to carry on negotiations with the next highest bidder and also with the lowest bidder, because there entered into the situation a consideration of the need for a particular kind of fertilizer in that area. One of the remaining two bidders was going to make one kind of fertilizer and the other company was going to make another kind. Another consideration which entered into the matter was whether the Columbia Metals Corp. could finance this transaction, in addition to the plant at Salem, Oreg., in which it was interested, and which it had under lease and had been operating.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may I have a further moment?

Mr. HOEY. Certainly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I simply wish to make this point: There was the Administrator knowing of the urgent need for this product. There was the Government with a plant which it had been trying to sell and dispose of for 2 years. Four previous invitations for bids had been issued, and the Government had carried on private negotiations unsuccessfully in an attempt to dispose of the plant. Under those circumstances, Mr. Larson—even if we term what he did a mistake of judgment, which I do not—kept the negotiations open and above-

board with the two bidders, and finally disposed of the plant—and I think rightfully so—to the Simplot Co.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that this nomination has been pending in the Senate for 5 months. Are we to delay it longer? Certainly I think every opportunity has been afforded to everyone who might question the transaction or who might oppose the confirmation of Mr. Larson's nomination to submit the evidence that would warrant the Senate in refusal of confirmation. That has not been done. I believe, in justice to Mr. Larson and in justice to ourselves, no further delay should be granted, and that the Senate should act favorably on the nomination.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I desire only 3 minutes.

Mr. HOEY. I have already agreed to yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], after which I shall be glad to yield to other Senators. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish only to say that when Mr. Larson took over as Administrator of the War Assets Administration last December or November, it was in very bad condition. Under his leadership it has been restored to the point where it is doing a very good work. Mr. Larson has done so much better work than anyone else who has had charge of the War Assets Administration, that it is truly remarkable. If he has committed errors of judgment, he has been no more than human in that respect. But in the matter which has been brought up as an argument for not confirming his nomination the committee is not satisfied that he committed even an error of judgment, which is the most that could be charged against him. I think, indeed, I know, that he has been instrumental in discouraging the sale of certain United States property which should have been retained, which had previously been declared surplus.

I do not believe that his nomination should be recommitted to the committee. I can see no good coming from such action being taken at this time. If we should not have Mr. Larson as War Assets Administrator the chances are 100 to 1 we would have somebody far less capable than he. I believe that when the committee unanimously voted to approve his nomination, it took the right course.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I now yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President not only does the report filed by the committee unanimously favoring confirmation of the nomination of Jess Larson for this important position have much weight with me in casting my vote, but also the fact that I have had some experience with Mr. Larson since he became Admin-

istrator of the War Assets Administration. Coming from a large State such as Illinois, there are many problems presented by my constituents which make it incumbent upon me to endeavor to make sure that they will have a respectful hearing upon the questions in which they are interested. I want to say for Mr. Larson that during all the time the War Assets Administration has been in existence I have had constant contact with those in charge, and Mr. Larson far surpasses any other individual who has been serving in that capacity for courtesy, kindness, efficiency, and high public service. He has demonstrated all those qualities to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

The time of the Senator from North Carolina is completely exhausted.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has yielded me 3 minutes, which I yield to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad to add my testimony to the faithful, competent, and skilled service in the public interest which has been rendered by Mr. Larson during the time he has been head of the War Assets Administration.

Mr. President, in the performance of my duties as Senator from Florida, I have had to take matters to him for consideration. I have never known him to be inattentive to their importance or to fail to see to it that they got an impartial, full, and fair hearing. I have never seen him interested in anything other than the best protection and preservation of the public interest. He has justified, in my opinion, the confidence of the United States Senate and its continued support in the performance of his public service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall try to summarize without going into detail what is involved in the question before the Senate. First of all, I am not questioning Mr. Larson's boyhood, or his early manhood, or whether he goes to church on Sunday, or smokes. I am questioning whether or not by a piece of concrete evidence now before the Senate there is not a prima facie case made out warranting further investigation—and that is all I am asking for, additional investigation—to determine whether or not on the basis of facts which are not in dispute Mr. Larson should be entrusted with this high office of great responsibility.

It has been said that when invitations to bid were put out, Mr. Larson was not the Administrator. That is true. But when the bids came in, it was Mr. Larson's duty to determine whether or not the bids tendered fitted with the invitation to bid. So he had to know what limitations were put on each and every bidder before he could intelligently award the bid. That is just common sense.

It is said that the American Potash & Chemical Corp. were not among the

original bidders. What has that to do with it? They were invited to bid through newspaper advertisements asking anyone interested to submit a bid, on the terms embodied in the invitation; and they did. There is nothing illegal about it. And praise on high, if it had not been for the American Potash & Chemical Corp.'s bid the Government would have lost \$150,000, because their bid had to be met. With that preliminary, let us see what is involved.

The invitations went out. What did they say? They notified every prospective bidder when he read it to determine, first, whether he would consider bidding or not and that—

In the event that no acceptable bid is received, at the discretion of this Administration either a new cut-off date will be set, or negotiations will continue with only the highest bidder.

A man calculates. He says, "Let me see whether I want to bid on those terms or not. They will either throw out all the bids, or I may be the highest bidder, and if I am, they will not negotiate with anybody else except me. All right, John, get such and such an engineering firm to survey this plant to see what it will take to reconvert it. Do this and do that. Incur expense." Finally, when all that is done and the money is paid out for the survey, the concern makes its bid in accordance with the terms of the invitation to bid.

The bids are opened. The American Potash & Chemical Corp. has complied with every single solitary restriction thrown around the bidder. They are roughly \$125,000 higher than the other two bidders. They are high. "Now," Mr. Larson says, "I know that I said I would only negotiate with the highest bidder, but I am going to send down to the Commerce Department, for, under the law, that is what I have to do if I want to do it." He did not have to do it. It says he may. But he did it. That is how the start was made to get rid of one bidder.

What did the Commerce Department write? They wrote back to Mr. Larson a long letter recommending, not that the Simplot Co. be awarded the property; they recommended specifically by name that the Columbia Metals Corp. be given the property. But they did not get it. Why did they want the Columbia Metals Corp. to get it? Senators, it is as plain as the nose on a man's face. This is why: They said the American Potash & Chemical Corp. and the Simplot Corp. proposed to convert to the production of phosphatic fertilizer. Those two concerns would make phosphatic fertilizer, whereas the Columbia Metals Corp. proposed to convert to the production of nitrogenous fertilizer. Continuing, the letter says:

We have been informed by the Department of Agriculture, by the Department of Commerce, and by two committees of the Congress that there is existing today an acute shortage of nitrogenous fertilizer.

That is the fertilizer which the Columbia Metals Corp. proposed to make. Then the letter goes on to say that there is no shortage of potassic and phosphatic fertilizer, that they are in reasonable supply. The Commerce Department

then says that there is only one plant, the Columbia Metals Corp., which proposes to manufacture a fertilizer which is badly needed, and as that company was the next highest bidder they advocated that the property be awarded to the Columbia Metals Corp.

Did that company receive it? The Columbia Metals Corp. had already bid more than had the Simplot Co. It had already bid more than the appraised value of the property. Here is the report of the Department of Commerce saying that, under the law, the property should be given to the Columbia Metals Corp. What happened? They called in the president of Columbia Metals Corp. and said, "Will you pay as much as the American Potash Co. bid?" The president of the Columbia Metals Corp. said, "I cannot tell you. I shall have to go back and consult my board of directors. I am only the president. I have not been authorized by the company to go any higher than this figure." They said to him, "That is all right. Do not go back. You do not have to go back. We will try to make up to you for the loss of this plant by letting you get another plant in Salem, Oreg."

That left the field clear for the lowest bidder to get a plant. No wonder Mr. Gallagher sent a telegram to my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. HOBY]. He has not received the Salem, Oreg., plant yet. He is still negotiating for it. The telegram was not very enthusiastic. He is still "over the barrel." He dare not complain, or he will lose both plants.

Senators, this is one of the seamiest propositions ever to come before this body. Are we to say that the Government can tell its citizens the conditions on which bids will be received, and then, when a citizen, according to law, makes a bid the Government can award a contract on some other basis? What good is the Government's word? It is not worth the paper upon which it is written. We shall demoralize all business dealings with the Government if this practice should be condoned. What is the use of saying that the Commerce Department shall determine who is small business and who shall receive an award, if, after the Administrator submits the question to the Department, he rejects their word?

I have quotations which I have already put into the RECORD. I have given the facts of the matter. I could give the Senate a great deal more "filler." I have had to investigate the matter as I have gone along on it. When the debate was opened a few days ago it was assumed that the Columbia Metals Corp. had already received the plant in Salem, Oreg., in lieu of the plant in Utah. I put the question to the Administrator and find that they have not received the plant. That transaction was to be made last December. It is now approximately the middle of May, and they have not yet received the plant. No wonder their telegram comes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CONDON] and to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOBY] that they are not complaining. They dare not complain, or they will not get either plant.

The best witness in this case is the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. He rose and backed up the position the Senator from Maryland stated. He said, "By giving this plant to Simplot you have given a monopoly to one concern manufacturing a certain kind of fertilizer." He is correct about that. The Simplot Co. is already making phosphatic fertilizer at a plant in Pocatello, Idaho. The Salt Lake City plant will be making the same general character of fertilizer and in the whole intermountain area there will not be a large competitor. The business is all placed in the hands of one man, for the Simplot Co. is a one-man corporation. It was so testified before the committee. Who is Mr. Simplot? He is a man who had 25 or 30 million dollars worth of war contracts at Pocatello, Idaho, and according to his testimony alone his fortune during the war increased from approximately a half-million dollars to well up toward \$2,000,000. He already has one Government plant. Now he is about to get another one.

I do not like the looks of it. I did not have full time to devote to the question, but I submit that I have made out a strong case for a further investigation. Even if there were no further investigation, how good is the word of the Government, forsooth, if its citizens are to be invited to bid for the sale or acquisition of a plant, and they do it in good faith and spend their money to get data on which to bid, and then someone representing the Government says to them, "Oh, that does not count"? When a bid is submitted to the Department of Commerce, as is required under the law to be done, and that Department says, "Give it to this company," the answer is "No, I do not want to do what you tell me to do. I will give it to the lowest bidder."

This is the Government of the United States of America, not a second-hand store with three balls on it. This is a great Government whose unwritten word ought to be as good as that of any statement printed in a Government bond. In the instant case its word has not been worth a continental cent. It has violated all its commitments. It has not followed the recommendations of its sister departments as required by the law. Contrary to its word, it has given the property to the lowest bidder at the highest bidder's figure, overlooking the intermediate bidder who was to manufacture the article the country needed. The award has been given to a concern making something which is not in comparably short supply.

No one has questioned the basic facts in the case. I submit that the sensible thing for the Senate to do is to recommit the nomination to the committee headed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and that a further investigation be made to determine whether or not Mr. Larson is a fit man to administer a domain involving many millions of dollars.

I yield the remainder of my time, Mr. President, and ask for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the unanimous-consent request was to vote exactly at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Chair just stated that without objection the Senate would proceed to vote. Is there objection to proceeding to vote at this time, or shall the Senate hold its breath for a minute?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, 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	Hatch	Moore
Ball	Hawkes	Morse
Barkley	Hayden	O'Connor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bricker	Hill	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Revercomb
Buck	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Ives	Russell
Byrd	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Capewhart	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Capper	Kem	Stennis
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Connally	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Lodge	Thye
Donnell	Lucas	Tobey
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworschak	McFarland	Vandenberg
Eastland	McGrath	Wherry
Ecton	McKellar	White
Ferguson	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Magnuson	Williams
George	Malone	Wilson
Green	Martin	Young
Gurney	Millikin	

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

There is before the Senate the nomination of Jess Larson to be War Assets Administrator. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jess Larson, of Oklahoma, to be War Assets Administrator?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Paul L. Mather, United States Navy, retired, to be Associate War Assets Administrator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Francis K. Newcomer, United States Army, to be Governor of the Panama Canal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon to be Assistant to the Chief of Engineers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Louis Aleck Craig to be Inspector General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry other nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified immediately of all confirmations of today.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of Jess Larson.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has taken that action in respect to all confirmations of today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 801 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of

several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

BANK FOR COOPERATIVES

MR. CAPPER. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 2543, for the retirement of Government capital in Federal and regional banks for cooperatives, which is before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution in support of this proposal which has recently been approved by four important farmers' organizations in Kansas.

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

BANK FOR COOPERATIVES

The Bank for Cooperatives has been of inestimable value to the farmers' cooperative associations of the State since its advent with the Farm Credit Administration in 1934. It has been a dependable source of credit and assisted materially in developing sound cooperative business enterprise. It has been eminently fair to competitive lending agencies while at the same time rendering this service to the cooperatives.

We feel that the Government has been fully justified in furnishing a part of the capital for the bank, but believe that the time has come when the ownership of these banks should be gradually shifted to the farmers' cooperatives. We, therefore, heartily approve the measure sponsored by the national farm organizations and cooperative associations providing for the orderly retirement of Government capital of the banks for cooperatives in a manner that will not adversely affect their ability to serve the cooperative associations.

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Farmer Cooperatives of Kansas in annual meeting assembled do endorse the purposes and principles of H. R. bill No. 6301 and Senate bill No. 2543, as recommended by the committees of the House and Senate, which provide for orderly retirement of Government capital of the banks for cooperatives.

Be it further resolved that we urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to vigorously support and further the enactment of this legislation at the earliest possible date during this session of Congress and be it finally provided that copies of this resolution be sent to all Senators and Representatives from Kansas.

KANSAS STATE GRANGE.
RAY TEAGARDEN.
KANSAS FARMERS UNION.
E. T. FORTUNE.
KANSAS FARM BUREAU.
H. A. PRAEGER.
H. E. WITHAM.
KANSAS COOPERATIVE COUNCIL.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2664. A bill to authorize the Indian Claims Commission to hear and determine

certain claims of the Indians of California; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1343).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 424. A bill for the relief of certain persons who suffered losses as the result of flood waters in the vicinity of the Nebraska Ordnance Plant at Mead, Saunders County, Nebr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1345);

S. 873. A bill for the relief of Warren H. McKenney; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1346);

S. 1303. A bill for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1348);

S. 1476. A bill to require the designation by the senior circuit judge of another judge to sit in the place of any judge against whom an affidavit of personal bias and prejudice has been filed; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1347);

H. R. 350. A bill for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1349);

H. R. 669. A bill to provide a method of paying all unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy; with amendments (Rept. No. 1355);

H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1356);

H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Gross; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1357);

H. R. 2384. A bill for the relief of Colbert H. Cannon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1350);

H. R. 3526. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret K. Cahn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1351);

H. R. 3644. A bill for the relief of James M. Dingwall, Jr., Aileen Reynolds; Bert Wool-slayer; and Mrs. Maisie Purser Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1352);

H. R. 4377. A bill for the relief of the Consolidated Steel Corp. of Los Angeles, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1353); and

H. R. 4379. A bill for the relief of the Harbor Boat Building Co., the Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works; and B & R Machine Works, of Los Angeles, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1354).

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

S. 1035. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., for use as a domiciliary facility by the Veterans' Administration; with amendments (Rept. No. 1344).

INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION FOR WAR—MINORITY VIEWS AND SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM (REPT NO. 440, PT. 4-A)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, recently the majority of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program filed a report on industrial mobilization for war. I was not in complete accord with the report of the majority, and asked leave to prepare a report expressing my own separate views.

I was not in any sense of the word denied an opportunity for the expression of my separate views, and I consented to the filing of the majority report with the understanding that if I cared to submit a report expressing more adequately my own individual views, I might have an opportunity to do so at a later time. I have prepared such a statement, and I now ask unanimous consent that my individual views on this subject may be received by the Senate.

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not intend to object. I welcome the presentation of the views of the Senator from Florida. However, I merely ask that the majority of the committee—in this instance 9 out of the 10 members—may have an opportunity to file supplemental comment on the minority views of the Senator from Florida, if it should be deemed advisable. I ask that the time be extended for 2 weeks. Under the circumstances, I think it would be advisable to extend the time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have no objection. I think that is a perfectly proper request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from Maine adding his request as a part of the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BREWSTER. I think probably the quickest way would be to have the Senator from Florida incorporate my suggestion in his request.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request submitted by the Senator from Florida, supplemented by the suggestion of the Senator from Maine, is granted.

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:

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 2692, to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MARTIN introduced Senate bill 2693, to continue until the close of June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 2694. A bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 2695. A bill to authorize Federal participation in shore protection works; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. WHITE (by request) introduced Senate bill 2696, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine to build more ships, and to remove inequities, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JENNER):

S. 2697. A bill to authorize the allocation of funds to Grant County, Ind., for payment of one-half the cost of a certain bridge across the Mississinewa River in Grant County, Ind., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH.

S. 2698. A bill to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 2699. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Olga Lengyel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. FERGUSON introduced Senate Joint Resolution 217, requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1948, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

RETIREMENT SYSTEM OF OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF CURRENCY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

I may say that this bill if passed would discontinue the retirement system in effect for approximately 1,000 employees of the Comptroller of the Currency, and give them only the benefits of the Civil Service retirement system. When Congress passed the retirement bill there were 17 different retirement systems. Ninety-eight and five-tenths percent were under one measure. This bill is an attempt on the part of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to have all retirement provisions embodied in one law.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2692) to terminate the Retirement System of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTIES ON SCRAP IRON, ETC.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to continue until June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap.

This measure proposes to extend for another year the act of March 13, 1942 (Public Law 497, 77th Cong.), which provided for the suspension of tariff duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap during the national emergency.

The emergency with respect to shortages of iron, steel, and nonferrous scrap is as great today as it was during war years. The national reservoir of scrap was drained by war production. The normal turn-over of iron and steel items of scrap has declined sharply due to lack of replacements. One hundred twenty-four million tons of steel were shipped overseas during the war. Much of this has been irretrievably lost in combat or through disposal abroad of surplus military equipment. Some of it is still possible of recovery in the form of obsolete equipment and rubble scrap.

To understand the importance of scrap, we must know its part in steel production. One half of the metallics used by steel mills and foundries to make new iron and steel products is scrap. Production of steel today, while at almost the wartime peak, is not sufficient to meet vastly increased demands. But to maintain production at today's level requires 53,000,000 tons of scrap per year. Half of this scrap may be generated within the steel mills themselves in shavings and cuttings; the other half must be secured from the junk piles, and the scrap metals which can be recovered from all parts of the world.

The Steel Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, reported these facts to the Senate in its interim report on Steel Supply and Distribution, in January 1947. To further the recommendations made by the Steel Subcommittee for scrap recovery, I introduced Senate bill 2109 on February 2, 1948, to provide for the release of surplus military and industrial equipment from Government and military installations both here and abroad. This measure is still in committee, having been transferred from Banking and Currency to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

It is my feeling that it is urgent to consider and give prompt action to measures that will increase the sources of scrap and encourage the movement of scrap into this country.

The bill which I introduce today will continue an incentive to collections of scrap through commercial channels, by the suspension of tariff duties.

It is a companion bill to one which was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative ROBERT A. GRANT, of Indiana, on April 14, reported favorably to the House by the Ways and Means Committee on May 11, and now is on the Union Calendar. I trust that the Senate will take equally prompt action.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2693) to continue until the close of June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. In that connection, I request that a section-by-section analysis of the bill may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the section-by-section analysis of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2696) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant

marine to build more ships, and to remove inequities, introduced by Mr. WHITE (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The section-by-section analysis of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL TO AMEND THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

Section 1: The amendment to section 501 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, broadens the present basis for extending construction-differential subsidies, by removing the limitation that vessels constructed with such aid must be intended for use in conjunction with an "essential" route and subsidized operation. The amendment removes this requirement and sets up certain general requirements under which the United States shipping industry as a whole would be eligible for aid in the construction of new vessels and thus would be able to acquire such vessels at world market prices therefor. Specific language is inserted in the amendment to insure that any vessels so constructed would not be subject to operating restrictions associated with subsidized operation. (However, no change is made concerning certain other restrictions placed on vessels so constructed—such as the requirement for documentation under the United States flag, special requisition provisions in case of national emergency, etc.)

Section 2: This amendment to section 501 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, runs parallel to the amendment of section 1 and makes the same application in the case of subsidies in connection with reconstruction or reconditioning of old vessels.

Section 3: The amendment to section 504 is a similar amendment which removes the reference to the Commission's control over the operation of the subsidized vessel as presently applied in the case of subsidized operations. The existing requirements for documentation, etc., are retained.

Section 4: Section 506, which is repealed hereby, relates to certain special cases where vessels constructed under subsidy under the present law can with certain limitations operate in the domestic trade while on round-the-world voyages, etc. With the broadened application of section 1, these limitations are meaningless and therefore repealed in entirety.

Section 5: Sections 5 through 11 of the bill are a series of amendments designed to broaden the application of the construction reserve funds of the unsubsidized operators and to remove certain discriminations. Section 5 itself makes two minor amendments in line with an amendment in a following section which would permit the use of section 511 funds for certain specified purposes in addition to the presently authorized uses.

Section 6: This section is an amendment to subsection (c) of section 511, which would permit certain earnings and receipts to be deposited in a construction reserve fund and if so deposited they would receive, in effect, a tax deferment. This is an effort to equalize in part the disparity of tax treatment that now exists between subsidized and unsubsidized operators, as noted in the recent report of the President's Committee on the Merchant Marine. The privilege is limited to earnings from vessels documented under the United States laws. Because of the accounting and segregation problems involved in the treatment of earnings, the general requirement for deposit within 60 days of receipt is modified to permit deposit of earnings for any given fiscal

year up to the time of filing Federal income-tax returns for that year.

Section 7: The amendments to section 511 (d) are clerical amendments required by the amendment of section 6 above. The earnings or receipts not recognized for tax purposes result, by the amendments of this section, in a reduced depreciation base on any vessel or other facility acquired from a construction reserve fund. This situation (which is the present law, but applying only to gains not recognized under subsection (c) of sec. 511) is the reason why the apparent tax exemption is, in reality, only a tax deferment.

Section 8: This section involves similar clerical amendments to section 511 (e), relating to the order of deposits and withdrawals.

Section 9: This section makes several major changes in section 511 (g), relating to the conditions under which tax benefits can be had, the purposes for which the funds may be used, and the time in which withdrawals must be made. In general, the time for withdrawal is extended to 3 years instead of the present 2-year period. The purposes for which the funds can be used are extended to include the liquidation of outstanding indebtedness on vessels, capital expenditures in the reconditioning or reconstructing of vessels, and acquisition of terminal or other facilities directly connected with shipping operations, including the capital stock of companies owning United States-flag vessels. Such acquisitions, however, would require prior approval of the Commission before sums in the fund could be expended for such purposes. Other clerical amendments in numbering within the subsection are also involved.

Section 10: With the proviso proposed to be added to section 511 (h) a general extension would be granted for 3 years for all funds on deposit on September 30, 1948. This is an effort to bridge what is hoped to be a temporary period of uncertainty in the postwar shipping situation, especially insofar as it relates to domestic shipping.

Section 11: This section contains clerical amendments to make deposits in the form of earnings or receipts subject to taxation if withdrawn for purposes other than those permissible under the terms of section 511, or if not used within the prescribed period for such purposes.

Section 12: This section proposes to add a new section to title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, which would permit owners of vessels of not less than 2,000 gross tons, documented under the laws of the United States, and operated without the aid of an operating-differential subsidy, to amortize the cost of such vessel in such manner as he deems appropriate and, for the purpose of Federal income and excess-profits taxes, entitle the owner in each taxable year, beginning after December 31, 1947, to a deduction of the portion of the cost so amortized in such taxable year. The purposes of this amendment are: To afford to unsubsidized American owners financial privileges similar to those available to subsidized owners under section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; to narrow the existing disparity as between unsubsidized owners of vessels of American registry and those of foreign registry with respect to depreciation, and to encourage the investment of private capital in the American merchant marine, thus providing an incentive for a continuing replacement of modern new vessels.

PRINTING OF PRAYERS BY CHAPLAIN OF SENATE DURING EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 237), which was re-

ferred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That 2,500 copies of the prayers offered by the Reverend Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, at the opening of the daily sessions of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress, be printed and bound for the use of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5883) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 59, to strike out lines 19 through 21, including the word "repayment" in line 22 and substitute therefor the words "be made in conformity with the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 1148)."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6481) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 2, line 9, strike out the figures "\$27,389,061" and insert in lieu thereof "\$31,389,061."

On page 2, line 13, strike out the figures "\$21,689,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,689,000."

On page 2, line 14, after the word "dams," insert "one at Johnsonville, Tenn., and."

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SAMUEL HAMILTON KAUFMAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 26, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Samuel Hamilton Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. John Bright, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]; and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON CIVIL RIGHTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ATLANTA JOURNAL

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relative to a speech delivered by Senator THOMAS

of Utah in connection with the debate on the southern regional education compact, published in the Atlanta Journal of May 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY CRAWFORD H. GREENEWALT BEFORE THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. BUCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Crawford H. Greenewalt, president of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., at the annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in Washington, D. C., April 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS ALVA EDISON—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Thomas Alva Edison—A Symbol of Free Enterprise," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, before the Rotary Club of Birmingham, Ala., April 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS ISSUE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Both Parties Declared Inconsistent in Stand on 'Civil Rights' Issue," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CLARIFICATION IN PALESTINE—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Clarification in Palestine," by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of May 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION BY THEODORE W. SCHULTZ OF ARTICLE BY GEORGE WELLER

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters from Prof. Theodore W. Schultz, head of the Department of Economics of the University of Chicago, correcting an article by George Weller, which appear in the Appendix.]

TREATMENT OF JAPANESE-AMERICANS—EDITORIAL FROM THE DES MOINES REGISTER

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Proper Way to Right a Wartime Wrong," published in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, May 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND (MAINE) PRESS-HERALD

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Electoral College," from the Press-Herald of Portland, Maine, which gives a very lucid description of Senate Joint Resolution 200, which was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary, and which seeks to change the Constitution so that the electoral votes for President shall be counted in proportion to the popular vote.

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

ELECTORAL COLLEGE

The approaching Presidential elections give point to the proposal made by Senator

LODGE to alter our electoral-college system through constitutional amendment. The Senator's bill, reported out almost unanimously by the Judiciary Committees of both Senate and House, would end the unit rule under which the entire number of electors in each State go to the candidate of the winning party even if he wins by a single vote. Instead, the several candidates would receive electoral votes proportionally to the popular votes received in each State.

A familiar illustration, used before by the Press Herald in advocating passage of the Lodge bill and its submission to the States as an amendment to the Constitution, is the result in Ohio in the 1944 election. President Roosevelt received 1,570,763 votes; Governor Dewey, 1,582,293 votes—a difference of 11,530 votes. That was virtually a tie; but the Republican candidate received all 25 of the Ohio votes in the electoral college. Under the Lodge plan, the Republican candidate would have received, probably, 13 of the electoral college votes, and the Democratic candidate, 12.

How far this proposal will get in this present Congress with its crowded calendar and eagerness to adjourn before the political conventions is problematical. There is no immediate call for speed; a constitutional amendment must be ratified by 36 States before it can become law; and ratification not seldom is notoriously slow; obviously a change, if approved, could not become effective before 1952.

But the Lodge proposal seems to be so sound that it ought to have easy passage through the Congress and the State legislatures. Had it been in effect 4 years ago, there certainly would have been important changes in the standing of the major-party candidates.

Under the present system, Roosevelt received in the electoral college 432 votes and Dewey 99, a plurality of 333. If one were to approximate what that vote would have been under the Lodge system, he clearly would find that the Roosevelt plurality would have been cut down. If one were to take the 9 States with the greatest number of electors—California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin—and to apply the proportional principle, Roosevelt might be shown to have led not by a count of 196 to 27, but to have lost them by a vote of 119 to 104, or thereabouts. Figuring another way, using for comparison the total popular vote throughout the country—for Roosevelt, 25,602,505; for Dewey, 22,006,278—one might find that Roosevelt was actually entitled, under the Lodge plan, to but 282 electoral votes and Dewey to 249—a striking difference from the 432 to 99 votes actually announced.

Presumably, under the new proposal, Roosevelt still would have won the election; anyone who wishes might find a useful exercise in arithmetic in running down the proportional strength of the candidates in all 48 States; but it is apparent from the figures already presented that the present plan is less accurate in measuring a candidate's actual strength; that under it, a candidate, though the choice of the people, conceivably could lose an election. At any rate, Mr. Lodge's proposal seems to come closer to the democratic principle and deserves submission to the States as a constitutional amendment.

SUPPLY OF SCARCE MEDICINES AND LABORATORY FACILITIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK POST

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Night Cries," from the New York Post, which relates to the critical situation which exists in so many

American families because of the expensive nature of vitally important drugs necessary in taking care of people when they are sick. The editorial discusses a problem which I have sought to reach by a bill which is now pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

NIGHT CRIES

A sudden cry in the night, the lights go on, the child is rigid with pain, screaming for help. Then parents think of the rare drugs—streptomycin, sulfadiazole, and penicillin. The drugs with the tongue-twisting names which could spell out hope for their child's life. The drugs whose very mention is a benediction in most American households.

But the mercy of these drugs is often stamped with a price. And the healing of insulin, liver extract, mercury diuretics, endocrine products, vitamin preparations, typhoid vaccine, X-ray and iron lungs, in many cases must be bought.

Health in America is still governed by the dollar sign. Our rich have modern medical privileges and our poor, too often, have only a prayer.

There is a reason, and not a very pretty one, why adequate medical treatment is too frequently classed as a luxury in America, to be enjoyed only by the special class of Americans who can afford similar treats like sending their children to an expensive college.

The reason is two words, innocent enough, but shouted with increasing suspicion by backward Congressmen every time legislation is proposed which would ease the American family medical load.

The words are "socialized medicine" and the opponents of any Federal medical aid string them together glibly, counting on Americans to react unthinkingly against the phrase because it suggests some foreign way of doing things.

In the best of all possible democracies, the term would not be considered suspect, but redundant. In a nation of self-governed people, an essential need like medical care should belong to the people precisely to the extent that private sources fall down on the job.

An illustration of how flagrantly the bug-a-boo of socialized medicine is flaunted, when it does not even remotely apply, can be found in senatorial opposition to a bill recently introduced in the Labor Committee by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE JR., Republican, of Massachusetts.

Lodge has apparently been appalled by the numbers of gravely ill Americans who are left to die simply because their money has run out and they can no longer purchase the medical supplies and treatment which would stave off collapse.

Under his bill, the Federal Government and the States would match sums, amounting to the trifling total of \$70,000,000 a year, to see to it that scarce medicines and laboratory facilities would be supplied to all persons in the United States needing them, regardless of ability to pay.

The bill is a moderate statement of the minimum of service our democratic Government should be expected to supply. But your pressure will probably be needed to convince our Senators that it should receive prompt passage on the Senate floor.

Yet at this stage, Government funds obviously cannot be left to wage the battle against disease alone. Your own dollars

should stand ready to fill the gaps in medical research, education, and service until the convictions of our legislators catch up with the needs of the people.

By now you have learned from your newspapers, radios, and billboards that every 3 minutes someone dies of cancer.

Someone dies because we haven't cracked the secret of why cells suddenly go mad and multiply with deadly confusion, crowding out life. Someone dies because you harbor the cancer of indifference and haven't made your contribution to conquer the killer through experiment and study.

It would take you less than 3 minutes to write out a check to the New York Cancer Committee, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York City 17.

Use the time to advantage now by helping to prevent the 3 minutes from beating out a tragedy in more American lives.

VETO OF BILL REQUIRING REPORTS ON NOMINEES TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two editorials dealing with the President's veto of Senate bill 1004, which relates to a requirement for reports from the FBI on nominees to the Atomic Energy Commission. One of the editorials, entitled "Mr. Truman's Veto," was published in the Washington Post of this morning. The other, entitled "They Should Work Together," is published in the Washington Evening Star of today. I urge all Senators to read the editorials.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 18, 1948]

MR. TRUMAN'S VETO

In pursuit of his generally sound doctrine that the President should be master in his own house, Mr. Truman has vetoed the bill authorizing the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to require reports from the FBI on nominees to the Atomic Energy Commission, who can hold office only with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President's chief complaint is that five Senators would be permitted, under the bill, to direct the FBI to make a report. That, he fears, would be an unwarranted encroachment upon the executive branch. "The complete independence of the executive branch," he wrote in his veto message, "renders it imperative that the Executive have sole authority over the officers whom he appoints."

If the bill has any constitutional weakness, it probably lies in the fact that it enables five Senators to direct the FBI to act in this particular instead of imposing that duty directly upon the FBI by command of Congress. Certainly there can be no doubt that Congress can require an executive agency to make an investigation and report its findings to Congress. The Atomic Energy Act, for example, instructs the AEC to keep the joint committee "fully and currently informed" as to its activities. To be sure, the President ought to have "sole authority" over officials in the executive branch so far as the performance of their duties is concerned, but the function of prescribing what their duties are belongs to Congress.

This is a problem which obviously requires cooperation between the President and Congress. Mr. Truman emphasizes his great responsibility in making nominations to the AEC and pledges himself to use every facility of the executive branch in uncovering facts

about the appointees. He seems to forget that the Senate has an equally grave responsibility, also imposed upon it by the Constitution, to act intelligently in confirming such nominations. We do not think it is unreasonable for Congress to provide that, in meeting this obligation, the Members of the Senate chiefly concerned should be able to draw upon the fact-finding facilities of the FBI. It is not a question of demanding FBI reports that are made to the President, but only of making separate reports for the benefit of the Senators who will have to recommend approval or rejection of the nominees.

It is well to remember, in dealing with questions of this sort, that, while we have a separation of executive and legislative powers, we have one Government and not two. An arbitrary attitude on the part of either Congress or the President can upset the normal cooperative relationship which alone enables the American system to function satisfactorily. Congress has attempted various encroachments upon the Executive, and it may be that the President feels it necessary to strike back in a narrow spirit to sustain his position. We cannot help thinking, however, that in this instance he pushes his argument too far.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 18, 1948]

THEY SHOULD WORK TOGETHER

The President's veto of the bill authorizing Senate Members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee to use the services of the FBI to investigate presidential appointees to the Atomic Energy Commission rested on two main premises.

Mr. Truman's first point was that a law empowering a congressional group to direct the FBI, an executive agency, to investigate the members and general manager of the AEC would be an unconstitutional intrusion by the legislative upon the executive branch of the Government. If the President was persuaded of that, it was his duty to veto the bill, for the principle at stake is important. The remedy, if Congress is sufficiently convinced to the contrary, is to pass the bill over the veto and leave the determination of the constitutional question to the courts.

The other premise was that the objective of the bill was "unnecessary and unwise." This is a conclusion which is open to serious challenge.

The Star has no doubt concerning the loyalty of the present officials of the AEC who would have been affected by this vetoed bill. Nor is there any reason to doubt that President Truman, using the facilities of the FBI, would be careful to check thoroughly into the background of any one whom he might select for any of these important posts. But this does not meet the point which has been raised by Senator KNOWLAND. It is conceivable that some day another President will be in the White House—another President whose judgment in the matter of such appointments would be open to grave doubt. And it is possible that such a President might name men to the AEC who ought not to be confirmed without the most thorough check of their records.

In that eventuality the Senate would be in a difficult position. For under the law it is required to concur in the selection of members of the AEC, and it ought not to concur unless fully satisfied as to their fitness. The responsibility involved in this is no light matter, since the AEC has been given great powers and the security of the country is in the hands of its top officials. This being the case, it is not possible to agree with the President that the effort to enable the Senate to satisfy itself as to the loyalty of AEC offi-

als, prior to voting for their confirmation, is unnecessary and unwise.

This does not dispose of the constitutional questions, of course, and it may be that the courts will agree with Mr. Truman. If so, that ends the matter. But if the courts should share the opinion of Congress on the legal issue, then, in the long view, they would seem to be more prospect of gain than loss in the Knowland proposal. It is too bad that the President and the Senate could not have worked this matter out satisfactorily between themselves, but since that was not done the only alternative is to attempt to pass the bill over his veto and let the courts determine the constitutional issue.

EXCHANGE BETWEEN HENRY A. WALLACE AND JOSEPH STALIN

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I cannot refrain from making one or two observations, which will take me only 2 or 3 minutes, upon the subject of Mr. Henry Wallace's exchange of notes with Mr. Stalin. I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senator from Missouri to go into the matter fully, but I think it is important that someone rise on the Senate floor as quickly as possible to point out that what Mr. Wallace has proposed is an implementation of the Russian foreign policy. I think that conclusion can be documented in very great detail.

Mr. President, the first point that is made by Mr. Wallace, and repeated by Mr. Stalin, occurs in these words:

A general reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons.

Note the order, Mr. President. A year ago last October, when it became evident that the acid test of Russia's intentions was being had in her action and reaction to our atomic energy proposal and when she became embarrassed at the acceptance by all nations of the earth of the righteousness and justice of the proposals which we made on this subject, at a meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York she started to talk about a reduction of armaments in general. Of course that is what she would like to do. She knows that the last disarmament conference went on for about 17 years and ended in nothing. The last thing in the world she wants to do is to come to grips with the proposals which we have made for atomic disarmament, and if there cannot be atomic disarmament, there will be no disarmament.

Mr. President, it strikes me as indeed strange that on the very day when negotiations were closed in New York on this subject in a confession of failure, Mr. Wallace exchanged a note with Mr. Stalin in which he said, in effect—"Let's bring about atomic disarmament."

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

Mr. McMAHON. I shall yield to the Senator from Maine in a moment. I can tell them how they can be successful in this field. They can be successful in this field if they send Gromyko back to New York and let him make a motion to reopen the negotiations, and let Russia accept that which every other nation has accepted which has been a party to the study of this whole terrible question. If they will do that, it will do more to establish confidence than anything else

that can be done on the face of the earth, and we will start to get somewhere in making a permanent peace for which I know the vast majority of men everywhere yearn with the deepest and strongest emotions of their hearts.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am profoundly interested, as is everyone, in the comments of the Senator from Connecticut. The Senator opened his remarks with the statement concerning the exchange of notes between Mr. Wallace and Mr. Stalin. If that characterization is correct, I submit there is ample law to cover the situation in the prohibition upon private citizens indulging in the discussion of our foreign affairs with any foreign potentate. I hope the Senator can substantiate the case. It is a matter of increasing interest. The mere utterance of the views of a private citizen might not come within the characterization. I mention this because in my judgment we must come to grips with the realities of this thing.

Senators who were privileged last night to listen to the discussion for 1 hour of some of the associated problems, between two very eminent gentlemen, will recognize that there are curious ideological problems involved.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator, but I will say that I am interested today in the substance and not in the form this whole controversy has taken. I am not unmindful of the fact that the Senator from Maine may have a point in what he has said, but I do not wish to devote myself to that today. I do, however, desire to make clear beyond peradventure of a doubt that the acid test of Russia's intention has just been had in the United Nations in New York, and we can go back there and renew discussions at any time Russia will give any evidence that she wants to listen to reason respecting that prime purpose.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I to understand that the Senator from Connecticut contends that Mr. Wallace could not express publicly his opinions in this matter? That, it seems to me, must also be kept in mind, however much we may disagree with him.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Maine that I assume he is inferring that Mr. Wallace has violated the Logan Act.

Mr. BREWSTER. I said that if the Senator from Connecticut could substantiate his statement that there has been an exchange of notes between Mr. Wallace and Mr. Stalin, there is ample law to cover that situation.

Mr. McMAHON. And I say to the Senator from Maine that at the moment I am not interested in that phase of the matter.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the question is one which will continually recur, and I think the more quickly we get it clarified the better. This is not to indicate any sympathy whatever with either the tactics or the proposals which have been followed in the current case.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion of the granting of statehood to Hawaii, a great many

statements have appeared in the press and elsewhere which seek to give the impression that Hawaii has waited longer than other areas or regions before securing statehood. To clarify this point, I have had prepared a table showing the waiting period for other regions. This table shows, I believe, that the waiting period for Hawaii has not been unduly long as yet, particularly in view of the unusual circumstances involved in granting statehood for the first time to a non-contiguous territory.

I present a table showing the lapse in time between the date of acquisition of the areas which later came to be organized in the form of States, and the dates on which statehood was achieved in each case. This table shows clearly that a great number of the States waited much longer than 50 years, the period Hawaii has waited to date. In the case of Oklahoma it required more than 100 years. It actually required 104 years. With reference to my own State of Nebraska, we were a part of the United States for 64 years before becoming a State.

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

List of States showing period elapsing between acquisition of the region and final achievement of statehood

	Date area acquired	Admission as State	Years between acquisition of Territory and statehood
Oklahoma.....	1803	1907	104
Wyoming.....	1803	1890	87
Montana.....	1803	1889	86
North Dakota.....	1803	1889	86
South Dakota.....	1803	1889	86
Alaska.....	1867	(?)	81
Minnesota.....	1783	1858	75
Colorado.....	1803	1876	73
New Mexico.....	1845	1912	67
Wisconsin.....	1783	1848	65
Arizona.....	1848	1912	64
Nebraska.....	1803	1867	64
Kansas.....	1803	1861	58
Michigan.....	1783	1837	54
Hawaii.....	1898	(?)	50
Utah.....	1848	1896	48
Idaho.....	1846	1890	44
Washington.....	1846	1889	43
Iowa.....	1803	1846	43
Alabama.....	1783	1819	36
Illinois.....	1783	1818	35
Mississippi.....	1783	1817	34
Indiana.....	1783	1816	33
Arkansas.....	1803	1836	33
Florida.....	1819	1845	26
Ohio.....	1783	1803	20
Missouri.....	1803	1821	18
Nevada.....	1848	1864	16
Oregon.....	1846	1859	13
Tennessee.....	1783	1796	13
Louisiana.....	1803	1812	9

¹ At least.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska there appear a list of the States which have been admitted to the Union, showing the length of time they existed as organized Territories. I think the Senate will find the list of great interest. It shows that 29 of the States have been organized Territories. Hawaii has been in that category for longer than 27 of the organized Territories. Only 2 organized Territories were required to be such for a longer period of time.

The facts also show that Hawaii has a larger population than any other organized Territory admitted to the Union as a State, with one exception, namely the Territory of Oklahoma, at the time it was admitted to statehood.

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

Territory	Date of organic act	Date admitted as State	Years waited	Population at date of organic act	Population at date admitted as State
New Mexico	1850	1912	62	61,547	327,000
Arizona	1863	1912	49	9,658	204,354
Hawaii	1900		48	154,001	502,122
Utah	1850	1896	46	11,383	276,749
Washington	1853	1889	36	11,198	357,232
Michigan	1805	1837	32	4,762	212,267
North Dakota	1861	1889	28	2,977	109,983
South Dakota	1861	1889	28		
Idaho	1863	1890	27		88,548
Montana	1864	1889	25	20,595	142,924
Florida	1822	1845	23		87,445
Wyoming	1868	1890	22	9,118	62,555
Mississippi	1798	1817	19	8,850	75,448
Arkansas	1819	1836	17	14,255	97,574
Oklahoma	1890	1907	17	61,804	1,657,155
Indiana	1800	1816	16	5,641	147,178
Missouri	1805	1821	16	20,845	66,586
Ohio	1787	1803	16		45,365
Colorado	1861	1876	15	34,277	194,327
Nebraska	1854	1867	13	28,841	122,993
Wisconsin	1836	1848	12	30,945	308,391
Oregon	1848	1859	11	13,294	52,465
Illinois	1809	1818	9	12,282	35,211
Minnesota	1849	1858	9	6,077	172,023
Iowa	1838	1846	8	43,112	192,214
Louisiana	1804	1812	8	76,556	76,556
Kansas	1854	1861	7		107,208
Tennessee	1790	1796	6	35,691	105,602
Nevada	1861	1864	3	6,857	6,857
Alabama	1817	1819	2		127,901

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business is House bill 5524, the civil functions War Department appropriation bill, and the pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], for himself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with certain instructions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is necessarily absent on public business. He has asked me to announce to the Senate that he opposes the pending motion to recommit the civil functions appropriation bill and has requested me to ask unanimous consent that a statement of the reasons for his position be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO RECOMMIT H. R. 5524 (ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL) WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO REDUCE FUNDS FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVERS AND HARBORS WORK BY AT LEAST \$200,000,000, MAY 18, 1948

The motion to recommit is based on a theory that the same amount of money ap-

propriated last year (for the current fiscal year) for flood control and rivers and harbors work would be sufficient to carry on an effective program during the coming fiscal year beginning July 1. This reasoning sounds logical enough when the discussion is maintained on a level of hundreds of millions of dollars, but breaks down completely when the individual projects which go to make up the aggregate of funds in this bill are analyzed as they should be—individually.

It must be remembered that since the end of the war, we have been trying to catch up the threads of flood control and navigation projects delayed or interrupted by the war. Thus, the original appropriations following the end of the war were comparatively small, because comparatively few projects were in the going stage or close enough to that stage to get under way promptly.

It is only natural that the total amount in the bill each year has been steadily increasing. Nearly all of the projects in the first postwar appropriation bill were large projects and have been coming back for funds each year in order to keep them going toward completion. One of the best examples of these is the huge Conemaugh Reservoir for the protection of Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley. It will still be some years before that project is completed. It will be eligible for funds—and will deserve funds—each year until completed.

It would be folly—almost criminal folly—to delay the completion of this project by as much as a single day just for the purpose of making any one year's flood-control appropriation that much smaller. This project alone can save its entire cost in the damages it would prevent in a single important flood.

The same is true of nearly all of the projects of which I have personal knowledge which are included in this bill. Pinching pennies now in order to delay inevitable expenditures would be the height of false economy, for each Pennsylvania project in this bill will be built regardless and the question is only whether we will speed their completion or delay them for a year or two or more, meanwhile being denied the protection they could provide.

As I said, the first postwar appropriations were comparatively small and have been steadily increasing in amount because additional new projects have been put into the "going" stage while most of the earlier projects are still obtaining funds. These newer projects are now far enough advanced so that cut-backs in their funds would cause serious and substantial delay.

I cannot support such a short-sighted policy. I do not see how this Senate, if it were to adopt such a policy, could possibly explain it to the satisfaction of the people of Sunbury, Punxsutawney, Williamsport, Pittsburgh, Johnsonburg, Ridgway, St. Mary's, Latrobe, Johnstown, Allentown, Bethlehem, Turtle Creek, McKeesport, McKees Rocks, Honesdale and Hawley, Tyrone, and other communities included in the flood-control funds in this bill, communities which have all felt the cold fury of rampaging floodwaters rolling into their streets and homes.

And as for the rivers and harbors appropriation, I am sure the businessmen of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh who make extensive use of our shipping and harbor facilities would be most amazed to find that these facilities cannot be maintained in proper functioning condition because the Congress wants to save money.

The savings in such a case would be illusory indeed.

It is obvious that even the inadequate appropriations voted by the House in this bill could not be provided if the Senate were to carry through on this motion. The House bill was substantially below budget estimates on such projects in Pennsylvania, for instance, as Punxsutawney, Williamsport, East Branch Clarion Reservoir, and many others. It left out completely the Delaware

River improvement project at Philadelphia, and curtailed drastically the maintenance funds for Erie Harbor, the Ohio Valley locks and dams, and for similar activities. If the Senate were now to cut the bill not merely back to the House amount—a difference of \$100,000,000—but back to an amount of \$100,000,000 less than even the House provided, all of the increases voted in specific projects by the Senate committee would be wiped out and, in addition, deep cuts would have to be made into amounts already voted by the House for these and for other projects which the House did not cut.

The minority report starts off by condemning in the most critical manner the judgment and integrity of the Army engineers, whom I consider among the most able and outstanding of all Government employees, but thereupon ends up by proposing that the judgment of the engineers—these same much-criticized engineers—should be allowed to determine how the remaining money shall be spent, once the over-all cut of \$200,000,000 is made by the committee.

I think the final recommendation of the minority report completely disputes the original position of those who signed the report—that the engineers cannot be trusted to use good judgment.

I have received demands from the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce that I support this recommit motion providing for the cut of \$200,000,000. I am puzzled. The chambers of commerce and the businessmen in the communities affected by this bill urge me to oppose the cut.

Does the State chamber of commerce speak for Williamsport, for York, for Punxsutawney, for Pittsburgh, for Latrobe, for Sunbury, for any of these towns—for the businessmen in these towns who have big stakes in the achievement of early flood protection for those towns?

I don't think so. I think it speaks for itself.

And, Mr. President, in this instance the facts speak for themselves. They speak a clear thought: that flood control and rivers-and-harbors work designed to protect investments and protect lives and increase safety are worthy functions of Government and must not be jeopardized by the penny-pinching of ultra-economizers. We cannot economize our people in Pennsylvania into disaster from floods, and I cannot support any legislative move to delay for 1 year, 2 years, or however long, projects now long overdue and projects which, had the war not intervened, would now be operating.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, we in the State of Missouri have an abiding and continued interest in the control of the waters of our rivers. Some of the most fertile land in our State has been won from the Mississippi and the Missouri. Our largest city is located near the confluence of those two rivers. Our second largest city stands at the junction of the Missouri and the Kaw. Many of our finest cities and towns and much of our best farming land is subject to recurrent threats from high water. Under these circumstances there is no State in the Union, perhaps, to which flood control means more or is of more vital importance than the State of Missouri.

Notwithstanding these facts, Mr. President, and the vital interest of our people in the subject matter of this bill, I shall vote to recommit the pending bill. I shall do so because I believe that in the long run it is to the advantage of the people of our State and of the United States that I do so. I believe that the great majority of the people of our State who understand the facts would want me to do so.

I have always favored wise and well-considered appropriations for flood control and for the protection of property. I shall do what I can to see that such appropriations are made. I believe that the minority report is entirely justified in its assertion that—

the total amount recommended by the committee is inimical to the interest of the national economy and an unwarranted and unnecessary drain on the Treasury of the United States at a time when the American people are pledged to expensive foreign commitments and national-defense preparedness measures.

The pending bill includes many new projects not for the immediate protection of property and flood control. The bill should be reviewed under instructions of the Senate to eliminate projects not now essential and required by immediate necessity.

The Eightieth Congress is under serious criticism. We are told that while we have tinkered with the budget we have made no statesmanlike full-scale effort to reduce it to proper and reasonable proportions.

We are told that we have "made no realistic genuinely American approach to the problem of inflation and restoring the value of the dollar," but instead, we have "rubber-stamped administration proposals which mean more inflation."

I suppose that there is no Senator who does not receive by every mail evidence that the American people are watching our performance. I want to read into the RECORD one of the many letters which I have received. It comes from a distinguished Federal judge, Hon. John Paul, United States district judge for the Western District of Virginia. I think I should say that I do not enjoy the honor of Judge Paul's personal acquaintance. However, I do have his permission to use his letter, which seems to me to be quite significant. The letter reads as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA,
Harrisonburg, Va., April 30, 1948.

HON. JAMES P. KEM,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KEM: I have just been reading with interest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, April 26, the proceedings in the Senate on consideration of H. R. 5607, making appropriations for the judiciary, among other things.

I notice that during the consideration of this bill you inquired of Senator BALL why it was that appropriation bills which came from the House always seemed to have the amounts increased in the Senate. I think that your inquiry was very pertinent and that Senator BALL's answer to it was by no means satisfying. The very same question has often occurred to me, and particularly with reference to the appropriations for the judiciary.

For example, I notice that in the course of the proceedings to which I refer the Senate adopted an amendment providing \$468,000 for court criers and messengers, an appropriation which the House, quite properly, refused to make. This appropriation for court criers, who act in many instances merely as the personal servants of the judges, is a completely unjustified waste of public money which I have always opposed.

Again, at the last session of Congress, the House undertook to eliminate the cost of a number of entirely useless clerks' offices in

a number of places where courts are prescribed but where there is no justification for maintaining open office at all times. I think that most of the judges in the country were in favor of the elimination of these useless offices. However, when the appropriation bill got to the Senate, the appropriations were restored.

I speak of these two instances because they happen to be in a branch of the Government with which I am familiar. You may wonder that a judge should be interested in a reduction of appropriations for the judiciary, but my interest as a taxpayer is sufficient to make me opposed to any wasteful and useless expenditures which I see. I have never been able to understand just why it is that after the House has given careful consideration to these matters and refused to make appropriations, the Senate should habitually restore them. It inclines one to the belief that it is only in the House that there is any interest in governmental economy and that the Senate is entirely indifferent to it.

I trust that you will pardon the liberty I have taken in writing this letter, but I did want you to know that there is at least one judge who is in agreement with you in your attitude toward this appropriation bill.

Very truly yours,

JOHN PAUL,
District Judge.

Mounting inflation is a source of deepening concern to every American who loves his country. A realistic program is urgently needed to restrain inflation. Authorities agree that the first approach must be to reduce Government spending, now six times the prewar rate, excluding interest on the national debt.

I believe that there is still an opportunity for the Eightieth Congress, by swift positive action, to retrieve much of the ground which our inaction in this respect has cost us. We can still build up a record for national leadership in the time that remains.

The American people repudiated in 1946 the spending theories of the Truman administration. I believe the Eightieth Congress has a mandate from the people to restrain this spending, to cut the budget back to fair and reasonable proportions. The present bill offers an opportunity for the Senate to go on record that it means from now on to attack thoughtfully and courageously the far-reaching threat of inflation which carries with it so much for the welfare and happiness of all our people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECKON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] for himself and other Senators.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Cordon	Hill
Ball	Donnell	Hoey
Barkley	Downey	Holland
Brewster	Dworshak	Ives
Bricker	Eastland	Jenner
Brooks	Eaton	Johnson, Colo.
Buck	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Butler	Fulbright	Kem
Byrd	George	Kilgore
Cain	Green	Knowland
Capehart	Gurney	Langer
Capper	Hatch	Lodge
Chavez	Hawkes	Lucas
Connally	Hayden	McClellan
	Hickenlooper	McFarland

McGrath	Reed	Thye
McKellar	Revercomb	Tobey
McMahon	Robertson, Va.	Tydings
Magnuson	Russell	Vandenberg
Malone	Saltonstall	Wherry
Martin	Smith	White
Millikin	Sparkman	Wiley
Moore	Stennis	Williams
Morse	Taft	Wilson
O'Connor	Thomas, Okla.	Young
Pepper	Thomas, Utah	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to support the motion made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], for himself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the distinguished chairman and two members of the Appropriations Committee, to recommit the bill with the instruction that \$200,000,000 be eliminated from the \$735,000,000 program. I support the motion because I feel that today the country is in such condition that all expenditures should be reduced in any way they can be reduced. I feel, in particular, that this is a time in which a general program of public works should at least not be increased, but that, in fact, it should probably be reduced.

I pointed out yesterday that the budget contains an increase in public works expenditures from \$2,000,000,000 in the current year to \$2,800,000,000 in the next year. I think it is unfortunate from the general standpoint of inflation and from the general standpoint of the budget that there should be any such increase at this time. Cutting off \$200,000,000 from the appropriations will still leave the sun in excess of the amount used in the current year for rivers, harbors, and flood control, I believe, in general, we should not go beyond the appropriations for the current year in the construction of public works.

This does not in any way indicate any disapproval of the general program of flood control. I believe very strongly that we should proceed with the long-range plan to improve our rivers to their utmost capacity and to use all our rivers and all the power we can obtain from them. But that is a job which will take 25 or 30 years. It will involve many billions of dollars. In a general way I feel that we should go lightly when we have an inflationary condition, when we have such tremendous private activities, so many other expensive Government programs, and that we should make our plans and have the projects ready to proceed whenever private activity falls off and we are threatened with a depression.

There is no question that we are in the midst of an inflationary condition. It is not as bad as it was. It has gradually tended to stabilize. Yet every expert feels that we still face a serious danger that prices will increase, wages will increase, and we shall have a further spiral which will decrease the value of savings and cause serious hardship to the lower-income groups and persons who live on fixed incomes. In my opinion our whole policy should be directed toward avoiding that result.

Some persons say we can go ahead and impose controls. My opinion is that

controls simply postpone the evil day. In the first place, they will not be effective, they will not really prevent the result which must flow from such enormous spending programs as we are now endorsing. They will simply retard increase in production and the ultimate solution of the problem.

The difficulty, as I see it, is that we are trying to do too many things at one time, until we have reached a point where we are beyond the capacity of the Government to do all the things we are trying to do. By trying to do them all, we are creating a condition in which prices must increase and wages must increase, until gradually a situation may be brought about resulting finally in complete depression. We are at the present time still trying to catch up on consumers' goods with the expenditure of money saved during the war. There has been a tremendous production of semidurable consumers' goods, to say nothing of the great increase in the use of consumption goods, so that today people are living better than they have ever lived in the history of the United States.

A far-reaching program is involved in trying to catch up with the housing deficiency created by the war. Last year I think we spent very close to \$7,000,000,000 on housing. Of course, there was private construction, with some Government expenditure, and yet it involved money which went into the market and built up a huge demand for materials of all sorts, with which we compete the moment we increase public works on the part of the Nation itself.

In order to battle communism throughout the world, so that eventually we may have peace and prosperity, we have embarked upon an extensive program of foreign aid, far beyond anything that anyone in this country has ever seen in time of peace. Apparently we shall spend approximately \$7,300,000,000 on foreign aid during the next 12 months.

We are also faced with a military threat. We spent this year \$10,500,000,000 on the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the chances are that we will spend at least \$2,500,000,000 more than that in the next fiscal year, or a total of \$13,000,000,000. That is a program which we consider necessary for the safety of the country. But if we have to undertake that kind of military expenditures we must cut down somewhat on civilian expenditures.

We have a large veterans' program to take care of the education of veterans—a program of which I thoroughly approve—but which is entirely nonproductive. We are spending \$3,000,000,000 maintaining men in educational institutions who produce nothing, who add to the demands for consumers' goods, but who do not participate in creating a supply of such goods.

We have an additional general program with which the whole world, outside of Europe, is trying to keep up, making tremendous demands on exports from this country, in addition to those covered by the European-aid program.

All these programs are good things in themselves. The civil-works program is a good thing in itself. The difficulty is not that there is any objection to any

one of the programs—each one has the highest reasons behind it—but when we try to do all we create an inflationary condition which may actually bring more harm than the combination of the programs can bring good. It seems to me we have only one choice. We cannot abolish any of these programs, but we can try to hold them down to the very minimum. We can try to take something off all of the programs, so that when we get through we shall have relieved to a considerable extent the inflationary condition.

Mr. President, I read from the Economic Report of the President, which states the general condition regarding inflation. The President says:

The question has been raised as to whether we have inflationary pressure because of large exports, because of the very low rate of business investment—

Another program which I have not mentioned is the expenditure for machinery and plant which is going on at such a rapid rate—

because of the large amount of residential and commercial construction, or because of the high level of consumer spending. The answer is that we have inflationary pressure because the sum total of these combined factors exerted too great a demand on available supplies. No one factor can be singled out as the principal cause.

The inflationary impact of spending was strong in all fields—capital expenditure, exports, and consumption. The high level of domestic business investment and construction aided in unfolding a total demand which increased prices, individual incomes, business profits, and Government receipts. The supply of consumer goods was limited by the large amount of resources devoted to capital goods and exports. Consumer demand, swelled by wage increases, by high farm earnings, by the use of consumer credit, and by the cashing of terminal-leave bonds, was in excess of the supply at the current prices.

So we had last year a dangerous increase in all prices. The report says further:

The stubborn and intractable fact about an economy already operating at peak levels is that output cannot be expanded except by slow degrees.

Nor are the immediate consequences of inflation as favorable as superficially appears. Some people are gaining at the expense of others. The heavy weight of higher costs of living bears down upon the millions of families who are unable to keep up with advancing prices. Economic relations degenerate into a hectic struggle to catch up or keep ahead. No firm basis can be established for orderly and stable progress.

We had before our committee Mr. Marriner Eccles, who certainly is in favor of spending in times of depression, and has such a record. He said:

In restraining inflationary pressures under present and prospective conditions, monetary and credit policies must be combined with fiscal and other government policies. The public should be given every possible assurance that the Government will protect the purchasing power of the dollar so that the public would be more willing to defer the satisfaction of wants, particularly for houses and durable goods.

Wherever possible, Government expenditures that will add to the pressures on the labor and capital goods markets should be deferred, and State and local governments should be requested likewise to defer non-essential expenditures of this type.

I might add the last word of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, given in a memorandum published on April 9, in which they said, with relation to the additional expenditures for military purposes:

Every citizen must recognize that further diversions of productive effort to military uses inevitably involve some sacrifice of civilian types of consumption. It is our particular application of the old alternative of guns or butter.

Our people had—and we believe quite properly—looked forward to a postwar period in which larger numbers of people would achieve higher standards of living than had ever been realized before. Those hopes are not nullified by the defense program. But they must be in some measure postponed or for the present revised downward.

So, we have the advice of the President's economic advisers, and of the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

I now read from the report which will be filed shortly, probably, by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

The substance of our conclusion is that the inflationary condition is due to our attempt to accomplish more than is possible at our present capacity for production. Just as England has been criticized for proceeding too rapidly with her housing program instead of devoting more time to production for export, so our people and our Government, both executive and legislative, may well be criticized for trying to carry on at the same time so many huge programs as those represented in our expansion of business transactions, our expansion of residential housing, our support of veterans' education and rehabilitation, our Government public works program, our huge Military Establishment, and our economic support of free peoples throughout the entire world. Liberal credit policies on the part of private and public agencies alike and the maintenance of low interest rates have encouraged the expansion of these programs. We do not intend to criticize these programs or question their desirability. We merely point out that the attempt to carry them all on at once with very little restraint in the field of consumer spending and liberal credit policies is the basic reason for inflation, which otherwise could hardly coincide with a large Government surplus.

So, Mr. President, in the case of public works in particular, it seems to me that we can reasonably ask that we defer some of these works, which have been deferred now for 160 years, and which can certainly be deferred another year without any very dangerous consequences to the country. There are some things which cannot be deferred, but I do not think there is anything which cannot be somewhat cut down, and that is all we are asking in the motion filed by the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

I believe very strongly that if we shall continue to insist on all-out development of every one of the programs I have mentioned, we will face another period of inflation in prices, which will mean probably further increases in wages, and a general inflationary condition throughout the United States, which will injure many people, which will produce hardship and suffering among many families, and which may ultimately lead to a serious depression.

Mr. President, with special reference to the budget which we face this year, and the effect of the appropriations

which we are asked to make, not only in this field, but in many other fields, so far as I can judge at the present time, the best advice is that after the tax cut which was made by Congress, there will be receipts to the Government in the next 12 months of \$42,500,000,000.

It is, of course, more difficult to estimate what the expenses will be, but I have had prepared a table which I think gives a fair idea of about where we are today. It assumes that national defense, for which \$11,000,000,000 was asked, will cost \$13,100,000,000. It may cost more. International expenses have been increased from \$7,000,000,000 to \$7,300,000,000. Veterans' benefits have been increased from \$6,100,000,000 to \$6,300,000,000, and the interest on the national debt is \$5,300,000,000. Refund of taxes is estimated now at about \$2,500,000,000. The reduction in all other expenditures is estimated at from about \$8,300,000,000 to \$7,800,000,000, or about \$500,000,000. That is not a very large decrease, but it is as much of a decrease as we can see any evidence of, so far as all present appropriations have proceeded.

Mr. President, that would mean a total expenditure of \$40,600,000,000, and would leave a balance of \$1,900,000,000. This Congress has said that we should apply at least \$2,600,000,000 to the public debt, and on the basis of the present outlook, and a fairly conservative estimate of military expenditures—we do not know how much of the money is to be spent in the next 12 months—we have already treasured upon the \$2,600,000,000 which should be set aside to reduce the national debt.

In addition to that, in all probability we face an increase in the salaries of Federal workers generally and of postal workers, which may easily total four or five hundred million dollars. Some of the bills provide even more than that.

It seems to me that if we are really to succeed in balancing the budget, \$40,000,000,000 is an outside figure for expenditure the coming year. I do not think the taxpayers should bear a greater burden than \$42,500,000,000. Their burden is already great. Government expenditures already take more than 25 percent of the national income, which means people have to work more than 1 day in 4 for the Government, and only 3 days for themselves. The burden has been somewhat relieved by the inflation which has taken off the taxpayer the burden of the increase and really passed it on to the consumer in higher prices, but when that stops the burden will be so heavy as to discourage any further investment or increase in production. I think it is a burden beyond anything we should stand. In order to meet our promises, I believe very strongly we should confine the expenditures of the Government to not more than \$40,000,000,000, which would leave \$2,500,000,000 to apply on the public debt.

With special reference to the public works program, I call the attention of the Senate to the President's budget, page 1283, and ask that there be incorporated at this point in the RECORD table No. 5, giving the Federal civil public works expenditures by functions and subfunctions.

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

TABLE 5.—Federal civil public works expenditures, by function and subfunction
[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949
Veterans' services and benefits: Veterans' hospitals, other services, and administrative costs.....	\$54	\$179	\$418
International affairs and finance: Foreign relations.....	2	2	2
Social welfare, health and security: Work relief and direct relief.....	2	6	9
Promotion of public health.....	1	21	74
Crime control and correction.....	1	1	1
Total, social welfare, health, and security.....	4	28	84
Housing and community facilities: Public housing programs.....	376	74	19
Provision of community facilities.....	46	50	58
Total, housing and community facilities.....	423	124	77
Education and general research: Educational aid to special groups.....	(¹)	1	5
Agriculture and agricultural resources: Loans and investments to aid agriculture.....	194	302	322
Conservation and development of agricultural land and water resources.....	5	8	10
Total, agriculture and agricultural resources.....	199	310	332
Natural resources not primarily agricultural: Conservation and development of land and water resources.....	324	551	781
Conservation and development of mineral resources.....	6	10	10
Conservation and development of fish and wildlife.....	(¹)	1	(¹)
Recreational use of resources.....	5	10	15
Development and control of atomic energy.....	51	174	326
Total, natural resources.....	387	746	1,132
Transportation and communication: Provision of navigation aids and facilities.....	100	147	183
Provision of highways.....	238	433	514
Promotion of aviation, including provision of airways and airports.....	40	51	84
Postal service.....			1
Other services to transportation.....		6	15
Total, transportation.....	378	638	797
General government.....	10	8	13
Total, civil public works, gross.....	1,487	2,035	2,859
Adjustment to net expenditures for corporations.....	35	34	34
Total, civil public works, net.....	1,422	2,002	2,825

¹ Less than \$500,000.

Note. Figures do not necessarily add because of rounding.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this table shows that in the year 1947 the Government actually spent on civil public works \$1,422,000,000; that in the fiscal year 1948 it is expected the Government will spend \$2,002,000,000; that the estimate for 1949 contained in the budget, apart from any increase Congress may make, is \$2,825,000,000, or an increase of \$823,000,000 over the expenditures for the current year.

Mr. President, I believe very strongly that under present conditions there should be no increase in public works; that it is something which can be put off. As I said yesterday, I do not think

there is an economist, a left-wing economist, or a right-wing economist, or any other kind of economist, who does not accept the general theory that we should let up on public works in time of boom, in time when private activity is rampant, and that we should save those expenditures and pile them up when a depression is threatened. That theory is accepted by everyone I know of. It was accepted by the last Republican President. Mr. Hoover was very strong for the theory of using public works as a balance to private activity. It was accepted by President Roosevelt. It has been accepted by President Truman. It is accepted I think by all parties as a matter of principle. I believe we should abide by that general principle.

Some persons have said, "You were in favor of a Government pay increase, and also in favor of Federal aid to education." In the first place those expenditures are small compared to what we are doing in these other fields. In the second place it seems to me that we have a prior obligation to Federal employees to see that their salaries are increased at least as much over prewar as their cost of living. I believe that is a prior obligation to undertaking any public works. It seems to me that we have an obligation in that case to a million or more men and women to see that they receive a reasonably decent living.

The same thing is true in the field of education. If a million children perhaps, who are not receiving any education to speak of today, continue without education, it will be lost and gone to them forever. I believe again that where we have that kind of a current obligation it should come ahead of public works. I believe that in a budget of the size of our country's budget such increases are reasonable increases. I do not believe that being in favor of increases in salaries and aid to education in any way militates against the position of economy respecting every program. After all, it is a question of weighing the importance of different public expenditures, but all of it, it seems to me, must be included finally in a \$40,000,000,000 expenditure budget, and if we are to come within it it is necessary to have to shave every single appropriation bill that comes along.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think it is unfortunate that we have to make this decision now when we do not have the final report of the Bureau of the Budget as to where we are finally going to land in the way of governmental expenditures, but we do have to proceed step by step. I believe we will be far safer, I believe we will adopt sound principles, I believe we will keep our promises, if we vote to recommit the bill to the committee and reduce by \$200,000,000 the civil public works appropriation measure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the bill, and I speak as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from Ohio today has made, as he usually does, a very able argument, and certainly there is ample room for an honest difference of opinion as to what policy we should perform in this regard.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I meant to say that it is not my desire or intention by what I have said to reflect in any way on the action of the committee. The committee has a particular job to perform, just as a particular job must be performed respecting each program that comes before us. I am rather trying to suggest an over-all policy for Congress. I have the highest respect for the committee. I know the difficulty the committee has had in picking out particular projects and rejecting others, and I do not want what I have said to be in any way considered as a reflection on the details of the bill or on the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out a few of the problems that faced the Committee on Appropriations, and also a few basic policies of national import which I think should be of interest to the Senate of the United States.

In the first place, as we all understand, but perhaps some of the public does not, there is not a single item in the bill which has not first run the gantlet of a congressional authorization. Over a period of years after consideration by the proper Senate committee and the proper House committee Congress has passed authorization bills. Our authorizations are far ahead of our appropriations. As a matter of fact, if the Senate should diligently try to for the next 10 years we could probably not catch up with the authorizations which are ahead of us.

Mr. President, in addition to that there is a further matter which should be kept in mind. After a bill has been authorized, it is the duty of the Army engineers to give careful scrutiny to the various projects throughout the country, of both a flood-control and a rivers and harbors character, and then to make recommendations to the President's Director of the Budget. The engineers have to deal with this problem day in and day out. They see the living examples of what happens to an area which is subject to floods. They see industry destroyed; they see people made homeless; they see livestock and land destroyed. Their job is to help to fight the floods on the firing line, if I may use that expression.

Mr. President, I regretted, I think more than any other Member of this body, to hear the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] say yesterday that he had lost confidence in the intelligence and the integrity of the Army engineers, but I am sure that on reflection he will find it may have been something which was said only in the heat of debate, because I do not know a single agency of the Federal Government which over a long period of years has given more faithful service to the public and the Nation than has the Corps of Army Engineers. I know of no agency of the Federal Government which has been more free from any partisan charge than has the Corps of Army Engineers. I know of no agency in the Government of the United States which has more conscientiously tried to reach proper decisions in regard

to the vast program with which it is confronted.

The Senator from Kansas and some of the other opponents of the pending bill have questioned the emergency nature of some of the projects contained in it. I would certainly be the last individual to stand on the floor of the Senate of the United States and say that of the vast number of projects included there are not some which could be classed as having a higher priority than others, but I do say to the Senate that when a little community on the Mississippi River or on one of the other great river systems of our Nation is faced with having its homes destroyed, its livestock killed, perhaps its families lost, to that community it is the greatest kind of emergency. It is as great an emergency as one facing us in international affairs. Who are we to sit in the Senate of the United States and say that when a community of 500 people or 1,000 people is apt to be wiped off the face of the map, that is not the greatest emergency which such a group of Americans have ever been called upon to face?

I want to say to the able Senator from Ohio, who I know is very conscientious in all these matters which he discusses, that as I have gone around the country, into the valley of the Tennessee, into Kentucky, into other States of the Union, I have made a point of familiarizing myself insofar as I could with their various problems and inspecting their flood-control projects. I was in the city of Louisville not long ago. It is a great distance from my own State of California, but in company with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and Army engineers I went over their flood-control project. I saw the vast industrial capacity in that community which was in danger of flooding. I saw where the floodwaters at various times in the history of Louisville had destroyed property and caused great loss to the economic well-being of that area. I select that merely as one of innumerable examples. The committee in this instance has endeavored to plug the dike before there are additional vast losses in that section of the country.

To pick up my story, the Army engineers use their best estimates as to what, in their opinion, will be the most productive and most economical rate of construction on these projects throughout the Nation, and they send their recommendations to the Director of the Budget. What were those recommendations? The Army engineers stated that in their judgment, in the interest of protecting the soil, the industry, and the economy of the Nation, \$874,441,600 should be spent during the next fiscal year.

The next process is that the Director of the Budget, representing the President of the United States, and having a serious responsibility in the matter of the expenditure of funds, scrutinizes and screens the various recommendations of the Army engineers. What was the recommendation after such screening? It was recommended that the Army engineers' figure of \$874,441,600 be reduced to \$737,804,300. That is the second process.

What happens next? The recommendations go to the House of Representatives, which holds a long series of hearings. Members of the House committee exercise their judgment and discretion. The House committee finally reported the bill with a figure of \$606,558,766. The bill went from the House committee to the floor of the House, and was considered by the House of Representatives. After some minor changes, the bill was passed and sent to this body. Under our procedure, it went to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I have served in a State legislative body, and I have been a Member of this body for a little more than 3 years. I have never known a harder working committee than the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate. It worked long hours, for days on end, hearing the various witnesses—not only Members of Congress, but everyday citizens from the various communities, including farmers, businessmen, mayors, boards of supervisors, and others who have a vital interest in the entire program.

After the hearings were closed the evidence was examined. The committee worked long hours, far into the night, and finally prepared its report. Contrary to some of the implied charges, I wish to say that I have never known a committee whose work was so completely free from any suggestion of logrolling as is the work of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I can say without fear of contradiction that every project in this bill received as careful, honest, and thoughtful consideration as possible, whether the State was represented on the committee or not. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that if anything, the members of the committee lean over backward in order to make sure that no charge of the nature which I have described could ever be made or implied on the floor of the Senate.

After going through this process, the committee recommended a figure of \$737,804,300. This is under the estimates by \$29,217,634.

If the United States Senate sees fit to sustain its Committee on Appropriations, that does not end the matter because, as we all know, the bill must go to a conference between the Senate and the House. Whether some persons recognize it or not, we do have a two-house Congress; and, consequently, when the bill reaches conference there will be a process of give and take as between the views of the two Houses of Congress. So while the Senate's figure is almost \$30,000,000 under the budget estimate, which was approximately \$100,000,000 under the estimate of the Army engineers, the practical aspect of the situation is that when the bill is finally enacted into law the figures will be somewhere between the Senate figure and the House figure.

The able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has stated that since we have gone along for 160 years, we can wait another 3, 4, 10, or 50 years if need be. He also mentioned the question of national defense. I submit that national defense does not depend alone upon armies, navies, or air forces. The economic well-

being of the people is also an important factor. I fully recognize the fact that, of course, we wish to operate with a balanced budget. In my judgment we shall operate with a balanced budget if the action of the full committee is approved.

I have just had taken from the United Press ticker in the anteroom some late figures from the Treasury Department, showing Government expenses and receipts for the current fiscal year through May 14, as compared with a year ago. The comparison is as follows:

Government expenses and receipts for the current fiscal year through May 14 compared with a year ago

	This year	Last year
Expenses.....	\$30,793,833,867.87	\$34,920,861,258.27
Receipts.....	38,512,038,259.94	36,216,477,945.14
Surplus.....	7,718,204,392.07	1,295,616,686.87
Cash balance....	5,027,898,903.72	4,139,385,449.16
Public debt....	252,201,407,876.30	257,728,056,540.85
Gold reserve....	23,235,360,449.03	20,878,077,860.83

The able Senator from Ohio has made some comment with regard to the question of payment on the national debt. I believe that no Member of this body has had more interest in the gradual reduction of the Federal debt than has the junior Senator from California. It was my amendment a year ago which was placed in the then pending resolution, and which made it a part of the policy that each year we should reduce the debt by at least two and a half billion dollars. I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that according to the official Treasury figures which I have just read, this year we have already reduced the public debt by five and one-half billion dollars, which in effect, is more than a 2-year reduction at the rate of two and a half billion dollars a year.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in order to get a proper perspective, I think we should have some additional figures in mind. From 1802 through 1948 the total expenditures for rivers and harbors amounted to \$3,370,000,000. That was for 146 years of our domestic economy, in building our great harbors, developing our great river systems, and our systems of canals for the commerce and economy of the Nation. In passing, Mr. President, I merely mention the fact that that is less, by some \$400,000,000, than the amount of the British loan.

It is true, of course, that the other day the Senator from Kansas listed the expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood-control works by years, over a period of 11 years. The chart he presented at that time shows that for 11 years we have expended for those two items \$2,975,510,688, and that figure includes the appropriation which is now under debate. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, just to give some comparisons so that we may keep a proper perspective, let me point out that for the 11-year period those total appropriations are \$774,490,000 less than the British loan. Let us consider the situation under the European recovery plan, a plan of tremendous consequence to the general stability

of the world. The Senate has approved the ERP for an authorization, for the year, of approximately \$5,300,000,000, although the appropriations themselves have not yet been made. For 11 years we have expended, or we propose to expend, I repeat, on the flood-control and public-works projects of this country, including works on rivers and harbors, \$2,975,510,000.

Now let us consider some other figures. One of the important reasons why the Congress has had to increase appropriations for the armed services has found it necessary and desirable to lend a hand for the rehabilitation of Europe is the threat of aggression from the nation which has endeavored to gather smaller countries behind the Iron Curtain. During the fiscal year 1946, the United States allowed in credits and grants to the nations which are behind the Iron Curtain, not in front of it, \$853,000,000, and \$733,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947. Both those amounts are larger than the amount we propose for public-works expenditures in the 48 States and the Territories of the United States.

The Senator from Ohio mentioned the fact that with limited supplies of building materials available and, to a certain extent, with a limited supply of labor available, a vast public-works program would tend to compete for materials and labor with the efforts to provide the needed homes and housing facilities in the United States. I agree that there is considerable merit in the Senator's contention. However, I wish to point out that it is not true that all these projects by any means take away from the limited supplies of materials, because in the flood-control work, both on the rivers and in connection with the building of dams, a great many such projects largely involve the moving of earth. Of course, other materials are used; but not all by any means, of the dams or other types of construction requires steel and concrete. It is true that they do require some labor; but, again, the type of work that is done in these vast public-construction programs and the type of equipment that is used for them are not generally of the type that can be used for the building of homes.

I do not disagree with my able colleague, the Senator from Ohio, when he says that we should carefully scrutinize public-works programs. Insofar as they are monumental in character and insofar as they mean the building of post offices or other public buildings or similar construction, I think the Senate and the House of Representatives should very carefully scrutinize those types of public works, and should, except in cases of the direst necessity, hold them over until a period of time when there is not so much demand for private construction. But I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that to a large degree this public-works program is one of a constructive nature, one which will add to the economic well-being and the economic wealth of the Nation.

Certainly at a time when our farmers are being called upon to supply more

food to help feed a hungry world, it is only common-sense prudence that insofar as possible we should try to keep down soil erosion. At a time when industry is asked to produce to the maximum extent, not only to meet our own defense requirements and increased domestic demands but also to help rehabilitate the war-torn world, we should do everything possible to prevent the disastrous floods which can shut down industry in a great many areas. Certainly, in a period of time when it is difficult to catch up with the great housing needs of the country, we should do everything possible to prevent the flooding of homes and the destruction of homes by flood. I think that is only common sense.

Moreover, Mr. President—and, again, I do not wish to speak in a narrow sense, but I make these points because I know more about the problem in my own State of California, so perhaps the Senate will pardon me for making a few remarks concerning it—I wish to point out that in our State of California just a few short weeks ago we had a very serious shortage of electric power. Because of the lack of rainfall and the lack of snowfall in the high Sierras, our State had to go through an emergency brown-out which became, in effect, a black-out period. I can cite example after example of large industrial plants in the State of California which had to go on a part-time basis and still others which would have had to be closed if the situation had not been alleviated temporarily, at least. All those plants were contributing to the productive life of the Nation and were supplying goods which are in short supply. To that extent, the keeping open of plants of that character, by means of an adequate supply of power, actually contributes to the lessening of inflationary dangers, because, although we may talk as we will, the one cure for the inflationary pressures which come from an expanded demand and a limited supply of goods is an increase in the productivity of the Nation. In this bill there are provisions for starting or continuing—not only in the State of California, but also in other States of the Union—the construction of power projects which will supply much-needed power not only for rural electrification but also for the industrial life of the Nation.

Mr. President, in addition to the projects contemplated by the bill being a major contributing factor to the economic well-being of the Nation and to the national defense in the respects I have indicated, I want to call attention to one other factor. We have had reports from the Secretary of the Interior and from national defense authorities that the visible supply of oil in this country is not as great as we need. Under those circumstances the industry has been asked by the Government to attempt to develop undeveloped resources. I call attention to the fact, Mr. President, that we can save literally millions upon millions of barrels of oil for the defense needs of the Nation by the adequate and rapid development of hydroelectric power. In that way we shall save fuel

and we shall contribute to the economic life of the Nation.

Mr. President, at this time I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table showing the various income and excess-profits taxes of corporations, and the personal income taxes

in the various States of the Union paid into the Federal Treasury. I insert the table, for the general information of the Senate and the country, to show that by the development of the various States of the Union and the promotion of their well-being through public works projects,

and other things, we are actually adding to the wealth of the Nation and to the ability to support the Federal Government.

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

Statement of internal revenue collections during the calendar year 1947

District and State	Corporation income taxes, 1947			Individual income taxes, 1947		
	Normal and surtaxes	Excess-profits taxes	Total	Normal and surtaxes	Withheld on salaries and wages	Total
Alabama.....	\$57,499,408.36	\$7,043,012.33	\$64,542,420.69	\$80,774,477.99	\$70,612,211.16	\$151,386,689.15
Arizona.....	10,131,667.48	709,140.11	10,840,807.59	33,357,731.27	22,489,009.89	55,846,741.16
Arkansas.....	23,342,979.96	1,611,120.72	24,954,100.68	50,143,340.17	22,768,549.19	72,911,889.36
First California.....	242,074,404.40	31,184,793.59	273,259,197.99	445,849,990.23	426,753,602.14	872,603,592.37
Sixth California.....	178,065,512.64	36,276,361.34	214,341,873.98	579,816,955.66	456,552,970.46	1,036,369,926.12
(State of California).....	420,139,917.04	67,461,154.93	487,601,071.97	1,025,666,945.89	883,306,572.60	1,908,973,518.49
Colorado.....	49,675,658.35	3,808,475.07	53,484,133.42	86,361,276.55	65,843,979.32	152,205,255.87
Connecticut.....	111,055,001.08	3,244,858.58	114,299,859.66	185,065,477.51	206,305,524.53	391,401,002.04
Delaware.....	165,597,417.29	6,653,294.19	172,250,711.48	56,951,930.72	58,860,258.83	115,812,189.55
Florida.....	64,425,315.17	6,879,601.42	71,304,916.59	167,197,972.35	89,322,086.91	256,520,059.26
Georgia.....	95,632,189.16	12,476,234.67	108,108,423.83	122,892,663.23	100,712,738.78	223,605,402.01
Hawaii.....	17,006,564.89	4,532,939.19	21,539,504.08	34,500,566.04	38,886,992.16	73,387,558.20
Idaho.....	11,999,111.18	371,259.94	12,370,371.12	29,404,668.04	19,601,769.00	49,006,437.04
First Illinois.....	762,760,699.16	72,927,052.43	835,687,751.59	576,137,841.62	910,426,784.88	1,486,564,626.50
Elghth Illinois.....	69,180,347.48	7,832,333.10	77,012,680.58	143,175,318.03	92,569,026.46	235,744,344.49
(State of Illinois).....	831,941,046.64	80,759,385.53	912,700,432.17	719,313,159.65	1,002,995,811.34	1,722,308,970.99
Indiana.....	129,701,375.91	16,446,530.44	146,147,906.35	215,422,981.11	185,253,324.24	400,676,305.35
Iowa.....	63,151,003.24	5,307,165.90	68,458,169.14	157,268,584.34	82,190,829.24	239,459,413.58
Kansas.....	62,378,603.82	4,382,894.09	66,761,497.91	112,662,769.35	63,959,933.40	176,622,702.75
Kentucky.....	76,410,526.18	3,430,122.97	79,840,649.15	91,117,163.78	70,408,442.40	161,520,606.18
Louisiana.....	79,874,573.66	7,177,301.39	87,051,875.05	87,136,038.83	71,521,176.28	158,657,215.11
Maine.....	32,982,618.44	2,885,049.38	35,867,667.82	35,725,696.07	33,769,783.65	69,495,480.72
Maryland (Including District of Columbia).....	124,164,606.12	11,381,147.13	135,545,753.25	239,451,967.70	425,753,405.23	665,205,372.93
Massachusetts.....	285,376,751.90	34,770,588.06	320,147,339.96	364,261,348.00	413,396,216.00	777,657,564.00
Michigan.....	327,431,245.98	24,854,993.22	352,286,239.20	344,240,434.20	608,624,570.46	952,865,004.66
Minnesota.....	149,728,081.24	16,744,076.73	166,472,157.97	188,017,273.97	175,354,693.83	333,371,967.80
Mississippi.....	20,309,114.98	2,345,481.83	22,654,596.81	41,778,206.46	21,562,614.58	63,340,821.04
First Missouri.....	178,483,180.33	19,544,724.36	198,027,904.69	134,853,153.46	185,527,779.55	320,380,933.01
Sixth Missouri.....	86,723,966.34	8,373,608.31	95,097,574.65	87,475,917.51	84,111,275.58	171,587,193.09
(State of Missouri).....	265,207,146.67	27,918,332.67	293,125,479.34	222,329,070.97	269,639,055.13	491,968,126.10
Montana.....	12,349,437.76	362,356.15	12,711,793.91	32,518,590.02	17,717,240.07	50,235,830.09
Nebraska.....	45,162,828.20	1,835,749.47	46,998,577.67	88,460,764.82	63,390,406.02	151,851,170.84
Nevada.....	5,691,376.33	132,077.81	5,823,454.14	18,972,945.44	10,944,055.63	29,917,001.07
New Hampshire.....	20,153,636.03	2,299,327.29	22,452,963.32	22,956,042.32	27,763,589.96	50,719,632.28
First New Jersey.....	48,765,028.99	5,745,171.56	54,510,200.55	69,636,250.88	66,442,949.44	136,079,200.32
Fifth New Jersey.....	231,400,383.19	19,179,608.21	250,579,991.40	287,579,446.64	270,522,583.82	528,632,030.46
(State of New Jersey).....	280,165,412.18	24,924,779.77	305,090,191.95	308,688,834.70	354,022,396.08	662,711,230.78
New Mexico.....	4,949,243.61	291,792.40	5,241,036.01	24,419,053.66	13,292,426.55	37,711,480.21
First New York.....	118,742,555.91	13,956,685.25	132,699,241.16	277,300,963.11	218,966,578.72	496,267,541.83
Second New York.....	764,749,147.27	43,064,820.13	807,813,967.40	436,687,878.53	639,556,446.98	1,076,244,325.51
Third New York.....	903,574,492.00	186,317,437.20	1,089,891,929.20	488,350,947.52	947,551,596.95	1,435,902,544.47
Fourth New York.....	73,167,054.95	4,770,571.46	77,937,626.41	153,548,925.17	194,638,690.23	348,187,615.40
Twenty-first New York.....	62,345,913.05	4,756,395.89	67,102,308.94	55,722,564.78	85,511,398.30	141,233,963.08
Twenty-eighth New York.....	119,407,331.64	14,819,342.52	134,226,674.16	112,424,109.35	159,427,307.91	271,851,417.26
(State of New York).....	2,041,986,494.82	272,685,252.45	2,314,671,747.27	1,524,035,388.46	2,245,652,019.09	3,769,687,407.55
North Carolina.....	165,184,998.31	13,006,146.50	178,191,144.81	121,945,151.61	104,446,550.28	226,391,701.89
North Dakota.....	5,437,559.46	205,954.42	5,643,513.88	31,664,317.30	10,051,880.85	41,716,198.15
First Ohio.....	151,230,809.48	13,958,765.43	165,189,574.91	130,614,783.18	157,063,347.51	287,678,130.69
Tenth Ohio.....	76,462,122.65	2,717,175.39	79,179,298.04	66,879,284.46	85,593,918.86	152,473,203.32
Eleventh Ohio.....	47,667,409.09	5,077,761.91	52,745,171.00	58,923,893.93	67,683,507.89	126,607,401.82
Eighteenth Ohio.....	340,668,045.21	33,294,582.68	373,962,627.89	207,289,416.04	389,536,785.79	596,826,201.83
(State of Ohio).....	616,028,386.43	55,048,285.41	671,076,671.84	463,707,377.61	609,877,560.05	1,073,584,937.66
Oklahoma.....	66,985,053.18	3,270,075.35	70,255,128.53	80,349,097.47	74,484,107.40	154,833,204.87
Oregon.....	48,589,487.35	5,520,304.51	54,109,791.86	111,459,748.09	90,967,150.75	202,426,898.84
First Pennsylvania.....	241,351,414.50	65,691,938.39	307,043,352.89	365,776,767.07	454,147,190.39	819,923,957.46
Twelfth Pennsylvania.....	54,014,539.16	2,945,581.13	56,960,090.29	51,715,079.71	92,684,534.34	144,409,614.05
Twenty-third Pennsylvania.....	198,506,988.90	11,524,866.35	210,031,855.25	200,169,199.65	329,307,001.03	529,476,200.68
(State of Pennsylvania).....	493,872,912.56	80,162,385.87	574,035,298.43	617,661,046.43	876,148,725.76	1,493,809,772.19
Rhode Island.....	69,600,547.65	5,907,037.89	75,507,585.54	59,846,852.90	63,754,952.91	123,601,805.81
South Carolina.....	68,147,656.48	7,648,427.01	75,796,083.49	46,857,447.91	41,492,455.47	88,379,903.38
South Dakota.....	6,052,778.65	436,339.98	6,489,118.63	30,910,630.51	11,038,461.44	41,949,151.95
Tennessee.....	84,920,069.55	5,832,809.92	90,752,879.47	113,821,646.01	88,571,022.06	202,392,668.07
First Texas.....	136,159,950.71	7,860,089.10	144,020,039.81	216,105,620.83	138,463,904.97	354,569,525.80
Second Texas.....	96,545,716.42	7,586,448.46	104,132,164.88	199,680,696.40	119,443,772.71	319,124,469.11
(State of Texas).....	232,705,667.13	15,446,537.56	248,152,204.69	415,786,317.23	257,907,677.68	673,693,994.91
Utah.....	16,852,384.32	911,955.18	17,764,339.50	23,051,640.60	27,471,354.32	50,522,994.92
Vermont.....	8,767,264.59	575,574.48	9,342,839.07	13,808,085.34	13,902,782.15	27,710,867.49
Virginia.....	105,809,904.94	8,011,895.34	113,821,800.28	112,697,473.25	116,640,293.27	229,337,766.52
Washington.....	85,572,827.94	12,649,056.17	98,221,884.11	161,940,442.56	167,618,486.95	329,558,929.51
West Virginia.....	50,928,397.46	2,671,804.47	53,600,201.93	53,001,005.08	62,684,944.28	115,685,949.36
Wisconsin.....	162,616,576.59	18,476,254.78	181,092,831.37	161,130,776.07	202,953,005.30	364,083,781.37
Wyoming.....	4,126,314.69	92,395.82	4,218,710.51	16,921,202.38	8,561,234.02	25,482,436.40
Total.....	8,177,977,170.95	891,598,737.39	9,069,575,908.34	9,326,714,581.96	10,654,459,296.49	19,981,173,878.45

Statement of internal revenue collections during the calendar year 1947—Continued

District and State	Total, all income taxes		Miscellaneous	Employment	Grand total, all sources	
	1946	1947	1947	1947	1946	1947
Alabama.....	\$197,905,884.46	\$215,929,109.84	\$19,824,120.58	\$19,799,298.11	\$232,010,468.70	\$255,552,528.53
Arizona.....	61,404,381.06	66,687,548.75	7,439,189.64	3,893,995.07	71,703,703.25	78,020,733.46
Arkansas.....	83,392,410.25	97,865,990.04	10,629,153.30	6,039,365.85	100,036,677.41	114,534,509.19
First California.....	1,167,290,783.17	1,145,862,790.86	272,428,651.87	84,945,472.94	1,545,133,117.40	1,503,236,915.17
Sixth California.....	1,312,155,886.41	1,250,711,800.10	223,098,063.75	72,410,431.37	1,626,916,946.34	1,546,220,295.22
(State of California).....	2,479,446,169.58	2,396,574,590.46	495,526,715.62	157,355,904.31	3,172,050,063.74	3,049,457,210.39
Colorado.....	191,305,450.06	205,689,389.29	48,306,235.45	14,730,409.59	252,116,584.16	268,726,034.33
Connecticut.....	532,060,685.92	505,700,861.70	89,602,829.57	41,518,204.94	643,508,524.15	636,821,896.21
Delaware.....	319,159,494.56	288,062,901.03	10,834,888.80	10,910,894.28	338,304,345.43	309,808,684.11
Florida.....	323,624,392.92	327,824,975.85	62,812,021.72	18,770,880.73	397,198,563.71	409,407,878.30
Georgia.....	323,312,039.84	331,713,825.84	63,987,703.15	24,553,315.67	407,819,840.00	420,254,844.66
Hawaii.....	106,771,190.38	94,927,062.28	10,733,956.52	4,412,720.27	123,984,656.01	110,073,739.07
Idaho.....	49,854,079.76	61,376,808.16	5,940,423.22	3,797,277.22	59,055,641.63	71,114,508.60
First Illinois.....	2,256,126,893.90	2,322,252,378.09	405,522,666.36	210,480,250.72	2,819,922,821.31	2,938,255,295.17
Eighth Illinois.....	275,717,364.45	312,757,025.07	275,959,390.10	17,026,872.86	535,209,996.77	605,743,288.03
(State of Illinois).....	2,531,844,258.35	2,635,009,403.16	681,482,056.46	227,507,123.58	3,355,132,818.08	3,543,998,583.20
Indiana.....	516,678,043.02	546,824,211.70	365,398,761.70	34,092,075.25	898,529,860.55	\$946,315,048.65
Iowa.....	256,514,045.56	307,917,582.72	39,411,035.65	16,111,039.21	325,334,267.84	363,439,657.58
Kansas.....	282,393,010.63	243,364,200.66	85,542,885.24	25,765,326.79	363,529,932.00	354,672,412.69
Kentucky.....	241,039,960.99	241,361,255.33	484,434,841.91	23,916,209.16	724,998,599.08	749,712,306.40
Louisiana.....	246,047,243.05	257,809,990.16	70,281,671.49	15,754,213.41	324,159,546.96	343,845,875.06
Maine.....	110,084,395.49	105,363,157.54	9,761,767.31	8,754,336.83	127,857,664.58	123,879,261.68
Maryland (including District of Columbia).....	855,101,440.80	800,751,128.18	264,415,904.83	66,413,901.20	1,201,375,107.33	1,131,590,932.21
Massachusetts.....	1,098,258,039.82	1,097,804,903.96	172,791,049.33	75,070,703.44	1,353,660,028.85	1,345,666,656.73
Michigan.....	1,305,302,652.90	1,305,151,243.86	508,005,553.04	112,749,449.72	1,705,135,577.69	1,925,906,246.62
Minnesota.....	446,927,486.47	499,842,125.77	100,810,471.92	50,461,452.62	571,292,919.61	651,114,050.31
Mississippi.....	79,412,258.45	85,985,417.85	9,369,481.19	5,938,124.12	94,114,219.47	101,293,023.16
First Missouri.....	584,996,871.80	518,408,837.70	144,248,153.20	54,656,174.31	761,199,517.95	717,313,165.21
Sixth Missouri.....	246,506,983.97	266,684,767.74	39,642,607.05	17,810,605.29	302,256,490.59	323,637,908.08
(State of Missouri).....	831,503,855.77	785,093,605.44	183,890,760.25	71,966,779.60	1,063,456,008.54	1,040,951,145.29
Montana.....	51,148,720.96	62,947,624.00	8,270,548.42	2,956,303.88	60,269,286.66	74,174,476.30
Nebraska.....	188,827,986.48	198,849,748.51	80,574,121.89	24,639,638.28	288,486,946.89	304,063,408.68
Nevada.....	33,334,468.75	35,740,455.21	5,344,115.63	1,562,984.43	41,431,615.57	42,647,555.27
New Hampshire.....	62,354,428.82	73,172,595.60	7,394,632.40	5,320,641.63	75,357,084.81	85,887,799.63
First New Jersey.....	191,425,858.19	190,589,400.87	56,794,907.73	11,449,133.42	231,128,127.34	258,833,442.02
Fifth New Jersey.....	741,101,521.67	777,212,021.86	176,756,213.87	49,870,122.42	957,211,012.60	1,003,838,358.15
(State of New Jersey).....	932,527,379.86	967,801,422.73	233,551,121.60	61,319,255.84	1,188,339,139.94	1,262,671,800.17
New Mexico.....	37,476,398.46	42,952,516.22	4,915,390.94	2,411,072.44	46,405,076.53	50,278,979.60
First New York.....	649,936,845.15	633,966,782.99	123,035,113.32	37,362,632.12	807,689,084.32	794,364,528.43
Second New York.....	1,993,860,606.54	1,884,058,292.91	365,716,771.67	99,846,276.98	2,436,754,839.30	2,349,621,341.56
Third New York.....	2,533,290,596.80	2,525,794,473.67	464,335,501.92	202,150,842.29	3,112,361,347.19	3,192,280,817.88
Fourth New York.....	508,912,770.68	426,125,241.81	89,279,177.02	34,711,436.79	623,923,184.36	550,115,855.62
Twenty-first New York.....	185,955,580.62	208,338,272.02	35,150,366.75	15,438,386.43	229,348,719.46	258,925,025.20
Twenty-eighth New York.....	416,528,634.94	406,078,091.42	89,206,171.48	27,539,314.01	520,308,794.82	522,823,576.91
(State of New York).....	6,288,485,034.73	6,084,359,154.82	1,166,723,102.16	417,048,888.62	7,730,385,969.45	7,668,131,145.60
North Carolina.....	348,105,865.59	404,582,846.70	791,637,384.14	32,095,782.78	1,136,101,740.96	1,228,016,013.62
North Dakota.....	40,885,889.45	47,359,712.03	3,461,099.51	1,668,519.43	45,653,088.69	52,489,330.97
First Ohio.....	424,465,121.14	452,867,705.60	185,490,308.37	27,210,767.68	629,858,779.30	665,568,781.65
Tenth Ohio.....	247,621,692.19	231,652,501.36	42,388,647.98	16,416,365.74	298,290,650.52	290,457,515.08
Eleventh Ohio.....	163,035,367.98	179,352,572.82	23,361,512.96	11,959,915.74	193,364,077.32	214,674,001.52
Eighteenth Ohio.....	991,873,222.10	970,788,829.72	246,774,795.37	91,078,179.58	1,290,437,698.63	1,308,641,804.67
(State of Ohio).....	1,826,495,403.41	1,834,661,609.50	498,015,264.68	146,665,228.74	2,411,951,205.47	2,479,342,102.92
Oklahoma.....	198,559,464.62	225,088,363.40	77,077,941.28	14,900,320.96	282,088,182.81	317,066,625.64
Oregon.....	227,720,439.61	256,536,690.70	21,342,836.60	16,550,710.94	263,348,931.86	294,430,238.24
First Pennsylvania.....	1,131,615,785.31	1,126,967,310.35	361,418,555.32	129,858,276.10	1,728,176,548.34	1,618,244,141.77
Twelfth Pennsylvania.....	199,360,081.64	201,369,704.34	33,348,798.71	22,277,245.75	252,428,758.33	256,995,748.80
Twenty-third Pennsylvania.....	737,864,419.05	739,508,055.93	254,758,812.44	72,645,437.83	1,049,697,016.07	1,066,912,306.20
(State of Pennsylvania).....	2,068,840,286.00	2,067,845,070.62	649,526,166.47	224,780,959.68	3,030,202,322.74	2,942,152,196.77
Rhode Island.....	177,307,770.61	196,169,371.35	20,405,691.92	11,266,282.35	207,635,688.80	227,841,652.02
South Carolina.....	151,513,621.71	164,175,987.77	10,910,874.45	10,305,381.15	170,513,356.03	185,392,243.37
South Dakota.....	39,010,331.15	48,438,270.58	5,835,593.90	1,937,692.29	44,868,976.20	56,211,556.77
Tennessee.....	264,626,063.05	293,145,527.54	34,449,401.23	22,026,577.06	316,515,542.14	349,621,505.83
First Texas.....	457,729,322.98	498,689,665.61	72,094,749.93	35,204,335.12	558,929,240.57	605,888,650.66
Second Texas.....	396,415,045.90	423,256,633.99	69,809,580.73	31,585,888.90	489,831,220.13	524,652,103.62
(State of Texas).....	854,144,368.88	921,946,199.60	141,904,330.66	66,790,224.02	1,048,760,460.70	1,130,540,754.28
Utah.....	64,461,254.46	68,287,334.42	13,111,986.50	5,220,867.17	80,956,386.49	86,620,188.09
Vermont.....	34,330,003.97	37,053,706.56	4,448,806.57	3,685,859.66	43,899,551.36	45,188,372.79
Virginia.....	347,302,963.07	343,159,596.80	344,602,789.71	35,597,511.73	731,502,997.74	723,359,868.24
Washington.....	423,702,890.28	427,780,813.62	51,530,572.02	24,379,518.66	499,603,306.67	503,690,904.34
West Virginia.....	158,297,202.99	169,286,151.29	19,621,934.31	14,088,581.06	189,078,549.16	202,996,666.60
Wisconsin.....	616,449,576.09	645,176,612.74	144,573,471.13	36,521,457.20	770,361,120.04	726,271,541.07
Wyoming.....	24,919,335.24	29,701,146.91	3,849,978.08	1,459,964.36	30,017,014.06	35,011,089.35
Total.....	28,930,169,418.33	29,050,749,786.79	8,144,612,534.09	2,225,483,125.31	38,640,057,860.84	39,420,845,446.19

NOTE.—Tax receipts are reported by internal revenue collection districts, but such figures are not entirely indicative of the Federal tax burden of the respective States since the taxes may be eventually borne by persons in other States. Collection districts are all contained within State boundaries, except that the Maryland district includes the District of Columbia, and the Washington district includes the Territory of Alaska. Separate figures for Alaska and the District of Columbia are only reported to the Bureau at the close of the fiscal year. Internal revenue receipts deposited by postmasters from the sale of documentary stamps and by customs collectors from the excise tax on imported liquors are included in the miscellaneous internal revenue figure above.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The able Senator from Ohio also mentioned the fact that there were other appropriations, and in order to avert any criticism for his own stand on the question of public education

and other things, he made certain mention of that. I supported the able Senator from Ohio both in the case of the housing legislation and education legislation, for the simple reason, Mr. Presi-

dent, that I believe the greatest wealth the Nation has is in its men and women and in its children who are coming along and who will have to carry the burdens of Government. In considering national

defense, Mr. President, I think we have to take all these things into consideration—the human resources and the natural resources of the Nation.

I do not look upon the expenditures covered by the pending bill as the Senator from Kansas apparently did, as merely pork-barrel appropriations. It is easy to make that kind of charge, but we requested him—at least one of my colleagues, I believe, the Senator from Oregon requested him—yesterday to give a bill of particulars and to outline the particular projects he considers to be pork in this bill. I defy him to name any such projects in the bill as reported to the Senate.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. To the contrary, is there any project in the bill that does not have the approval of the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is no project in the bill, that I can recall—and I think I am not making a mistake—that has not had the approval of the Army engineers. There are few, if any—there are a few—that have not run the gantlet of the Bureau of the Budget. On top of that I believe each and every one of them has run the gantlet of prior congressional approval in an authorization bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it the practice or is it one of the standards of the Army engineers that they do not approve projects and report them to the Congress, unless there is economic justification for the projects; that is to say, unless the benefits to be derived will exceed expenditures made in the completion of the projects?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The able Senator from Florida is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It has been brought out in the colloquy very clearly that the Army engineers have approved each of these projects. As a matter of fact, each one of them contained in the bill has had prior congressional authorization, has it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have been listening to the remarks of the junior Senator from California and I have been greatly impressed. The hydroelectric and flood-control projects he mentions are really developing new frontiers in this era of power. I commend the Senator for his able remarks. I regret that I must leave to attend a committee session and shall therefore be unable to listen to the remainder of the Senator's statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I have already detained the Senate longer than I had intended, but I felt that some statements had been made on the floor which, in fairness to the Army engineers, and in fairness to the Committee on Appropriations and

the subcommittee, led by the very able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] should be clarified before a vote is had on the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

I wish to read into the record at this point, Mr. President, a copy of a resolution adopted by the Western Governors' Conference, held in the city of Sacramento, the capital of California, on April 23, 1948. It is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., APRIL 23, 1948

Whereas a serious shortage of power seriously threatens the continued industrial and agricultural expansion of the Western States; and

Whereas fuel resources must be carefully conserved; and

Whereas western hydroelectric, reclamation, flood control, and other multiple-purpose projects must be expanded and developed in a systematic and comprehensive way to meet production requirements, conserve fuels, and to protect the economy of the West; and

Whereas soil conservation is vital to the economic well-being of the Western States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western Governors' Conference urge upon Congress the enactment of appropriations in amounts sufficient to facilitate systematic, prompt, and comprehensive development of western projects for purposes of the development of hydroelectric power, reclamation, flood control, soil conservation, and other purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and the congressional delegations from the Western States.

I might add for the information of the Senate that the Governors attending the conference approving the resolution were Governors Ford, of Montana; Robins, of Idaho; Maw, of Utah; Hall, of Oregon; Pittman, of Nevada; and Warren, of California.

I merely wish to say in conclusion, Mr. President, that I cannot pretend to speak for any other section of the country. I have tried, in my service in the Senate, not to be sectional in any degree. I have supported the development of the great Tennessee Valley area under the TVA. I supported the flood-control projects in the Mississippi Valley because I believed they were necessary for the economic development of that region. I supported the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] in his move to develop the great St. Lawrence seaway project, which was considered by the Senate not long ago and which one of the minority members of the Senate Appropriations Committee was urging the Senate of the United States to adopt. I have done these things, Mr. President, because I felt the projects were capital expenditures in the development of a greatly expanding American economy which would bring an ever-increasing standard of living to the American people. I feel that, regardless of what other sections of the country may do, the eyes of the West are on the Senate of the United States.

RECORD OF SECOND SESSION OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield temporarily to permit

me to make an insertion in the RECORD, to come at the end of his remarks?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from California an article from the Washington Daily News dealing with the record of the Congress in the present session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here's how the record of the Eightieth Congress, second session, will look when it's completed a month from now:

Stalin was responsible for most of what was done: European recovery program, 70-group Air Force, other increased arms spending, limited draft, Mundt bill (if it passes).

On the domestic front, the record is practically blank except for tax reduction.

House Republican leaders will continue to sit on Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing and Federal-aid-for-education bills.

Last year we told you, Republican leaders were telling committee chairmen to keep bills bottled up during first session, pass ones that would be popular with voters just before election. But they're keeping them bottled up this year, too. Instead of broadening social security they've reduced its scope.

Minimum wage, about which there was much talk, has not been raised, won't be. It's still 40 cents.

There'll be no civil-rights legislation. Republicans will make noise about antilynching in the closing days, rely on southern filibuster to kill it. That's now standard procedure.

Reciprocal Trade Act will be extended for 1 year only, but with crippling amendments. Modified rent control has been extended; farm price support will be. Republicans are anxious to make as few enemies as possible; hope jokers in reciprocal trade won't be detected. And they're putting off fight on appointments to Atomic Energy Commission.

There's been no national health legislation. Republicans hope everyone forgets their inflation controls of special session. They aren't working. They'll study better controls, they say.

Congress isn't even coming close to saving \$2,000,000,000 it planned to trim from budget. It's just passed deficiency appropriation to make up for savings last year on tax refunds which were quarter of billion bigger than the \$800,000,000 Republicans boasted of saving.

Closing days may see Congress overriding Truman vetoes to give to States vast oil reserves in sea, exempt railroads from anti-trust laws.

Fate of margarine tax repeal bill is in doubt. If TAFT goes to bat it has a chance.

DESIGNATION OF MAY 30 AS DAY FOR NATION-WIDE PEACE PRAYERS

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 16, Carl M. Saunders, editor of the Jackson City Patriot, Jackson, Mich., published an editorial in that newspaper entitled "Suppose All America Prayed for Peace." The editorial struck me so forcibly that I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

SUPPOSE ALL AMERICA PRAYED FOR PEACE

The United States is generally classified as a Christian nation.

If that means anything at all, it means that the vast majority of our people accept the basic tenets of the Christian faith. Beyond that there is a large minority of Americans who worship in the Hebrew faith. Both Christian and Hebrew believe in God as the maker of heaven and earth.

Yet as a nation we seem utterly unaware of God or of his place in the making of history.

As individuals many Americans worship. Many pray to God daily or more often.

Why, then, should not America pray as a nation in a time when as a Nation we are in dire need of help and guidance?

We do have 1 day in the year supposedly dedicated to thanksgiving, when we as a people are expected to offer thanks to the Supreme Being for the blessings showered upon us.

But we have no day or hour or minute when as a people we turn to prayer.

If we are a Christian nation, isn't a national moment of prayer a logical natural course?

Differences in creed or systems of worship or dogma need not enter into this discussion if as a people we believe that there is a God who shapes the course of our lives.

It should be possible for Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and others to join in a common appeal to a common God.

The world is troubled today. America is deeply troubled. The threat of war hangs over all of us, yet we want peace. We are not a warlike people. We cherish the lives of those young people who become sacrifices in war. We are ready to be tolerant of all nations which do not menace us, regardless of divergent ideologies.

So far as this newspaper is concerned, it believes that the preparation for defense of our country is wise and is not in contravention of basic religious beliefs. We appreciate, of course, that some good people disagree with us. They do not believe a fire department is needed to protect us from war's flames even though conflagration threatens.

But first things should come first.

And the first defense against disaster should be prayer. The first appeal for peace should be to the Omnipotent Master of the universe.

We as mortals do not know what are His plans for us and for the world.

We know only that, as the poet has said: "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform."

But a troubled Christian nation should turn to prayer. Its people should lift their voices as from a single throat in supplication to the Divine Architect of our destinies, remembering always "Thy will be done."

Through the medium of newspapers and the radio we have great opportunities for mass supplication. We as a Nation can duplicate the mass prayers of the early Christians who gathered, a small handful, to present their appeals.

Suppose that Congress were to set aside a day and an hour and a minute as the time to pray for peace.

Suppose that by request from Congress all newspapers on that day were to publish the appeal for prayer at the set time and were to print the proposed words for prayer.

Suppose that every radio station at the same moment broadcast the prayer for peace.

Suppose that millions of Americans turned their radios high at that same moment.

The voices of prayer would echo and re-echo from the White Mountains of Maine to the Black Mountains of California, from the warm currents of the Gulf Stream to the cold fogs of the Bering Sea.

All America asking for guidance, appealing for peace, pleading that our leaders be made wise and blessed.

We are not thinking that a 150,000,000-person pressure group can force God to create a peace disregarding His own great purpose. We would not want to be interpreted as anticipating that merely for all of us to rub the lamp of prayer will produce some white magic peace out of the heavenly mists. But we are suggesting that when 150,000,000 people by common consent turn their minds and hearts to the Spirit which created this world rather than leaning wholly upon the materialism of man's own strength, then something is bound to happen to those people—something which conceivably will make easier the accomplishment of God's purpose. Not knowing what that purpose is, whether in His great scheme of things we are to have peace or war, to survive or pass into the limbo of broken nations—not knowing, we still will have the inner warmth and cleanliness which is brought by prayer.

Inevitably would not such a moment of consecration raise us up? Would it not in a measure at least lend authenticity in a moment of travail to our proud claim to being a Christian nation?

We suggest that the President or Congress, or both, set a day and a moment for a national Prayer for Peace. Perhaps the early evening of May 30 would be a most fitting time. We suggest that in proclaiming such a period of supplication, all mediums of information—newspapers, radio, etc.—be asked to join.

"And pray unto the Lord for it; for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace" (Jeremiah, 29: 7).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there are two ways to arm for defense, one materially, the other spiritually. The Government itself can arm only materially, but the people, who compose the Government, must arm spiritually if we are to defend America.

Today when the great nations of the world are concentrating on arming the people of their countries with weapons of war in the hope of preserving the peace, it is vital that we think constructively and objectively.

With the emphasis on billions of dollars, on worldly goods, on material resources, and armament, can we pause for a moment and feel the futility of such emphasis? Each nation is intent upon the most devastating and deadly weapons of destruction before others can out-produce them. Where can it lead but to the end of civilization?

The Bible has warned us that faith without works is dead. Have we lost the faith and clung to the works of destruction only? Can we not seriously, with honesty of purpose, try a new approach, for us, but one old as the ages? The approach of faith. Faith in each other as human beings, faith in God to preserve the human beings He created, the faith that moves mountains of distrust and enmity, of hatred and horror, the faith that believes in prayer.

With sublime belief in that faith, we should petition the President to declare a period of prayer for peace, and with a Nation united in that prayer, other nations could join in the beginning of a new world.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, May 30, 1948, as a day for Nation-wide prayer for peace. The joint resolution reads as follows:

Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1948, as a day for Nation-wide prayer for peace

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe Memorial Day, 1948, by praying, each in accordance with his religious faith, for permanent peace; designating a period during such day in which all the people of the United States may unite in prayer for a permanent peace, and calling upon all the people of the United States to unite in prayer at such time; and calling upon the newspapers, radio stations, and all other mediums of the Nation, to join in observing such day and such period of prayer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 217) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1948, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the statement of the distinguished Senator from Michigan does himself honor and honors this august body. I think I have on another occasion called attention to the fact that last summer, as I returned to this country on the *Queen Elizabeth*, I was introduced to Mr. Vishinsky, who is the leader of the Russian delegation to the United Nations. I was introduced by Mr. McNeil, the head of the British delegation. The *Queen Elizabeth* was sailing along at a good clip, the wind was blowing, the crowd was pretty jolly. I took Vishinsky by the hand and held on to his hand, looked him directly in the eye and said, "Mr. Vishinsky, every night I pray that Britain, Russia, America, and all the other nations of the earth may have a sincere desire for peace and may be adequate to consummate that desire by some international organization."

Vishinsky, through his interpreter, said, "I do not pray."

That is why I say the resolution and the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan do honor to himself and to this august body.

Mr. President, at this time I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD an article published in March 1941 by Alexis Carrel, the great physicist and scientist, on the meaning of prayer. I think it is the most significant article that has ever been penned by a human being. I inserted it in the RECORD on March 17, 1941, on another occasion when we as a people found ourselves in deep water.

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

[From Reader's Digest of March 1941]

PRAYER IS POWER

(By Alexis Carrel, M. D.)

Prayer is not only worship; it is also an invisible emanation of man's worshipping spirit—the most powerful form of energy that one can generate. The influence of

prayer on the human mind and body is demonstrable as that of secreting glands. Its results can be measured in terms of increased physical buoyancy, greater intellectual vigor, moral stamina, and a deeper understanding of the realities underlying human relationships.

If you make a habit of sincere prayer, your life will be very noticeably and profoundly altered. Prayer stamps with its indelible mark our actions and demeanor. A tranquility of bearing, a facial and bodily repose are observed in those whose inner lives are thus enriched. Within the depths of consciousness a flame kindles. And man sees himself. He discovers his selfishness, his silly pride, his fears, his greeds, his blunders. He develops a sense of moral obligation, intellectual humility. Thus begins a journey of the soul toward the realm of grace.

Prayer is a force as real as terrestrial gravity. As a physician I have seen men, after all other therapy had failed, lifted out of disease and melancholy by the serene effort of prayer. It is the only power in the world that seems to overcome the so-called laws of nature; the occasions on which prayer has dramatically done this have been termed miracles. But a constant, quieter miracle takes place hourly in the hearts of men and women who have discovered that prayer supplies them with a steady flow of sustaining power in their daily lives.

Too many people regard prayer as a formalized routine of words, a refuge for weaklings, or a childish petition for material things. We sadly undervalue prayer when we conceive it in these terms, just as we should underestimate rain by describing it as something that fills the bird bath in our garden. Properly understood, prayer is a mature activity indispensable to the fullest development of personality—the ultimate integration of man's highest faculties. Only in prayer do we achieve that complete and harmonious assembly of body, mind, and spirit which gives the frail human reed its unshakable strength.

The words, "Ask and it shall be given to you," have been verified by the experience of humanity. True, prayer may not restore the dead child to life or bring relief from physical pain. But prayer, like radium, is a source of luminous, self-generating energy.

How does prayer fortify us with so much dynamic power? To answer this question (admittedly outside the jurisdiction of science) I must point out that all prayers have one thing in common. The triumphant hosannas of a great orator, or the humble supplication of an Iroquois hunter begging for luck in the chase, demonstrate the same truth: That human beings seek to augment their finite energy by addressing themselves to the infinite source of all energy. When we pray we link ourselves with the inexhaustible motive power that spins the universe. We ask that a part of this power be apportioned to our needs. Even in asking, our human deficiencies are filled and we arise strengthened and repaired.

But we must never summon God merely for the gratification of our whims. We derive most power from prayer when we use it not as a petition but as a supplication that we may become more like Him. Prayer should be regarded as practice of the presence of God. An old peasant was seated alone in the last pew of the village church. "What are you waiting for?" he was asked; and he answered, "I am looking at Him and He is looking at me." Man prays not only that God should remember him, but also that he should remember God.

How can prayer be defined? Prayer is the effort of man to reach God, to commune with an invisible being, creator of all things, supreme wisdom, truth, beauty, and strength, father, and redeemer of each man. This goal of prayer always remains hidden to intelligence. For both language and thought fail when we attempt to describe God.

We do know, however, that whenever we address God in fervent prayer we change both soul and body for the better. It could not happen that any man or woman could pray for a single moment without some good result. "No man ever prayed," said Emerson, "without learning something."

One can pray everywhere. In the streets, the subway, the office, the shop, the school, as well as in the solitude of one's own room or among the crowd in a church. There is no prescribed posture, time, or place.

"Think of God more often than you breathe," said Epictetus the Stoic. In order really to mold personality, prayer must become a habit. It is meaningless to pray in the morning and to live like a barbarian the remainder of the day. True prayer is a way of life; the truest life is literally a way of prayer.

The best prayers are like the improvisations of gifted lovers, always about the same thing yet never twice the same. We cannot all be as creative in prayer as St. Theresa or Bernard of Clairvaux, both of whom poured their adoration into words of mystical beauty. Fortunately, we do not need their eloquence; our slightest impulse to prayer is recognized by God. Even if we are pitifully dumb, or if our tongues are overlaid with vanity or deceit, our meager syllables of praise are acceptable to Him, and He showers us with strengthening manifestations of His love.

Today as never before prayer is a binding necessity in the lives of men and nations. The lack of emphasis on the religious sense has brought the world to the edge of destruction. Our deepest source of power and perfection has been left miserably undeveloped. Prayer, the basic exercise of the spirit, must be actively practiced in our private lives. The neglected soul of man must be made strong enough to assert itself once more. For if the power of prayer is again released and used in the lives of common men and women; if the spirit declares its aims clearly and boldly, there is yet hope that our prayers for a better world will be answered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I also ask that there be inserted in the RECORD the definitions of prayer as given by sincere thinkers throughout the centuries. They will be found at page 9050 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of November 21, 1942, starting with Montgomery, who said:

Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
Uttered or unexpressed;
The motion of a hidden fire
That trembles in the breast.

There being no objection, the definitions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There comes to mind a prayer of Robert Louis Stevenson which has become dear to the hearts of all who read the English language:

"We thank Thee for this place in which we dwell; for the love that unites us; for the peace accorded us this day; for the hope with which we expect the morrow; for the health, the work, the food, and the bright skies that make our lives delightful; for our friends in all parts of the earth, and our friendly helpers in this foreign isle. Give us courage and gaiety and the quiet mind. Spare to us our friends, soften to us our enemies. Bless us, if it may be, in all our innocent endeavors. If it may not, give us the strength to encounter that which is to come, that we be brave in peril, constant in tribulation, temperate in wrath, and in all changes of fortune, and down to the gates of death, loyal, and loving one to another."

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a prayer which I like—the Optimist's Prayer, by William J. Robinson.

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

"O Unseen Power that rules and controls the destinies of the children of earth: Teach me the symphony of life so that my nature may be in tune with Thine. Reveal to me the joy of being loving, self-sacrificing, and charitable. Teach me to know and play life's game with courage, fortitude, and confidence. Endow me with wisdom to guard my tongue and temper, and learn with patience the art of ruling my own life for its highest good, with due regard for the privacy, rights, and limitations of other lives. Help me to strive for the highest legitimate reward of merit, ambition, and opportunity in my activities, ever ready to extend a kindly helping hand to those who need encouragement and succor in the struggle. Enable me to give a smile instead of a frown, a cheerful, kindly word instead of harshness and bitterness. Make me sympathetic in sorrow, realizing that there are hidden woes in every life, no matter how exalted or lowly. If in life's battle I am wounded or tottering, pour into my wounds the balm of hope and imbue me with courage undaunted to arise and continue the strife. Keep me humble in every relation of life, not unduly egotistical nor liable to the serious sin of self-depreciation. In success keep me meek. In sorrow, may my soul be uplifted by the thought that if there were no shadow there would be no sunshine, and that everything in life must have its antithesis. Grant that I may be a true, loyal friend, a genial companion with the broad honest charity born of an intimate knowledge of my own shortcomings. If I win, crown me with the laurels fitting to be worn by a victor, and, if I fall, may it be with my face to the foe, fighting manfully, and, falling, fling to the host behind—play up, play up, and play the game."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we reckon time, human life is but a short voyage; and, with Hubbard, we can say:

"Teach me to know and observe the rules of the game. Let me never lack due sense of humor; preserve me from growing stogy and unimaginative; deliver me from atrophy of the emotions. I desire to radiate health, cheerfulness, calm, courage, and good will; to live without hate, jealousy, envy, fear. I wish others to live their lives, too, up to their highest, fullest, and best. To that end I pray that I may never meddle, interfere, dictate, give advice that is not wanted, or assist when my services are not needed. If I can help people, I will do it by giving them a chance to help themselves; and if I can uplift or inspire, let it be by example, inference, and suggestion rather than by injunction and dictation. I desire to be radiant."

Mr. President, it was my privilege to read the President's recent Thanksgiving message. The first sentence of the President's proclamation, "It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord," arrests my attention. Did we ever ask ourselves, "Why is it a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord?" What is the effect upon us and upon others who hear us? The answer must be that the expression of gratitude is a form of worship by which man renews himself by drawing closer to his Maker. Plutarch said:

"The worship most acceptable to God comes from a thankful and a cheerful heart."

The sentence quoted by the President comes from the ninety-second Psalm. All through the scripture we find the admonition to give thanks, to rejoice in all ways. The one hundred and eighteenth Psalm states the rule thus:

"O give thanks unto the Lord; for He is good: for His mercy endureth forever."

When we give thanks, we engage in the process of rejoicing. Thus the Psalmist says:

"Let Mount Zion rejoice, let the daughters of Judah be glad." (Forty-eighth Psalm.)

"Offer unto God thanksgiving." (Fiftieth Psalm.)

"O sing unto the Lord a new song: for He hath done marvelous things." (Ninety-eighth Psalm.)

"O give thanks unto the Lord; call upon His name." (One hundred and fifth Psalm.) That thought carries over in the New Testament. In the first chapter of the Book of Colossians we find:

"Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light."

In the third chapter of the Book of Colossians we find:

"Let the peace of God rule your hearts, * * * and be ye thankful."

In the First Book of Thessalonians, chapter 5, we are told:

"In everything give thanks: for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you."

The Great Teacher, the Wayshower, said, "Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard me. And I knew that Thou hearest me always." He taught that "God is a Spirit," and that "in Him we live, and move, and have our being." God certainly dwells in a thankful heart—in the mind that is filled with gratitude.

WHY WE ARE GRATEFUL

Mr. President, today (November 21, 1942) in the midst of the greatest cataclysmic event of all time, let us inventory a few of our blessings. What have we to be thankful for? We could pile the answer as high as the highest cloud, and still we would not be able to enumerate all our blessings.

Here are a few of them:

A free land, where free people live, exercising the great freedoms; valiant brothers in the service who are going forth to battle to preserve those freedoms; loyal citizens on the home front who give their brothers and husbands to the war effort and who sacrifice and serve in the factories, on the farms, in Government, and in business in order that victory may be assured; the daily lessons which teach us to leave the perilous ways and bring us in harmony with the laws of God; the opportunity to serve God and country and humanity and to banish discouragement and defeatism; growth in understanding the problems which come to all; the privilege of overcoming human limitations and striving toward perfection; joy of living, the beauty of nature, and human friendship.

To feel grateful, to be grateful, is a human obligation—a rule of freedom from human limitations. The spirit of gratitude provides a tonic for the mind and soul of man.

I conclude in the words of the Psalmist:

"It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto Thy name, O Most High: to show forth Thy loving kindness in the morning, and Thy faithfulness every night. * * * For Thou, Lord, has made me glad through Thy word: I will triumph in the work of Thy hands."

Mr. President, I believe it would be very appropriate for the President of the United States to follow the suggestion made in the editorial printed in the Milwaukee Sentinel, and to proclaim that the anniversary of Pearl Harbor and the 2 days preceding it be observed in prayer. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appearing in the Milwaukee Sentinel be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

"DAYS OF PRAYER—PROPER OBSERVANCE OF PEARL HARBOR ANNIVERSARY"

"The United States will have been at war 1 year on December 7, the first anniversary of the dawn attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese—an attack made in such circumstances that it will 'stand in infamy,' as President Roosevelt said.

"We have suggested that this anniversary be observed 13 prayer, and that the 2 days preceding it—being the Sabbath days of the great religious faiths to which many millions of our people adhere—be designated as national days of prayer.

"It is a proper suggestion.

"The religious leaders of the Nation have given it their approval, and are making full arrangements for it.

"The religious people of the United States—and there is no people on earth more conscious of the value of religion or more sincere in their faith—welcome the opportunity to do in unison what they are already doing individually in their hearts.

"The American people are not strangers to prayer.

"They believe in prayer, in its power and its wisdom and its goodness.

"They believe in religion, and especially believe in respect for and tolerance of all religions.

"They belong to their respective churches, and support them and understand the great good derived from them and recognize the great services rendered by them.

"They are sustained by their religious faith, and seek guidance and strength from it, and find courage and wisdom in it.

"The American people have not waited for a special day in this war as a suitable occasion for prayer.

"On the day Pearl Harbor was attacked, many of them repaired to their churches and temples and familiar places of worship to affirm their faith.

"Many of them bowed their heads where they were when the shocking news came, and silently and humbly and reverently prayed.

"The American family has ever since been a place for prayer and the expression of faith.

"Parents and loved ones have sent young men away with prayer.

"They have steeled themselves against long silences and doubt and fear with prayer.

"For the growing number to whom bereavement has come, an unfailing source of solace and comfort has been found in prayer.

"It will be a wonderful thing for all of the American people to join in their prayers, to have national days of prayer—and to seek together what they instinctively and devotedly seek by themselves.

"It will be good for them, and characteristic of them, and true to the ideals and examples of the founding fathers of this free land which we now defend.

"No manner of observing the anniversary of Pearl Harbor could be more appropriate, more ennobling, more truly American than a prayerful observance.

"Let us indeed observe December 5 and 6—the Sabbaths of our faiths—as national days of prayer.

"We will pray for victory, of course.

"But let us also pray for wise and inspired conduct of the war.

"Let us pray for an awareness, by Government as well as by the people, of our dire peril in the Pacific as well as in the Atlantic.

"Pearl Harbor is still threatened.

"The Philippines are still lost.

"Aleutian Islands outposts still remain in the hands of the Japanese and menace the American mainland.

"Our prayers should surely be for victory, but for understanding of our greatest dangers in addition.

"Let us finally pray for an awareness and understanding of the true meaning of faith, which has never been better defined than by Abraham Lincoln in these words:

"I know that the Lord is always on the side of the right.

"My constant anxiety and prayer is that I and this Nation may be on the Lord's side."

"The American cause in this war is right, it is just and it is morally and spiritually good, and we may confidently and devoutly conduct our prayers in this knowledge."

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

FIGHTING MEN AS MEN OF PRAYER

To the Christian Science Monitor:

"Don't worry about me, Mom. God has always watched over me, and now in war I know that He will protect and guard me."

Millions of homes throughout America—as well as in Britain and the Dominions—are treasuring messages like this from soldiers in camps, on the front lines in most parts of the world, and from sailors on the seven seas.

American soldiers and Navy men on board ship are asking radio stations to broadcast hymns. The men's preference is voted on each week, and the favorite hymn is played and sung every Sunday evening on the Hour of Charm, Navy men afloat and ashore are listening to these hymns such as one I heard recently, God Be With You Till We Meet Again, followed by assurances to "mom and dad" that Navy chaplains are diligently ministering to the religious needs of the men in the service.

Army generals, from Washington to Pershing, have prayed. Not only have our American admirals (like Farragut) been praying men, but those in the forecastle. Nearly everyone remembers how, the month after Pearl Harbor, three naval aviation enlisted men were forced down in the south Pacific with nothing except a rubber life raft and a new-born belief that God's strength would sustain them if they asked Him for help. They drifted and prayed for 34 days. Their prayers were answered.

If the men in the crews of old naval ships followed their leaders, we can be sure that Admiral Farragut's men prayed as he did the night before the battle in Mobile Bay. He expressed himself to his wife in much the same words as men now are writing to "mom."

"It has pleased God to protect me thus far. I have been nothing more than an instrument in the hands of God, well supported by my officers and men. I am going into Mobile Bay if God is my leader as I hope He is and in Him I place my trust."

Farragut's well-worn prayer book which he kept with him during all his naval campaigns has been preserved and is now in the chapel of the Naval Academy, Annapolis.

One of the Navy's heroes at the battle of Santiago in 1898 was Capt. Jack Philip, commanding the *Texas*, who said after the battle, "Don't cheer, boys. Those poor fellows are dying." Captain Philip's naval chaplain said: "His Christian belief influenced all his actions but did not affect adversely his virile efficiency. I remember him for his dependence on God. After the battle he called the crew aft and said: 'All who wish may join me in thanks to Almighty God.' All hands took off their caps and knelt in prayer.

But prayer and divine service on board ship were never allowed to interfere with naval duty as Captain Philip saw it. He peremptorily called off a Sunday evening service when his ship was endangered by rebels in Rio Janeiro.

Finally Captain Philip's religious convictions had a practical every day application for all the men of the Navy. He directed some of his ambition to the creation of the first Young Men's Christian Association.

Like Farragut, Nelson uttered his prayers on the eve of battle. Thus, as Trafalgar's fighting was about to begin, Nelson on his knees on the deck of the *Victory* prayed:

"May the great God whom I worship grant to my country a glorious victory and may no misconduct in anyone tarnish it, and may humanity after victory be predominant. I commit my life to Him who made me, and may His blessings alight on my endeavors for serving my country faithfully. To Him I resign myself and the just cause which is entrusted to me to defend."

After that Nelson composed the greatest naval signal ever hoisted in war or peace: "England expects every man to do his duty."

Gen. Robert E. Lee, who bore the hopes of the Confederacy, was always absorbed in his religious beliefs. When his armies failed him once in 1863, he wrote his wife: "The Ruler of the Universe willed otherwise." Again in 1863: "As soldiers we have sinned against Almighty God; we have relied too much on our own armies. God is our only refuge and our strength. God is the giver of victory."

God's will ought to be our aim. I am contented that His designs should be accepted."

No general in history prayed so fervently and so often as Stonewall Jackson. "On Him I rely," said Jackson, "we are sustained by Divine Providence. The text of one's life is: 'God's will be done.'"

Jackson prayed while in camp and when under fire for divine help to do his duty.

Jackson saw the "visible finger of God," he said, in every incident of life.

LOUIS J. GULLIVER,
Commander, United States Navy,
Retired, Annapolis, Md.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that more things are accomplished by right prayer than by any other force known to man. When I make that statement, it is bolstered by a scientist, Dr. Carrel, who says that prayer is more significant than is gravity.

In this article which I have taken from the Reader's Digest, it is said:

Prayer is a force as real as terrestrial gravity. As a physician, I have seen men, after all other therapy had failed, lifted out of disease and melancholy by the serene effort of prayer. * * *

Properly understood, prayer is a mature activity indispensable to the fullest development of personality—the ultimate integration of man's highest faculties. * * * Prayer, like radium, is a source of luminous, self-generating energy.

I repeat for the third time, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, in this political body, does himself honor and does the Senate honor by introducing this joint resolution and asking for action on it.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what I am about to announce, of course, depends upon the approval of the Senate. It is the intention at present that the Senate shall proceed to debate the pending question for a full session this afternoon, if necessary, in order to get a vote on the pending motion today if possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to associate myself with the Senator in expressing the hope that we can get a vote on the motion now pending. The motion will probably determine what is to happen in regard to the bill, and in view of our crowded calendar, I hope we may be able to conclude the debate and get a vote this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the minority leader for this expression, which I think represents the desire of the Members of the Senate. So we will work toward that goal in the remaining time left this afternoon.

If the motion shall prevail, as the distinguished minority leader has said, it will mean the end of the consideration of the civil-functions appropriation bill for a while at least. If it shall not prevail, it is the intention to continue with the bill until it shall be disposed of.

Following action on the motion and the bill, it is the intention to bring up the displaced-persons bill, and it is the hope that we may conclude its consideration, if possible, by Friday of this week at least, if not before. If it shall run until Friday, it is the intention then to adjourn until the following Monday, so

that there may be a morning hour, and at a later date there will be a unanimous-consent request for a call of the Legislative Calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is objection and for the disposition of a motion or two on the calendar at that time, if possible.

Inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Michigan has introduced a joint resolution and mentioned the date of May 30, I suggest to the Senate that the intention is now, if it shall meet with approval of the Senate, for the Senate to recess or adjourn on May 28 until the following Tuesday morning, in view of the fact that Monday, May 31, will be a holiday.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield, the 30th of May, which is Decoration Day, will fall on Sunday, so the holiday will occur on Monday, and it will be the purpose to adjourn from Friday to Tuesday.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct, and I thank him once again for his remarks. When the recess is taken, I repeat, it will be from Friday night until the following Tuesday noon. Of course, that depends upon the approval of the Senate; but those are the plans, and I trust they will meet with the approval of the Members of the Senate.

I once again admonish those who are about to speak on the bill now pending that it is very much desired that a vote be had on the motion to recommit tonight, and then that the Senate may proceed with the bill itself, in the event it shall not be recommitted; but if it shall be recommitted, the intention will be to take up the displaced-persons measure and proceed with that.

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5224) making appropriation for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my understanding is that there is a unanimous request made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that a speech on civil functions be read, which speech was prepared by the late Senator Overton, of Louisiana. I think it is proper and fitting at this time to ask that that speech be read under the unanimous-consent rule, and I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the very unusual circumstances, I feel that there should be a quorum present. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Cain	Dworshak
Ball	Capehart	Eastland
Barkley	Capper	Ecton
Brewster	Chavez	Ferguson
Bricker	Connally	Fulbright
Brooks	Cooper	George
Buck	Cordon	Green
Butler	Donnell	Gurney
Byrd	Downey	Hatch

Hawkes	McFarland	Smith
Hayden	McGrath	Sparkman
Hickenlooper	McKellar	Stennis
Hill	McMahon	Taft
Hoey	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Holland	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Ives	Martin	Thye
Jenner	Millikin	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Moore	Tydings
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Vandenberg
Kem	O'Connor	Wherry
Kilgore	Pepper	White
Knowland	Reed	Wiley
Langer	Revercomb	Williams
Lodge	Robertson, Va.	Wilson
Lucas	Russell	Young
McClellan	Saltonstall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the order of the Senate, the clerk will read the speech on the pending bill which had been prepared by the late Senator Overton, of Louisiana.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR OVERTON ON H. R. 5224

Mr. President, it is incredible to me that there would be presented to the Senate of the United States a report so fraught with inaccuracies, so calculably misleading, and so obviously distorted as the minority report which accompanies the Army civil functions appropriation bill for fiscal year 1949. It is so inconsistent with the facts in the case that, although its erroneous nature would ordinarily call for its being ignored, I feel that it must not be allowed to stand unchallenged.

In the first instance, the report is an indictment of your Appropriations Committee, for the charge is made repeatedly—although the Army engineers are made the defendant—that care was thrown out the window when the allotments were made and that discretion was exercised only by those who would now have us believe that their sole interest in this matter is the protection of the Nation's economy.

In my years in this body, I have never seen a committee which approached its task with a more open mind, which conducted its hearings as patiently and which engaged in its deliberations with more sincerity than did the subcommittee which prepared this legislation. There is not a project appropriated for which was not carefully studied and screened and balanced against the whole. Until far into the night, this committee labored and at times sweated blood in its endeavor to provide the funds for the orderly, systematic conservation and protection of our great natural resources covered by this bill. It was a great committee, one of which I am proud to have been a member and one which has discharged its duty as faithfully as any committee which ever sat in this body. To charge or even infer that it abdicated its authority and judgment to any executive agency or anyone else is simply to play loose with fact. Such an inference is without foundation and should be branded as the distortion that it is.

Early in the minority report, those who signed it betrayed their tragic ignorance of what is involved. I quote the fifth paragraph of this illuminating document:

"Many of the projects included in this appropriations measure were authorized in extremely broad language, the effect of which was to turn over the responsibility for selecting the projects to the Army Corps of Engineers which has a vested interest in continuing and expanding its level of activities and personnel."

With all charity, I say that the person who wrote that statement simply did not know what he was talking about. It just is not the fact. There is not a line of existing flood-control law on the statute books of this country that I have not participated in the writing of, and I challenge any man to stand on this floor and cite to me one in-

stance in which "the responsibility for selecting the projects" has been given to the Army engineers. The people and Congress provide for these authorizations and no one else. If everything this Congress authorized was given the attention and study which flood control and navigation projects are given, our troubles would be far less than they are.

Of course, I was particularly intrigued with the fact that my Republican colleagues recommend in their minority report the re-establishment of that prime example of New Deal agencies, the National Resources Planning Board. They do not mention it by name, but their recommendation for integration of public works construction so exactly duplicates the mouthings of that late, unlamented board that no other construction can be placed upon the recommendation.

I am sure that others have called attention to the erroneous figures set forth in the tabulation purporting to show the appropriations over a 10-year period and which, in column 2, charges to the Corps of Engineers more than \$650,000,000, which was not appropriated to the Corps of Engineers, but are sums which have been provided for the Panama Canal, for military cemeteries, the Soldiers' Home, and other items which are cared for in the bill. I also note in these figures that the minority rather carefully avoided differentiating between construction funds and maintenance funds, the latter constituting a rather large portion of the whole. Of course, maintenance costs are entirely beside the point in the over-all question under discussion, as they are fixed charges that must be met.

I was particularly interested in the subsection of the report entitled "The Astonishing Attitude of the Army Engineers." My intrigue was brought on by the fact that I cannot understand what is so astonishing about the Army engineers being consistent in their recommendations to the committee. The only thing astonishing about it was that they refused to request additional amounts over and above the amounts which had been allowed by the budget and which previously had been recommended to the budget by the Chief of Engineers. The budget had trimmed quite substantially the original recommendations of the Army engineers, in many instances exercising extremely poor judgment in so doing. I know of no group of men anywhere who are more capable of sound advice in engineering matters than the Army engineers. My only astonishment is in their conservativeness, because many times I feel that they refuse to recommend projects and appropriations which are fully justified, but which will not meet the rigid tests of engineering practicability and economic justification to which they are subjected by this splendid body of men who have so faithfully served us in peace and in war.

But my particular interest in this subsection is in the statement therein that some of these projects should not be provided for because "they will require years to be completed." That is not the sort of philosophy which has made America great. Such thinking did not build the Panama Canal. Such philosophy would have made impossible the construction of a transcontinental railroad. If such a course had been pursued throughout our history, our people would today be confined to a small section of the eastern seaboard, using wagons and oxen for transportation, and enjoying all the comforts provided by a log cabin, a tallow candle, and impassable roads. Refusing to undertake a task because it is going to take a long time is not the American way. America is the greatest nation in the world today, because it has historically pushed ahead against all obstacles, because it has fought back against the elements, against time, against foreign onslaughts, against domestic difficulties, and

against every impediment that has been placed in the path of progress.

Now the minority would have you believe that the money which this country has spent for flood control and navigation improvements, and which we now propose to spend, is money which is, to use the words of the report, "frittered away." Let us look at that picture and see whether that money has been frittered away.

In 1936 Congress determined that the Federal Government should undertake the preliminary investigation, planning and actual construction of a Nation-wide flood-control program. Appropriate legislation was passed by Congress to establish policies and procedures for the execution of this work. Although only 12 years have elapsed since the passage of initial flood-control legislation, it is appropriate at this time to look at the record of the completed flood control projects to determine whether or not money spent on these public works has been a good investment for the United States.

To date 56 reservoirs and 172 local flood-protection projects have been placed in operation. Some of these projects have been in operation for as long as 10 years, while others had their first test during this year's spring flood. Each and every project has functioned as planned. There is not a single instance where a project constructed under the Federal flood-control program has failed to function properly. Many of these projects have not yet been in operation long enough to determine a conclusive service record. However, the established record to date is quite impressive. The 33 oldest flood-control projects have now been in service an average of 6.2 years. The direct benefits from these projects already amount to 77 percent of their entire construction cost. At this rate these projects will have paid their entire cost within 8 years. During the past month the entire Ohio River Valley has experienced a near-record flood. Severe damages were suffered at many places. However, the upstream reservoirs and local protection works already in operation in that basin prevented a major disaster. The estimated direct benefits in damages prevented during this one flood alone amounted to more than \$47,000,000.

Severe flood damage occurs year after year throughout the Nation which cannot be long endured. Water resources are wasted. Vital topsoil is lost forever. Lives are lost, communications, and normal peaceful activities are interrupted. However serious these damages are, they are not capable of accurate monetary evaluation and are therefore referred to as intangible or indirect damages. Direct damage, that is, the loss of food, homes, factories, manufactured goods and equipment, bridges, railroads and highways, and all the physical equipment of modern life require immediate replacement in kind. This represents a serious drain on our available manpower and supplies. These losses are direct and tangible to our people. They also represent a monetary loss to the United States Treasury inasmuch as losses from flood damages not covered by insurance are deductible for tax purposes. The direct damages can be accurately evaluated from engineering studies and each year the Corps of Engineers reexamines each project as to revised costs and benefits. The benefit-cost ratio for those projects in the 1949 budget are shown on pages 510-513 of the House hearing for H. R. 5524. The 177 flood-control projects listed have a total estimated cost of \$2,472,428,000 of which \$826,207,000, or 33 percent have already been appropriated. Upon completion the annual benefits for these 177 projects will total \$198,432,275. The benefits from these projects will therefore equal their entire cost in just 12½ years. Most of the projects will be rendering an increasingly important service to this country for many years to come. Stated another way, these

projects will return their entire cost plus interest at 3 percent over an assumed 50-year life, pay their operation and maintenance costs and still return an additional 78 cents dividend for each dollar invested. It is important that this country obtain these immediate and direct benefits as soon as practicable. The intangible or indirect benefits will at the same time assist the future growth and insure the well-being of the Nation.

Probably the most outstanding investment which the Federal Government has made in a flood-control project is that on the lower Mississippi. This project, which includes portions of seven States extending from Cairo, Ill., to the Gulf of Mexico, has had appropriated for it slightly in excess of \$500,000,000 since it was begun in 1929. Already, even though it is not complete, the direct benefits from the completed works are well in excess of \$4,000,000,000. At the very moment, were it not for this project, a substantial portion of the lower Mississippi Valley would be under water and undergoing severe damage, perhaps in some instances resulting in a complete crop loss for this year.

I think it would be interesting to cite a few individual projects over the country to illustrate the great return which has been made to the Nation on these appropriations. For instance, the project at West Springfield, Mass., had been in service slightly more than 9 years up to October 1947, and had cost a total of \$1,510,000, but the benefits from this project already were more than four times the cost, or a total of \$6,300,000. The project at Hartford, Conn., in operation about the same length of time, had yielded \$17,248,000 in benefits, against a total cost of only \$10,280,000. Of nine projects located in New England, the average length of service is 8.2 years, the average cost per project has been \$2,698,000, and the average benefits have been \$3,213,000 per project, which means that on the average the benefits have exceeded the project costs in 6.9 years. There is a project at Augusta, Ga., which has been in service for 6½ years, and which cost \$3,760,000. The benefits to last October had totaled \$6,400,000 or nearly double the project cost. There is a project known as the Columbia Drainage District in Illinois which has been in service for 6 years and which cost \$2,060,000, and benefits thus far received amount to \$2,395,000. The project at Huntington, W. Va., in service less than 2 years, and which cost \$7,000,000, had in that brief period yielded benefits of \$6,900,000. At Tell City, Ind., there is a project which has been in service 5.7 years, and which cost \$900,000, but which has yielded a return of \$1,400,000 already. The Gill Township levee in Indiana has been in service 4.1 years and cost \$580,000, yet already has yielded benefits of \$740,000, which is well in excess of the total cost. I have a tabulation showing all of the oldest projects in the country, which total 33. They have been in service an average of 6.2 years and cost a total of \$78,368,000. Already, however, we have received benefits of \$61,222,000, from these projects, and at that rate, they will have completely returned their cost in 8 years. These figures were furnished me by the Chief of Engineers, who emphasized that the tabulation includes in the benefits only the physical destruction prevented and does not take into consideration the indirect damages suffered by business and individuals and makes no account of the saving of human lives and the prevention of disease and suffering which are the heavy toll which floods extract from us.

Now, let us turn briefly to the river-and-harbor picture. In 1946 our foreign and coastwise traffic reached an all-time record total of 263,000,000 tons. Great Lakes traffic has increased from 48,000,000,000 ton-miles in 1934 to 96,000,000,000 ton-miles in 1946. Inland waterway traffic has increased from 9,000,000,000 ton-miles, to 28,000,000,000 ton-miles during this same period. Traffic handled at the Port of New Orleans, a typical

large ocean port, has increased from 14,000,000 tons in 1936, to 21,000,000 tons in 1946.

The Corps of Engineers' estimates of benefits that would accrue from river and harbor projects have been consistently conservative. The actual tonnage developed after completion of projects has generally exceeded the tonnage originally anticipated and used as basis of justification at the time of authorization. For example, justification for improvement of one section of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway was based on an estimated annual movement of 4,600,000 tons. The annual tonnage through that section has actually reached 15,268,000 tons. Similarly, the estimated annual tonnage justifying improvement of Cape Cod Canal was 7,000,000 compared with a total of 18,851,000 tons that has actually moved through this canal in 1 year.

No, Mr. President, the only objection to this bill is that it fails to meet fully and squarely the issue which faces us. We are the bread basket of the world. We are the hope of the world. Unless we protect and husband our resources, unless we strengthen ourselves to meet the challenge, then all is lost. I know of no better way that we can meet these great responsibilities than by protecting our industry and agriculture from the ravages of flood and by extending our defenses through improvement to our waterways and harbors. When we fail to meet this responsibility by hiding behind a cloak of economy, we deny our faith in a great America.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of the death of his distinguished colleague. At his request, I wish to read the speech of the Senator from Louisiana on the pending motion. It is as follows:

I wish to give my unqualified support to H. R. 5524 as reported out by the Appropriations Committee, and to urge its adoption by the Senate. Additionally, I wish to endorse in full the intellectual and forthright remarks of my late colleague, Senator OVERTON, which remarks have been presented in absentia and read by the Clerk of the Senate.

Generally speaking, in the past I have followed the lead of my colleague in matters affecting flood control and rivers and harbors improvements. Of my own knowledge, however, as a result of careful study of the problems involved, I am familiar with the proposed legislation and its importance to the welfare of the country.

Before discussing this measure insofar as it affects my own State, let me say that my observations of the last 12 years lead me to the conclusion that there is nothing in the actions and recommendations of the Corps of Engineers which could possibly indicate that they are in any way motivated, in their conclusions and recommendations, by anything but their desire to perform their duty in the fearless and efficient manner which for so many years has characterized their activities.

Knowing that the engineers possess the professional capacity to properly appraise the dangers which face us as a result of the rampages of nature, of course I am inclined to follow, and I think all of us should be guided by their recommendations and professional analysis of our requirements rather than the general economic conclusions reached by laymen who, without rhyme or reason, would tinker with the safety of the lands and lives of citizens of the United States.

I have, of course, carefully examined the proposed legislation with respect to the State of Louisiana, which, containing the lower end and mouths of the Mississippi River, has the greatest flood-control problem in the United States. My State is subject to flood by the excess waters draining from all or a part of

31 States, comprising an area that is 41 percent of the United States.

Let me briefly describe for you what is the scope and status of the flood-control project for the Mississippi River and tributaries. It comprises:

(a) The protection of the great basins of the lower alluvial valley from headwater floods of the Mississippi River.

(b) The protection of certain areas from inundation by backwaters of the Mississippi River.

(c) The protection of the St. Francis and Yazoo Basins from floods of the St. Francis and Yazoo River systems and the protection of certain areas of the north banks of lower White River and lower Arkansas River.

(d) The improvement of numerous interior streams for the dual purposes of flood control and improved drainage.

(e) The stabilization of the banks and channel of the Mississippi River.

(f) Channel improvement for open river navigation and the improvement of certain harbors.

Protection against headwater floods of the Mississippi River is accomplished by building levees which, in general, extend from high ground at the heads of the several basins into which the valley naturally divides to the major tributaries which normally form their lower boundaries. To cite an example, the territory subject to overflow in Arkansas and Louisiana between the Arkansas River and Red River is known as the Tensas Basin. It is protected by a levee which starts at high ground on the Arkansas River at Pine Bluff and extends without a break for 381 miles to Point Breeze, La., near the mouth of the Red River. Its average height is 25 feet and its width at ground level about 250 feet. In the authorized project there are 1,705 miles of main-line levee and an equal mileage of smaller embankment on tributaries and in floodways and backwater areas.

I agree that the amount of \$67,500,000 recommended by the Senate committee is the minimum amount that would permit the construction, efficiency, and progress required to complete the project at minimum cost to the Government and in a reasonable length of time. The Budget estimate of \$70,000,000 for construction and maintenance cannot be reduced by \$10,000,000, as provided by the House, without seriously curtailing operations essential to optimum construction and maintenance of the integrity of the substantial works so far completed. There are still many miles of substandard levees which must be brought to project grade and section; there are miles of caving banks where new revetments must be placed or old revetments repaired; there are partially completed floodways where premature operation would cause widespread damages; and there are authorized, but incomplete, works in minor tributary basins that have suffered annually from floods that could have been prevented if funds had been available to complete the authorized works.

May I add at this point that in the matter of navigation improvements Louisiana is traversed from north to south by the greatest inland waterway in the world, the Mississippi River; and from east to west by the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway on which traffic has far exceeded the conservative estimates of the Corps of Engineers made at the time this waterway was authorized. In New Orleans the State has one of the Nation's greatest seaports and at Baton Rouge, the head of sea-going navigation there is located the largest oil refinery in the world.

I should like the RECORD to show the justification for the various rivers and harbors projects within Louisiana, as follows:

The 1946 River and Harbor Act adopted a modification of the project for Calcasieu River and Pass to provide for deepening the existing jetty and approach channel in the Gulf of Mexico from 32 to 37 feet and deepening the channel from the inner end

of the jetty channel to Lake Charles from 30 to 35 feet, together with a 35-foot channel around Clooney Island. Funds provided in the 1948 appropriation are being applied to deepening the Clooney Island channel and inauguration of deepening the main 35-foot channel southerly from Lake Charles, while the approved budget estimate was to be applied to completion of the 35-foot main channel. A reduction in the 1949 estimate will therefore postpone completion of the 35-foot channel until a later year. Completion of the 35-foot channel will permit use of deeper-draft tankers for oil shipments with resultant savings in transportation costs. Commerce during 1946 amounted to 10,052,000 tons.

Waterway from Empire, La., to the Gulf of Mexico: The 1946 River and Harbor Act adopted a project providing for the construction of a channel 9 feet deep, 80 feet wide, extending southerly from the State-owned Doullut Canal at Empire by natural channels and land cuts to and through Pelican Island to the Gulf of Mexico with initial jetty construction to 6-foot contour and later to the 9-foot contour, if found necessary. Funds provided in the 1948 appropriation are being applied to the dredging of the channel to the Gulf of Mexico, while the \$638,000 provided in the approved Budget estimate was to have been applied to the construction of jetties to the 6-foot contour in the Gulf of Mexico and dredging the channel between these structures. This waterway when completed will be of considerable value in the operation of existing oil fields and the development of new oil fields in the tributary area. However, that portion of the waterway now being provided cannot be used until the channel into the Gulf is completed.

Intracoastal Waterway, Apalachee Bay, Fla., to the Mexican border: Construction of a main waterway 12 feet deep, 125 to 150 feet wide, authorized in 1942, has been completed. The 1945 and 1946 River and Harbor Act provided for alternate connection, 12 feet deep, with the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Algiers, La.; Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route, 12 feet deep; salt water guard lock 231 miles west of Harvey lock and about 8 miles east of the Calcasieu River, and an 8-foot canal between the main waterway and Franklin, La. Funds available are being applied to excavation, foundations, and floors for the Algiers and the salt water guard locks. The Franklin Canal is being completed with advanced funds. The 1949 budget estimate included \$2,920,700 for continuation of work on the Algiers lock, for drainage structures, and bridge construction, and \$450,000 for the salt water guard lock. The reduction in the amount allowed for 1949 will result in postponement of construction of the railroad bridge and reduce construction work on drainage facilities that must be provided prior to excavation of the navigation canal. The reduced amount available for construction of drainage structures will result in a delay of approximately 1 year. Delay in initiating the construction of the railroad crossing will likewise result in prolonging the project. Commerce on the Intracoastal Waterway, New Orleans District, during 1946, was 11,215,000 tons west of the Mississippi. The capacity of the existing route is overtaxed by this volume of traffic and it is important that the alternate route be completed as soon as practicable.

Overton-Red River waterway, Louisiana and Arkansas: Red River rises in New Mexico and flows easterly and southeasterly for 1,300 miles, entering the Mississippi River through Old River near Phillipston, La. The project provides for a 9- by 100-foot channel from the Mississippi River through Old River and Red River, approximately 31 miles, thence by a lateral canal across the Mississippi-Red River backwater area along the right bank to Shreveport, La., for 175 miles through nine locks, each 55 by 650 feet. The waterway will

serve a trade area bounded by the watershed of the Red River in Louisiana, which contains the commercial region tributary to Shreveport in northeastern Texas, southeastern Oklahoma, and southwestern Arkansas. Principal industries within the area are petroleum, lumber, glass, fertilizer, grain, sand and gravel, chemicals, boxes, and clothing. Agricultural commodities include cotton, corn, hay, oats, wheat, peanuts, and garden vegetables. About 1,100,000 tons of commerce will develop on this waterway at an estimated annual saving of \$4,000,000 in transportation costs. In addition, it is estimated that incidental drainage benefits of about \$350,000 annually would result from construction of the lateral canal. Further benefits will consist of greater operating economies for tows now using the lower Red River en route to or from ports on the Ouachita River. The ratio of benefits to costs is 1.28:1. The amount that could be profitably expended during 1949 would be applied to preparation of plans and specifications and initiation of construction of the lateral canal.

Pearl River, Miss. and La.: The 1935 River and Harbor Act adopted a project providing for the improvement of the Pearl River to provide a channel 7 feet deep from Lake Borgne to Bogalusa, La., a distance of about 60 miles, by dredging, snagging, cut-offs, and lock construction. Dredging of the waterway to project dimensions in the lower 20-mile reach has been completed, and available funds are being applied to completion of lock No. 1 and inauguration of construction of lock No. 2, under a continuing contract. The budget estimate of \$3,509,500 was intended for completion of lock No. 2, the construction of the remaining third lock, and Bague Chitto and Pools Bluff Sills. The amount allowed by the House is insufficient to complete lock No. 2, by an amount of about \$200,000, and will result in suspension of work under that contract. The effective utilization of the Pearl River project is predicated on the total completion of the project, and very little benefit can be derived from that portion of the project already constructed and to be constructed under the House allowance for 1949. Since local interests provided the funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, payment for damages and construction of terminal facilities, through a bond issue in 1938, and since all work on the project was suspended during the war, it is believed that completion should not be further delayed.

With reference to the general flood-control projects in Louisiana, I should like to describe and give the status and justification for the following:

Aloha-Rigolette area, Louisiana: The project consists of enlargement of existing levees from mile 151 to mile 141 and extension of those levees to the hills on the left bank of Bayou Rigolette at mile 124 with two floodgates at bayou crossings; construction of a diversion ditch from Bayou Darrow to Saline Bayou and clearing and snagging Saline Bayou from the end of the diversion ditch to Bayou Rigolette; clearing and snagging Bayou Rigolette from mile 21.5 to its mouth and closing the head of Bayou Darrow. The project when completed will protect approximately 46,000 acres of alluvial plain in the Aloha-Rigolette area. Construction of the project is under way and will be about 34 percent complete by June 30, 1948. The amount of \$500,000 allowed by the House will permit continuation of construction of the levee between miles 135 and 124. It will not permit completion of the levees from mile 151 to mile 135 and construction of the floodgate structure on Bayou Rigolette. Full protection for the area will not be provided until the levees and floodgate structure are completed. Completion of the project will be delayed if the amount of \$549,600 is not restored for prosecution of the project and the Aloha-Rigolette area will remain subject to

damaging floods for a period of at least one additional year.

Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou, Louisiana: This project, in conjunction with the Bayou Bodcau Reservoir now under construction, will greatly reduce flood damage in the flood plain between the dam site and the limit of the Red River backwater. Headwater stages in Loggy Bayou will be reduced and a more rapid removal of backwater when Red River recedes will result. The average annual benefits are estimated at \$24,000.

Bayou Teche and Vermilion, La.: The project consists of a channel excavation for 21 miles in Bayou Teche, excavation of a navigable channel from Vermilion Bay to Intracoastal Waterway, excavation of a 100-foot channel in Vermilion River from the Intracoastal Waterway to Lafayette, La., and excavation of a nonnavigable flood channel from Lafayette to the junction of Bayous Bourfeau and Fusilier. The project is under construction and the navigable channel from the Intracoastal Waterway to Vermilion Bay and portions of the navigable channel from the Intracoastal Waterway to Lafayette and the flood channel above Lafayette have been completed. Clearing and snagging on Vermilion River and Bay Fusilier Channel enlargement on Bayou Teche and reconstruction of the Woodlawn Bridge over Vermilion River are in progress and will be substantially completed by the end of fiscal year 1948. The project as a whole will be about 73 percent complete on June 30, 1948. The amount of \$200,000 allowed by the House will permit completion of bridge alterations on the Vermilion River and continued channel excavation on the Vermilion River below Abbeville. It will not permit completion of channel enlargement on the Vermilion River below Abbeville and initiation and completion of channel work above Ruth Canal as contemplated by the construction schedule for this project. Early completion of the project is essential for protection of the basin from constantly recurring flood damages to the crops, livestock, improvements, and roads during floods which occur almost yearly and more serious damages resulting from major floods like those of 1913, 1940, and 1947. Completion of the project will be delayed beyond fiscal year 1949 if the amount of \$400,000 is not restored for prosecution of the work resulting in the delay of at least 1 year and realization of flood-control benefits and probable increased costs for the project as a whole due to the necessity for entering into contracts involving less yardage than can be economically handled by dredging contractors.

Mermentau River, La.: The project consists of channel enlargement of the lower Mermentau River below Grand Lake and construction of a gated control structure at Catfish Point; channel enlargement of the North Prong of Schooner Bayou; and channel enlargement and realignment of the existing navigation project from Vermilion Bay to White Lake and from White Lake to Grand Lake. Construction of the channel enlargement of the Mermentau River below Grand Lake is under way and construction of the control structure at Catfish Point will be initiated in fiscal year 1948. The project as a whole will be 18 percent complete by June 30, 1948. The amount of \$1,000,000 allowed by the House will permit completion of the Mermentau River control structure at Catfish Point. It will not permit completion of the enlargement of the Mermentau River and initiation and completion of the White Lake-Vermilion Bay control structure at Schooner Bayou lock as contemplated in the construction schedule for this project. Completion of the project will be delayed if the amount of \$1,500,000 is not restored for prosecution of the work resulting in a delay in realization of benefits from the project consisting of

flood control and salinity control for large areas of rice lands and low prairie croplands in the Mermentau River area.

Pineville, La.: The project, when completed, will protect property at Pineville, La., valued at approximately \$745,000, and approximately 700 acres of agricultural land from Red River floods. It is believed urgent to complete the project during the fiscal year 1949 in order to realize the maximum benefits and to alleviate the possible danger of flooding from incompleting works. The estimate of average annual benefits is \$14,000.

Red River below Denison Dam: This project is an integral part of the comprehensive plan for the protection of the valley of Red River. Pending completion of the reservoir system the levees will provide protection against floods equivalent to that of 1945 and prevent an annual flood loss of about \$2,000,000. The operation of the reservoirs will provide additional freeboard and safety to the levees. The systematic construction of bank-stabilization works will obviate the necessity of levee set-backs at locations where they would require costly relocation of railroads, highways, and other utilities. It will save from destruction valuable lands and improvements which would otherwise be lost on account of bank caving.

Shreveport, La.: The project consists of revetments and dikes constructed at locations where caving banks endanger the controlling levees and highly developed urban property in the vicinity of Shreveport, Bossier City, and their suburbs. Construction of the project has been initiated and during fiscal year 1948 will be advanced from 18 to 60 percent completion. The amount of \$1,000,000 allowed by the House will permit construction of stabilization works in Douglas Island Bend and at miles 311 to 312 on the right bank of the river. It will not permit completion of works in Honore Bend on the left bank during fiscal year 1949. Completion of the project will be delayed if the amount of \$475,000 is not restored for prosecution of the project and bank caving will continue along unprotected portions of the river front for at least an additional year with possible damage to water-front structures and property.

Jonesville, La.: This project provides for the construction of earth levees and concrete flood wall encircling the town of Jonesville, La., to provide protection against floodwaters of the Ouachita, Red, and Mississippi Rivers. This town is located on the right bank of Black River in Catahoula Parish, La., 56 miles above its mouth at the junction of the Ouachita and Little Rivers. A drainage structure and pumping plant for disposal of interior drainage would be provided. No work has been done on this project. Funds are needed in the fiscal year 1949 for preparation of construction plans and specifications and for completion of construction of the project. The allocation of \$368,000 will be applied for construction of the levees, concrete flood walls, drainage structures, and pumping plant. The town of Jonesville, La., with a 1940 population of 2,080, is located in the vast backwater area of Red River, which is subject to annual overflow by backwaters of the Red and Mississippi Rivers. In 1945 an emergency levee was constructed at a cost of \$30,000 to the Federal Government and \$15,000 to local interests to provide interim protection during the flood of that year. This levee is deficient in grade and section and its alignment does not encompass a large area. The proposed works will provide complete flood protection to public and private property, utilities, equipment, and fixtures, and eliminate the cost of evacuation of inhabitants, moving mercantile stocks and household goods during flood periods. The protected town of Jonesville would become a safe haven of refuge for the rural population of a large agricultural

area in the unprotected backwater region. The average annual benefits are estimated at \$27,000.

Lake Pontchartrain, La.: The project provides for the reconstruction and enlargement of the existing protective levee along the Lake Pontchartrain shore in Jefferson Parish, La., and the return protection levees along the Orleans and St. Charles Parish. The total work consists of 10 miles of lake-shore levee and 7½ miles of return levee. Construction has not been initiated. Funds are needed in fiscal year 1949 for initiation of construction. The allocation of \$900,000 of Federal funds, together with funds provided by local interests, will be used to prepare plans and specifications for the work and enlarging the low sections of the existing embankment as the first stage of construction. In view of the large amount of damage done during the hurricane of September 1947 a review report covering this project is now being prepared. This report gives consideration to the provision of a higher degree of flood protection than is contemplated under the existing project. The portion considered in the review report has an estimated Federal cost of about \$4,500,000 and the cost to local interest of \$1,400,000. Any work performed at this time on the existing project will not be wasted as the modified project will follow the same alignment as the existing project. Records show that destructive tides occurred along the Gulf of Mexico coast east of the Mississippi River in 1901 and 1915 and were repeated in the hurricane of 1947. Records of dangers to property along the lake front in Jefferson Parish during the early storms are not available because of the lack of development in that area and residential development has progressed at a rapid rate by extending lake-ward and into reclaimed marshlands. During the hurricane of September 19, 1947, excessive tide and storm wave action caused many serious breaks in the lake-shore embankment allowing free passage of lake waters into the lower areas behind the levee. During that hurricane the crown elevation of weakened sections of the embankment were reduced and a total length of 4,200 feet crevassed. Floodwaters in residential sections as far as 2½ miles from the lake were flooded with actual depths ranging up to 8 feet. Of the total 50-square-mile area of Jefferson Parish between Lake Pontchartrain and the Mississippi River, with an assessed value of \$21,000,000, approximately 39 square miles were inundated. The 3 pumping stations which normally removed the interior drainage were flooded and out of operation as was the parish incinerator and sewage-disposal plant, creating a serious health hazard to about 25,000 people. An international airport was closed, urban bus lines interrupted, public schools made untenable, stock of many small mercantile establishments damaged by the water, and many dairy and poultry farm stock destroyed. About 2,000 homes were damaged, 800 families were evacuated, and home furnishings, automobiles, and personal effects damaged or destroyed. The average annual benefits are estimated in excess of \$500,000.

As I stated to the committee when I appeared before it, I deemed this project very urgent in that in the last 6 months the people living on the south shore of the lake at a place known as Metairie have been overflooded twice. During September most of the inhabitants living in that area suffered tremendously because of the flood. Many lost their meager savings and several lost their lives. In that area there are over 36,000 people, and I am informed that there were from two to three thousand residents of that section who were compelled to move out and live for from 1 to 2 months with neighbors. My distinguished colleague the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] was in that vicinity right after the flood of last fall,

There was a similar flood shortly after he left. This project is vital to the interests of the city of New Orleans and its suburban areas. The South's largest city is entitled to the protection which this project affords.

It is natural that I should examine this appropriation bill with particular reference to my own State and refer to the work I have briefly outlined. However, from a National standpoint I want also to add my voice to that of the able Senator from South Dakota who conducted the painstaking and impartial hearings on this bill and who has made an eloquent presentation of the matter to the Senate.

In short, when we consider the manner in which the work contemplated becomes authorized; the remarkable record of sound engineering and impartial recommendations established by the executive agency under whose jurisdiction the Congress has placed this work; the urgent, yes desperate, need for these improvements in our own country, not some foreign country, and the great secondary benefit that such improvements will have in helping this Nation to fulfill the foreign commitments it has already made, I am amazed, even astounded, at the ill-advised and unsubstantiated charges that some Senators have made regarding the measure before the Senate.

It has not been many years since this Congress, tired and disgusted with superplanners who wasted public funds and infinite time in planning the plans to plan natural resource development, rose almost in unity and legislated the Natural Resources Planning Board out of existence. The primary objection was that nothing tangible was being accomplished. Now some Senators find themselves in the uncomfortable position of attacking a program because something very real and tangible is being accomplished. These works for which appropriations are now being asked are not boondoggling—neither are they hastily prepared visionary schemes.

There is not a single project for which funds are asked that has not traveled through a most rigorous engineering and economic examination, not only once but again and again as pointed out by the Senator from South Dakota. This procedure is prescribed by laws adopted by the Congress and is meticulously prosecuted by the Corps of Engineers. Repeated hearings are held before local people, before authorization committees of both the House and Senate, before Appropriation Committees of both the House and Senate, and before the Bureau of the Budget. Comments are secured from governors and State agencies—coordination with interested Federal agencies is carried out. Under these circumstances it is difficult for me to understand why any Senator would attack this whole program simply because there is a greater need for these improvements in some States than in others.

On my second point, namely the excellent record of sound engineering and impartial recommendations established by the Corps of Engineers under whose jurisdiction this work is placed, I need say little by way of enlargement. In fact there is little that I or any other Senator can say that will add to or subtract from the superior record that has been established over a period of 150 years.

On the third point concerning the need for and benefit of this work to our own country a great deal can be said. Let me mention just one or two highlights. Aside from the human suffering and economic loss to established industry occasioned by floods I call attention to the fact that there are hundreds of thousands of acres in the humid agricultural regions of these United States that are uninhabitable and unproductive because of flood hazards and poor drainage. Logically in a step-by-step manner these lands are being brought into production by the very projects we have before us now. We

can make no greater contribution to the welfare of this Nation and to our effort to fulfill our foreign commitments than to proceed with this work at the maximum practical rate. Does the Senate realize that not a single completed Federal flood-control project has failed to perform its desired function in flood? Is it realized that conservative impartial estimates of the benefits of completed projects indicate on an over-all basis that these projects will afford savings that equal their original cost in from 6 to 10 years? In the Alluvial Valley of the lower Mississippi River the project with which I am most familiar has prevented damages estimated at nearly \$5,000,000,000 since the last direct overflow in 1927. The Federal expenditure on the plan that has afforded these great benefits has been about \$600,000,000 over that 20-year period. In other words, eight times the cost of the work to date has already been saved. The story in the Ohio River Basin is much the same. And the story in the other major river basins will be the same if we get on with our work.

In the case of navigation our prewar tonnages have increased from 50 to 100 percent. Single cargoes are bigger and required depths are greater. Do we want to continue to progress or do we want to turn the clock back? When we are contemplating the expenditure of billions of dollars overseas to rehabilitate foreign nations do we want to hamper the logical development of our own country—I think not. Furthermore, I challenge anyone to prove that there is any other way under the sun that we can spend the amount asked for in this bill to greater advantage toward accomplishing the foreign commitments already made or contemplated. In the long run I am confident that increasing our agricultural production and industrial capacity at home by expenditures for flood control and navigation improvements will pay greater dividends toward fulfilling our foreign program than any equivalent expenditures as a dole to foreign nations.

Before closing I want to say just a word or two about the size of this program in dollars and cents. There has been considerable said by some Senators in comparing this program with the dollar-and-cent size of prewar programs. Is there a single Senator in this Chamber who finds that he can buy a steak, a pound of butter, a suit of clothes, or an automobile for the same price he paid before the war? The answer, of course, is "No" and needless to add no Senator is receiving the same pay he did before the war. The same story applies to the work we have under consideration. In fact the over-all construction price index shows that it took \$1.83 in late 1947 to accomplish what \$1 would accomplish in 1940. Costs are still rising. Add to this fact the well-known situation that much of this internal improvement work was rightly curtailed during the war and that the people back home are now clamoring for the improvements they have patiently waited for, and you must conclude as I do that double the prewar program in dollars and cents is not an unreasonable increase.

Yes, Mr. President, I wish to be on record as giving my unqualified support to H. R. 5524 as reported out by the Senate Appropriations Committee and to urge its adoption. I should, of course, have preferred an even more elaborate appropriation for the outlined projects, but although construction of some projects will be delayed, the amount recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee represents a substantial improvement over the bill as passed by the House. To do any less than is presently being recommended would indeed be folly.

Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] I have read the speech which he would have delivered had it been possible for him to be in the Chamber today.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE
ECONOMIC REPORT (REPT. NO. 1368)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report dealing with the 1948 economic report of the President. This report consists of the committee findings, a summary of the President's report, and a long analysis of the President's report by the staff of the Joint Committee. It also includes a dissenting minority report signed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and others. Attached are various exhibits.

I request that the report be printed. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 188. An act for the relief of Dionisio R. Trevino;

S. 511. An act for the relief of Francisco Gamboa Giocoechea;

S. 1050. An act 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;

S. 1305. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes;

S. 1365. An act for the relief of Lowe Way Yuen, and Dang Chee;

S. 1451. An act for the relief of Perfecto M. Blason and Joan Blason;

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Guy Cheng;

S. 1571. An act to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes;

S. 1637. An act for the relief of Leo Hamermann;

S. 1651. An act to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946;

S. 1874. An act authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for national defense purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for national defense purposes;

S. 1979. An act authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell and hard-shell clams;

S. 2077. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange certain property with the city of Kearney, Nebr.; and

S. 2233. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of a water main in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the United States naval air station, Alameda, Calif.

PROPOSED ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate takes a recess at the close of the session today, it recess until Thursday next at noon.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I believe I misspoke with respect to the day to which I asked unanimous consent to recess. It is tomorrow, Wednesday next, at noon. I renew my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I renew the objection.

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS
APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5224) 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], for himself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], to recommit the bill with certain instructions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the minority report on House bill 5524, and in opposition to the motion to recommit the majority report.

I was very much interested in the speech made earlier this afternoon by my good friend the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I respect his views on this question, as on all other matters. In this instance, however, I find myself in disagreement with him, particularly as to some of the premises which the Senator from Ohio laid down in his speech.

Toward the end of his speech he raised what I think is the vital question for us to consider in determining the position we should take on this particular bill. I think I quote the Senator from Ohio correctly when I say that he said in effect that the question before us is one of weighing the importance of different public expenditures.

On that point I am in agreement with the Senator from Ohio because I think the question before us is a question of weighing the importance of different public expenditures. However, in answering that question, I have come to a position diametrically opposed to that taken by the Senator from Ohio, because I think the projects which are covered by this particular bill are of such vital importance to the security and the economic welfare of our Nation that this bill should be passed, and the motion based upon the minority views should be rejected.

Earlier in his speech the distinguished Senator from Ohio referred several times to these projects as public works projects. He pointed out again the theory which he has so ably defended not only in the Senate but elsewhere in the country in months past; namely, that in times of boom we should, in effect, put public works on the shelf, to take them down in times of slackened employment, slackened business, and approaching depression.

I would make two points in presenting my point of view in contrast with the point of view of the Senator from Ohio on that particular matter. I do not deny that these are public works by defi-

inition, in the sense that we are using public funds for the building of these projects, such as great power projects and river and flood-control development and harbor-development projects. Nevertheless, I wish to point out that they are also in a very real economic sense private works, in that I think they are essential to the advancement of the best interests of our private-property economy. They are essential in order to develop to the maximum extent possible, in the shortest period of time, an expanding economy in the United States. The distinguished Senator from Ohio talks in terms of a balanced budget and in terms of a \$40,000,000,000 budget, which is now ours. He stresses the importance of paying \$2,500,000,000 on the national debt. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that we should be thinking and acting in terms of a balanced budget, but I do not agree with him that at the present time in our Government we are dealing with a scientific, businesslike budget. The budget we have is not a sound business budget. No corporation or large business would think of building a budget on the same accounting basis which we use in building our Federal budget.

On other occasions I have mentioned this point on the floor of the Senate; I think budget reform is inherent in the argument that is before us now. I wish to repeat that I think we should talk in terms of a balanced budget only in the sense that we talk in terms of a budget which has taken out of it, and set over to one side, separate and distinct from an expenditures budget, insofar as administrative costs of Government are concerned, all capital investments and all money that goes into self-liquidating projects.

What we have at the present time in the form of a Federal budget, Mr. President, is really a hodgepodge budget in which we include so-called expenditures for the administration of Government itself and also include the money that is paid out for capital investments. Thus, we include in the budget as expense money which is necessary for the building of great projects that are necessary in order to expand our economy, but which after all are, for the most part, self-liquidating projects. I say it is error to speak in terms of a balanced budget, so far as the Federal budget is concerned, as long as we follow such accounting principles. I support the principle of a balanced budget but I say that we should separate from that budget these vital, self-liquidating, capital investments. We should not be including them, it seems to me, in a so-called balanced Federal budget.

This point of these projects being self-liquidating always raises a question of fact on this subject, Mr. President. The question of whether most of these major projects, particularly the projects for flood control, reclamation, and the projects for power development, will, in due course of time, in fact be self-liquidating. In taking my position on issues in the Senate of the United States, I always seek to find the answer to the question, "What are the facts?" On the basis of such research as I have been

able to make to date, since I have been in the Senate studying this particular problem, and on the basis of all the data that have been made available to me from the various Government departments and agencies concerned with these projects, I am of the opinion that the fact is that, in the main, these major projects will in the course of years be self-liquidating. If I am correct in that finding of fact—and it is the only finding I can make on the basis of the data which have been supplied to me by the departments that have jurisdiction and control and supervision over these projects—then, Mr. President, I am not going to join in any view presented by any Member of the Senate that we should consider these projects within the concept of a balanced budget. I think they must be considered aside from and independent of a budget which goes to the question of administrative costs for the operation of the Government itself. We ought to look upon these projects, then, as Federal projects in the sense that they will return into the United States Treasury, in the form of new tax dollars flowing from the wealth which these projects will produce over the years, much more money than we shall ever invest in their original cost.

I think that statement marks as clearly as I can mark, at least, one line of difference which exists between the proponents of this bill and those who are in favor of the minority views and the motion to recommit. I think it should be kept perfectly clear in this debate that the proponents of these projects believe in a balanced budget but we do not think it is fair or right to include capital investments of a self-liquidating type in the Federal budget when it comes to applying the tests of a balanced budget. These costs are really loans to the people and their return to the Treasury is assured. I do not think that those of us who are in favor of going ahead now with the development of these wealth-creating projects should let anyone put us in such a position that it might appear that we are not in favor of a balanced budget as far as operating administrative costs of government are concerned.

There is another point which I wish to make, and I think it has a very direct bearing on the very able speech made by the Senator from Ohio. The point is that I am greatly concerned about the representations which are being made to the Members of Congress, these days, and the facts which are being presented before various committees in support of those representations as to the world crisis. Today we happen to be living in a world situation which can properly be characterized, it seems to me, as a world situation of tension. I think that is an understatement. I do not wish to overstate the situation, Mr. President; but having sat as a member of the Armed Services Committee for weeks in public hearings and in executive sessions, and having either listened to or read all the evidence and representations presented to that committee in connection with a great piece of major legislation which still is awaiting action by the Senate—namely, military manpower legislation—I know that I make no overstatement when I say that today

world conditions are such that they can be correctly described as creating a state of world tension. I think it is only fair and proper to go beyond that statement, and say that it is my honest judgment that although war is not inevitable and although it is my judgment that we can avoid war if all of us keep our heads, yet there is the ever-present danger that some international accident or incident might place us in a very serious war emergency. Because I do not think such a danger can be denied by anyone who goes through the records of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the hearings held before that committee on the international problems we on the committee have been considering as we have considered military manpower legislation, I say, Mr. President, that I cannot sit in the Senate of the United States and not do all within my power to keep my country prepared to enforce the peace. We owe the obligation to our country to do that not only from the standpoint of manpower, not only from the standpoint of air power, not only from the standpoint of naval power, but also from the standpoint of economic power. In fact, I think the greatest defense weapon we have is to be found in the economic power of the United States. It is to be found in our private-property economy. It is to be found in our capitalistic system. It is to be found in a sound industrial mobilization program. Such a program does not endanger our private-property economy. Rather it gives to that economy its greatest assurance of perpetuation.

What is the relation of that observation to the pending bill? A very important relationship, Mr. President, because I think the bill pending before the Senate of the United States is of great interest and great concern and vital importance to the business interests of America. I think it is through such legislation as this that we have our greatest hopes of expanding our economy to the point so that we shall be in a position to meet the financial obligations of our Government. We must meet this huge debt of, in round figures, \$255,000,000,000. May I say, incidentally, Mr. President, we should meet it by a payment of at least twice \$2,500,000,000 a year. I want to repeat in a sentence or two the observations I made in the tax debate. I want to say that I do not now, any more than when the tax debate was on, share the view of the leadership of my party that \$2,500,000,000 is all we ought to pay on the national debt during this year of tremendous economic boom. I want to repeat that I think the Republican Party in the Senate of the United States should have stood for a payment on the national debt of at least \$5,000,000,000. Why do I say that? Because that is what the carrying charge on the debt is. If, in a year of a great boom, apparently the year of the greatest boom in our history, we cannot pay a sum on the national debt at least equal to the carrying charge, then I think we are falling the people of our country in living up to the responsibility which is ours to keep the value of the American dollar as stable and as secure as possible. Mr. President, you are not going to protect the dollar stable, are not going to pro-

tect the value of the dollar, unless you retire the debt at a more rapid rate than \$2,500,000,000 a year. I am satisfied, Mr. President, that the issue of paying our debt once taken to the American people and thoroughly understood by them, will result in an overwhelming verdict on the part of a great majority of the American people that we made a mistake in not adopting a budget that would pay more than \$2,500,000,000 on the debt. We could have done it if the Senate had been willing to adopt the tax program of the Committee for Economic Development which tax program I offered in a series of amendments.

As I go about the country, Mr. President, the American people, as I find them, want the debt retired at a more rapid rate than \$2,500,000,000 a year.

Can it be argued that, if that is my position toward retirement of the debt, then I ought to support a reduction in the appropriations for the particular projects covered in the pending bill? I think not, Mr. President. I do not think that would be a logical reply to me. Why do I say that? Because I am convinced that these projects are needed if we are going to develop the wealth in this country which must be developed in order to give us the economy out of which we can obtain the new tax dollars necessary to retire the debt at a more rapid rate.

We are dealing here, as I see the picture, Mr. President, with a great American economic frontier. The potentialities of the projects, as far as creating new wealth in this country is concerned, I do not think have been grasped yet by the imagination of a majority of my colleagues in the Senate. I do not think the Members of the Senate fully appreciate the importance of the development of these projects to a great and ever expanding American economy.

I want to direct my attention and the attention of the Senate in the course of these remarks to the economic potentialities of some of these projects, and to their relationship to national security. Mr. President, I do not think there is any logic in voting to meet our national security problems from the standpoint of manpower unless we back up that vote by an industrial support which that manpower is going to need if an international accident or incident thrusts us into an international conflict. That is why I share the objectives of the Senator from Georgia when in the Armed Services Committee he proposes an industrial mobilization amendment to the manpower bill. Mr. President, you cannot approach this matter of national security just from the manpower angle alone. We must recognize that war is now a total operation involving all segments of our economy and all segments of our people. Also we must recognize that preparation for defense must be looked upon as a national problem which necessarily involves our total economy. Total defense as total war places responsibilities and obligations upon our total economy.

I sat in the Armed Services Committee this morning. I listened to testimony and argument in regard to the importance of saving for defense purposes some of the great war plants of this country. Some 32 out of a total of some

160 under consideration cost in round figures \$735,000,000. They would cost twice that amount if we found ourselves in an international conflict and had to replace them quickly. Their replacement cost as of today would double their original cost. I took the position in the committee this morning, and I shall take it on the floor when the bill gets here, that it is of vital importance in protecting our boys who we are going to draft into the services, that we mobilize those plants for defense by keeping them in the control of the Federal Government rather than permitting them to be salvaged or junked. The testimony before our committee shows that few of them will be used for commercial purposes, but most of them will be junked if we do not save them. Rather than permit them to be salvaged and junked, and then in case of emergency proceed to replace them at great increases in cost, I think they should be mobilized for defense now.

Mr. President, as long as we find ourselves in the position of living in a world characterized by international tension, then we must look at all legislation such as the legislation pending before us from the standpoint of its relationship to national defense. I want to say that in my opinion not to appropriate the money for the projects covered by H. R. 5524 would be contrary to the best interest of national defense. I want to say that it would be inconsistent to proceed to spend great sums of money for building up the ground Army and the Air Corps and a naval force, unless we are willing also on the level of economic production to spend money to build these projects covered in this bill so that we can build the war materials necessary to protect the lives of our boys in the event an international incident should occur which would take them to war.

I was also interested in the observation which my good friend from Ohio made when he pointed out again today, as he has many times in the past, that in effect the American people are working for the Government some 3 days out of every 10.

I shall not dwell on the point at any length this afternoon because I covered it during the tax debate: I simply deny the soundness of his premise, for this reason: We must look at Federal expenditures for services rendered the American people from the standpoint of their interest in and needs for those services. When we do that, save and except in those instances where there is unnecessary waste I think it is up to the budget-cutting proponents to show that the elimination of any given service is not a penny-wise, pound-foolish budget cut. The instances of wasteful governmental expenditures are only a drop in the bucket compared with the total services rendered to the American people by their Government. I do not know of any dollars which the American people spend from which they receive greater value for their individual interest and welfare than from the tax dollars they spend for Government service. I repeat, that I do not accept the argument that when American taxpayers pay money for a

health program, an educational program, police protection, for roads, for reclamation, for power development, for national security, they are working for the Government. They are working for themselves just as much as when they go to their daily occupations.

We have entered that era in our history, Mr. President, where a great many services must be performed by the Government in the sense that they must have Government financing and Government backing. Roads are a good example. Our Federal Treasury has recovered from expenditures for highways, Mr. President, many times the dollars we have invested in them. When we spend money in the interests of national security we are not working for the Government; we are working for ourselves and American children yet to be born throughout future generations.

It becomes a matter of degree as to how fast we shall move forward with improved services needed by all of our people. I am willing to admit that premise. But on the basis of that premise and on the basis of the test as to whether the particular projects covered by this bill are projects which should be considered at this time, my answer is that most certainly we should proceed with them immediately. It is my honest opinion that time is of the essence. These projects should not be put on the shelf, either from the standpoint of national security or from the standpoint of the economic welfare of the country. As to the latter, we must expand our economy in order to get out of the economic mess in which we find ourselves, and these projects will help along that course of action. They will create new wealth, new industry, more jobs, and increased tax revenues.

Referring to the minority report itself, I want to point out that it seems to me one of the fundamental misconceptions of that report is that it lacks consistency. On page 2 it is stated:

If we must violate our pledge for curtailed governmental spending, certainly it should be for the purpose of strengthening our national defenses against the threats of the totalitarian powers. Above all, it should not be used to chew up the very materials which, should they be needed, are so vital to our national security.

On page 4 the minority report states:

A few hydroelectric power projects account for over 40 percent of 1949 construction allotments.

Mr. President, during most of the remaining part of my remarks I shall lay particular emphasis upon the relationship between those hydroelectric power developments and national security. I shall seek to prove the proposition that these power projects are of vital concern to national defense and to our power as a people to protect ourselves in case we find ourselves thrust into a war. Therefore I want to point out as my major premise that I take the position that the power projects and other projects involved in this bill will not "chew up" vital materials needed for national security. I take the position that without these projects we cannot, in the new type of war which will be fought, if we have a

third world war, manufacture in the quantities necessary the materials vital for the prosecution of that war. We learned that lesson in the last war. Where would we be today and where would we have been during World War II had we not had Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Hoover Dam, and the great dams of the TVA? What would have happened to our atomic-energy program? We would not have been able to complete that program which was so vital to winning the war. The fact remains that our success in carrying forward the atomic-energy program was determined largely by the existence of those dams.

Mr. President, I have listened to the witnesses appearing before the Armed Services Committee over the weeks and I have heard their testimony regarding the strategic problems we may have, if we find ourselves in a third world war. I say to the American people here and now that it is in our self-interest that we proceed to develop to the maximum extent possible, in the shortest period of time, the power resources of the country.

What is my record for consistency on that? I want to direct this remark to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], with whom I had a cloakroom conversation earlier this afternoon. I voted for the St. Lawrence waterway project, not only because I thought it important to develop the transportation facilities involved in that project but because, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I recognized the importance of using that project also to develop to the maximum extent possible the hydroelectric resources of America. If we do not do so, we will be as short-sighted as many people were during the 1920's and 1930's when they did not prepare the country for the defense of its security. We paid in the long run an exceedingly high price for the lack of preparedness. I do not propose to make the mistake which many Members of Congress made during the 1920's and 1930's by failing to keep up our national defenses. So I say that I shall vote for the development of the hydroelectric power resources of America whether they be in Florida, Texas, Mississippi, Georgia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, or any other State. I am satisfied that from the standpoint of national security every dollar we spend, and as soon as possible, in the development of the hydroelectric power resources of America will be money just as well spent and, in my judgment, better spent, for the security of the Nation than spending it now for battleships or airplanes or manpower needs. I think the development of our power resources are more important, Mr. President, than any other defense need we have. Important as other needs of defense are, I think the development of the hydroelectric resources of the country is the most important national-defense development for which we could appropriate money. I propose to defend that premise in this speech, Mr. President.

Referring to the two statements in the minority report to which I have referred, which appear on page 2 and page 4, I

would say that those two observations are in total conflict and fail to recognize the critical material situation facing this Nation. It is not a question of "chewing up materials," but the more important requirement of producing those critical materials needed to protect us against an atom-bomb war. Measured in terms of power, this Nation is immediately short about 1,000,000 kilowatts of high-class hydro power capacity which is necessary to make a start in providing adequate defense. Steam or other types of power cannot be used on account of cost and other production characteristics and problems. Without light metals, chemicals, or ferroalloys—which are nothing more than frozen low-cost hydro kilowatts—the talk about strengthening our national defense has little real meaning, as used in the report of the minority. I repeat, Mr. President, the light metals essential to the new type of warfare in which we will be thrust if we go into another war constitute nothing else than frozen low-cost hydro kilowatts. Right now we are a million short.

The demand for additional kilowatts, both for national defense and for our economy, is a tremendous demand. Yet there is talk about putting these projects on the shelf until we get into a depression. There is talk to the effect that such was the position taken by President Hoover on this issue. Such talk does not recommend itself to me, because I am inclined to believe that had we gone along and developed these projects to a greater degree than we did in the 1920's, we would have had a fighting chance, at least, of preventing the tremendous depression in 1929. We found ourselves late in the twenties with a honeycombed financial structure and a restricting economy instead of an expanding one. As a result we were thrown headlong into a depression.

The moment this economy of ours starts to restrict, then watch out for the danger signs of a recession or depression. To beat it before it starts, to prevent it before the spark is lighted, I say we should constantly keep ahead of a depression by ever expanding the economy. The possibilities for expansion as we make scientific advancements is almost unlimited. These projects are vital to an expanding economy. I say to those in the East that the tremendous values which eastern manufacture is going to make out of the development of the hydroelectric resources of this country have not yet been fully appreciated by most people in the East with whom I have talked. The significance of these projects to the economic development of all sections of America has not penetrated as yet the imagination and vision of many men in Congress.

My faith in this capitalistic system of ours, I submit, is greater than that of many people in the country who talk in terms of pessimism. People who talk in terms of not being willing now to spend dollars which will repay themselves many fold in the Treasury of the United States by way of the new wealth flowing from the expanding economy these proj-

ects would create show an unconscious lack of confidence in our capitalistic system.

The lack of critical materials, largely electroprocessed materials, will have a much greater effect on our industrial economy than is recognized. It often has been stated that the automotive industry of Michigan would not have had its beginning if it had not been for the electroprocessed basic materials developed by low cost Niagara hydro power. The older conventional fuel-furnace produced metals cannot be used where high strength, light weight, and high speed are the basic requirements. Our new processing methods require great electric energy for the development of those metals. A cross section of our industry is now dependent on electroprocessed materials and this situation will increase year by year as we dig out our metal reserves.

Naturally, one who is not a member of the subcommittee handling this bill is not qualified to discuss all the details governing the inferences in this report. However, it does appear to one who has investigated this Nation's resource condition that some of the observations or inferences in this minority report can do a great violence to a properly expanded Air Force and the all out defense against the atom bomb. Our electro-processed metal situation is now being seriously jeopardized by a lack of the requisite power supplies.

Bearing on this point, Mr. R. S. Reynolds, who pioneered the expansion of light metals in this country as a defense requisite long before Pearl Harbor, said in an interview in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of April 19, 1948, as follows:

If the international situation continues to deteriorate the existing aluminum capacity will be wholly insufficient for the most critical wartime demands.

The United States Government no longer has a stock pile of aluminum. Its stock pile of bauxite would not be sufficient to meet increased emergency demands for more than 3 or 4 weeks.

At the close of the war our Nation had a stock pile of 400,000,000 pounds. Today there is not a pound of aluminum available from this source. The increased demand for this vital material has caused the consumption of the Nation's stock pile. Without this stock pile the Nation even now faces a military shortage. It will be impossible to replace the vanished stock pile with current production in view of the unprecedented demand for aluminum for vital uses.

The current production of aluminum in the United States is at the rate of approximately 643,999 tons per annum. This would be increased quickly by 255,000 tons if economical electric power were provided to operate the idle plants including those about to be dismantled.

Unless we build up superiority in this vital metal it will be futile to spend millions on atomic weapons and new airplane designs. The modern war machine is useless without an adequate aluminum supply. Our present armament program will fail completely unless the aluminum production is brought quickly to the absolute maximum volume.

POWER AND RESOURCES

Mr. President, I now wish to say a few words about power and power resources.

It is a well-known fact that for the past 7 years this Nation has been the storehouse for the world. The effect of such a supply contribution on its resource base, however, has not been so generally understood or appraised. What is needed to repair the foundations of our resource base has not, in my opinion, been given the requisite over-all attention, although certain parts of the problem have been given great attention by the Congress.

I now intend to discuss the erosion and repair of this base so that the resource contributions of the Pacific Northwest can be made just as effective in times of peace as they were during the periods of war stress.

I wish to repeat, Mr. President, that although I draw most of my data and evidence from Pacific Northwest problems, the problems are identical with or similar to hydroelectric problems elsewhere in our country. I use the Pacific Northwest hydroelectric problem only as an illustration of our need to proceed throughout the country from coast to coast, from north to south, in the development of hydroelectric resources wherever they exist in the entire Nation. We can absorb them all. Our economy is such a sound one and its potentialities for expansion are so great, that we run no danger of overdeveloping electric power resources in this country.

Many centuries of experience have shown that nations which permitted the resource base erosion to continue have fast become secondary nations, and in later periods decadent nations. China, unfortunately, is a modern example of what can happen to a country that permits such erosion to continue.

To protect the future position of this Nation, we must have the essential facts and then exercise foresight in the application of corrective measures.

RESOURCES

Naturally the question arises, "What is included in our resource base?" Broadly, the following major classification is offered for purposes of this discussion, although it is recognized that many further subdivisions are needed for an extended discussion, which is outside the scope of this presentation. The Pacific Northwest is rich in certain types of resources and it is my purpose to point out how these can be used for the greatest national benefit.

Such a broad classification as I have adopted includes:

First. Light metals, such as aluminum and magnesium.

Second. Chemicals and fertilizers.

Third. Energy resources.

Fourth. Strategic metals, such as iron, copper, nickel, zinc, tin, and lead; also the metal combinations used in producing mechanical bearings, which includes the metals I have previously mentioned, and, in addition, antimony. In the list of strategic metals there should be included all of the above which permit electrolytic refining.

Fifth. Strategic nonmetals, like glass and rubber.

Sixth. Forestry productions—plastics and like synthetic materials—and, of course, agricultural products.

In fact, Mr. President, we simply cannot escape the basic relationship between agricultural production and national defense and an expanding economy, too. In fact I think it is the common denominator in this whole field of building a structure for adequate national defense and an expanding economy.

In presenting this classification I have not completely followed the sequence of needs, but have adopted such a schedule as would bring the major needs together, for the purposes of a more logical presentation of the contributions that can be made by the Pacific Northwest.

THE PREWAR SITUATION

It is now well known that in 1939 this Nation was not prepared to fight a modern war because of the lack of up-to-date electrometallurgical and electrochemical industrial plant capacity. This condition resulted from adherence to the old Maginot Line theory that the strategy of succeeding wars—if they came—would duplicate the experience of World War I, in spite of the fact that this Nation entered World War I with no advance plan for industrial mobilization. As a result, industrial chaos was rapidly approaching when the armistice of 1918 was suddenly reached. It was only the shortness of our active participation in World War I that prevented a break-down in the Nation's supply of strategic materials.

Mr. President, Germany was not aware of our rapidly diminishing supply of strategic materials in this country in 1918. Our production capacity had not been developed to the point that we were in a safe position as far as producing, as rapidly as we would have needed them had that war continued, the strategical materials needed by our men fighting that war. We were not in a safe position on the home front in 1918. Our home front production resources were not in the position of strength that they should have been in order to carry through the line of supply which we needed to maintain in order to back up our Army in Europe had the Germans not been defeated in 1918.

This situation was fully recognized when Congress passed the National Defense Act of 1920. We were still shocked with fright, Mr. President, in 1920, because of the close shave we had, so far as a serious short supply of strategical materials was concerned, at the time of the armistice in 1918. In the Defense Act of 1920, Congress set up the machinery for emergency industrial mobilization, and the procurement of strategic materials which we had failed to procure during the period preceding World War I. Under the administration of this act the War Department was charged with this responsibility. Initially that department sought the advice of the national mining and commercial associations and thereby started a debate which continued almost up to the start of War II, without developing a quick and effective modern industrial plan. Seemingly we had forgotten the technological progress made in the interim, especially in the field of aeronautics. We then made no effort to break away from the older conven-

ventional processes of producing metals, and apparently closed our eyes to the developments of Germany between 1933 and 1939.

In going over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from 1936 to 1941, I have found it illuminating to see the vision exercised by members of the Northwest delegation in both Houses of Congress, when they urged on strategical grounds the rapid expansion of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee generating plants in order to prepare this Nation for what was coming. Early in 1940 the Congressional delegation called on the newly created National Defense Advisory Committee and suggested the immediate use of the congressionally authorized power facilities at Bonneville and Grand Coulee for the production of light metals. At that time this Nation's light metal production capacity was only about one-third of the capability under the control of Germany. Nothing was done by the Defense people until after Pearl Harbor—18 months later—and after Pearl Harbor the development progress was extremely slow for the succeeding 9 months.

WAR PRODUCTION DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

After long delays, the war agencies were forced to come to the conclusion that the large quantities of light and extra-strong metals required by a rapidly expanding air program could only be produced by expanding and utilizing electrical facilities. The power capacity was then available in the Northwest for such large quantity production, and at the lowest obtainable cost. When the metal program was finally established by the war agencies, the development of such industries in the Pacific Northwest rapidly followed. At this point, to be entirely accurate, it should be stated that the Aluminum Co. of America on its own initiative started their large aluminum ingot reduction plant at Vancouver as early as the fall of 1939.

I want to pay my sincere compliments and tribute to the foresight of the Aluminum Company of America because I believe that they, too, foresaw the international situation which was about to crash down upon us, and the importance of our taking the necessary preliminary steps to lay a base for the manufacture of needed light metals for an effective air power role.

As a result of this strategic program, the Nation saw the establishment of the following electrometal and electrochemical industries in the States of Oregon and Washington: Five ingot aluminum plants of large proportions; one extremely large aluminum rolling mill; one experimental alumina clay plant; three ferro-alloys plants producing high-strength iron metals; one extremely large ferro-silicon process magnesium plant; three calcium carbide chemical plants; one chlorine and chlorate chemical plant; one electrolytical manganese pilot plant; and the now well known plutonium—atomic bomb—at Hanford, Wash.

In addition to these basic electrolytic plants, electro-satellite plants were also

established, such as the shipyards built on electric welding, expansion of the Bremerton Navy Yard for Pearl Harbor and other Pacific repairs, and the expansion of the Boeing aircraft plant at Seattle. These plants were placed in operation and consumed power at a rate of many million kilowatt-hours per year, but nevertheless the region was hard pressed to meet power demands. This situation has continued to date.

Here is an economic fact, Mr. President, which I would have my colleagues in the Senate never lose sight of in the debate. Although the completion of some power dams was speeded up in order to meet the needs of wartime industries now with those wartime industries gone, there is still a tremendous shortage of power in the Pacific Northwest to meet civilian needs. It gives one some idea, Mr. President, of how rapidly our economy is expanding and will expand if we give that economy the electric power it needs for expansion. Now we have not only public power groups, but all of the private power groups of the Pacific Northwest taking joint action in pleading with the Congress of the United States, through the Tacoma agreement of last year, and through the new Tacoma agreement of this year, for the completion of the projects listed in this bill in the shortest period of time. Why do they take that position, Mr. President? In order to meet civilian needs. They are not asking for them for wartime emergency needs. The private utilities and the public power groups are pointing out to the Congress, in formal statements jointly signed, that these projects must be developed to meet the power needs for the civilian economy, because there is a great shortage of electric power in that great Pacific Northwest area of the country.

Although before World War II we followed a "too little, too late" policy in most matters of defense, the Nation saw the development of some needed power projects. The program was not as extensive as it should have been but it proved to be a vital help in winning the war.

As a result of this late start, the other pressing war needs, the lack of quickly developed power potentials in this country, and the antagonism to the use of Federal power, we found this Nation subsidizing the Shipshaw development in Canada in order to secure additional aluminum to meet the call for more and more aircraft. The subsidy given to the Shipshaw Canadian plant has produced a highly competitive power and metal combination in Canada, which because of subsidy has resulted in over-all power costs between one-third and one-half of the pay-out costs of the Columbia River power. The Shipshaw enterprise was projected at a time when identical results could have been obtained in the Pacific Northwest by accelerating the generator schedules of the two Columbia River plants.

In this connection it is interesting to present a comparative table of national

and regional aluminum production expressed in short tons:

Year	Total United States production	Production in Pacific Northwest	Northwest production in percent of national production
	Tons	Tons	
1939	163,565		0
1940	206,280	5,000	2.6
1941	309,067	67,000	21.8
1942	521,106	148,000	28.4
1943	920,179	252,000	27.3
1944	776,446	281,000	36.4
1946	1,418,000	128,000	30.5
1947	1,700,000	290,000	40.1

¹ Estimated.

Source: National figures from U. S. Bureau of Mines, and Northwest figures calculated from power-consumption figures.

From 1925 to 1937 ingot aluminum production in the United States required a supply of power ranging from one billion to two and one-half billion kilowatt hours per year. The maximum aluminum production shown in the tabulated material presented above means an annual national power consumption around 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours during the peak war period, or a tenfold increase from prewar levels. From 1939 to the peak of the war period, the total power used in all types of manufacture in the United States increased from 72,000,000,000 to 148,000,000,000 kilowatt hours per year, or practically a twofold increase. During the same period the needs of all types of electric process industries in the United States increased from about 9,500,000,000 to 37,500,000,000 kilowatt hours, or a fourfold production increase.

These cited increases show the rapidly growing importance of electric materials to our economy.

The increase in the development of electric materials shows the relationship between the production of those materials and our economic welfare. But we cannot produce them in the amounts which our expanding economy needs without the development of more electric power resources. I am not going to let anyone get off the hook of that dilemma in this debate. We cannot develop the electrical materials needed either for our civilian production or for national defense without developing to the maximum extent possible the electric power resources of the country. I do not propose to put the needs of an expanding economy on the shelf until we toboggan into a depression. Now is the time to look forward. Now is the time to take advantage of a backward look at our mistakes of the 1920's and 1930's and proceed forward with an expanding economy on the basis of the lessons taught by those earlier mistakes.

We cannot get away from the economic fact that the economy of our day, both from the civilian standpoint and from the standpoint of national defense, is largely dependent upon the maximum production of electrically processed materials. That is the sort of age in which we live. That constitutes one of the great dividends which we are now collecting from education in scientific research over a period of 150 years. It is a part of the pay-back to the people of

the United States from scientific research. We should not try to hold it back with any argument that we should put on the shelf until a depression hits us the great power projects necessary to produce the electrical processed materials which are essential to an ever-expanding economy.

I know that I am repeating. I intend to repeat this argument over and over again, because it sets forth a simple economic fact that we must get through the heads of the American people. Once they understand it, I think they will change the course and trend of thinking within my party on economic issues. Once the people understand this issue I think my party will become a great progressive party in the field of economic development. There is a constant relationship between economics and progressive political thinking. I cannot stress that point too much, either.

Metals and chemicals produced by the older direct-fired-furnace methods, because of adulterations acquired by direct contact with the fuel beds, do not have the lightness and strength necessary for aeronautical construction. At least, that is what the scientific experts say. I am going to take their judgment, because that is what we educated them in science research to give to us.

The light-metal information I have put together shows that the postwar aluminum production has not dropped, as was so freely predicted around VJ-day. The short supply of steel products has resulted in many aluminum substitutes, and with such substitutes the commercial advantages of aluminum have become apparent. Therefore, we find present aluminum production over three times the prewar level. Magnesium has rightly been called the metal of the future because of a more favorably pronounced weight-strength ratio than exists in any other known metal.

Magnesium is also an electric metal similar to aluminum, and mountain ranges of the basic magnesium material exist in the Pacific Northwest. In fact, we are satisfied that the supply is almost unlimited, in terms of foreseeable use in the future.

STRATEGIC METALS

The supply of hematite iron are in the Lake Superior region is being depleted at a rapid rate. This ore is the foundation of our steel industry. Nearly 90 percent of our presently usable iron ores come from the Lake Superior region. The only other State with any appreciable deposits of such ore is Alabama. When the present deposits are worked out in the next decade we must then develop the lower grades and more complex ores. Such ores require electric furnace treatment, as is the present practice in Sweden. We are also running into the same depletion situation with respect to copper, zinc, lead, tungsten, chrome, bauxite, manganese, antimony, and mercury. However, the opportunities for further development in this country for tin, nickel, manganese, chrome, antimony, tungsten, and mercury are not favorable, according to present explorations. Consequently these materials must fall in the stock-pile classification.

ENERGY BASE

The energy—or power—requirements of an industrial nation are perhaps the most important part of the industrial and agricultural structure. Nationally for some time to come we are well fixed as to coal, but in the field of petroleum and petroleum products this Nation is beginning to scrape the bottom. As is well known, this liquid fuel is the most important from the standpoint of security and defense.

According to the American Petroleum Institute, this Nation's estimated proven petroleum reserves are now of the order of 22,000,000,000 barrels. In 1947 the estimated rate of equivalent crude oil consumption was around 2,000,000,000 barrels annually, which is a figure higher than the total world consumption 10 years ago. Our own prewar consumption was around 800,000,000 barrels. In this same period our per capita annual consumption of oil products increased from around 370 gallons to about 610 gallons, or an increase in this shore period of 65 percent. Last year, for the first time, the energy produced from oil and gas exceeded the energy produced from coal products. This unbalanced liquid fuel situation results from the increases in all kinds of mechanical production and from shifts to oil-burning equipment, like the recent trend of railroads to the use of Diesel-drive locomotives in the place of steam locomotives. According to recent press accounts, seven-eighths of all late locomotive purchases by American railroads have been confined to Diesel locomotives.

The census of farm equipment manufacturers also shows that between 1936 and 1947 the production of farm equipment, in terms of dollars, has increased threefold, and in the same interval farm tractor production has increased at a rate higher than threefold. These same statistics further show that 90 percent of this total farm equipment went to American farms, and that the bulk of the farm tractors were equipped with Diesel drives, and the balance with gasoline engines. Such examples indicate how oil consumption is increasing.

From the defense and security standpoint, the depletion of our oil reserves is an extremely serious matter. As is well known, our Navy rides on oil, and so does the modern mobile Army, and more important still in this atomic age are the high-grade fuel oil requirements of our Air Force. I am told that one of the causes of the German defeat in Russia was the inability of their army and air force transportation to operate on synthetic fuels, lubricants, and tires in extremely cold temperatures.

What is the answer to this important problem? There is no single answer, so far as I can see. Rather, I think there are several avenues of approach, all of which should be used. These are: (1) The adoption of multiple conservation measures, one of which is the use for automobile driving of regular gasoline, rather than such special brands as ethyl gas. The experts in this field feel that this substitution will save around 3 to 5 percent of the total consumption. Other conservation measures are possible, such

as increasing well-output efficiency, refining efficiency, and reducing many kinds of fuel losses. The second approach is accelerating activity in the development of synthetic liquid fuels and lubricants under the 1944 Synthetic Fuel Act. A third avenue is the development and utilization of firm energy substitutes.

In the field of energy substitutes, the Columbia River can make a very substantial contribution, as can every other river in the country on which hydroelectric-power resources can be developed. I wish to have us think of the rivers, Mr. President, in terms of oil conservation. That is the point I am trying to get across at this stage of my remarks. I am using the Columbia River as my exhibit A, to show how its maximum use will result in a great deal of oil conservation. A kilowatt-year of power such as used in the Pacific Northwest is equivalent, in round figures, to 15.5 barrels of oil. On this basis, the Bonneville generating plant is saving 9,300,000 barrels of oil a year. The Grand Coulee plant, when all generating units are installed, will save 31,000,000 barrels of oil annually; and the McNary plant, when completed, about 15,500,000 barrels.

That shows the direct relationship, Mr. President, between the maximum development of our power resources and the conservation of our natural resources, including the conservation of our precious short supply of oil. If all the potential hydro power of the Columbia were developed, the equivalent oil saving a year would be about 235,000,000 barrels, which is approximately one-third of the Nation's prewar fuel oil consumption. This one point alone justifies proceeding with the construction of such projects as McNary Dam as rapidly as the construction material situation permits. It is therefore a matter of serious regret to see the House reduction of the McNary Dam budget item from \$30,000,000 to \$20,000,000 for the next fiscal year, and the elimination of blueprint funds for the Foster Creek project. I am pleased and proud over the fact that the Senate committee is seeking to restore part of that reduction. Nevertheless, I think the cut made by the House indicates a lack of understanding of the relationship between these great projects and the conservation of our natural resources and the maximum development of our economy. The oil and other defense contributions that McNary Dam can make should be thoroughly explored. Although the equivalent oil contribution which a plant such as the McNary Dam plant can make is important, there are other very important defense and security considerations connected with hydro projects like the McNary Dam project.

It is perhaps a little premature to make an early prediction as to the full possibilities of atomic energy. However, we do know from the experience of the Northwest atomic plant that certain quantities of power are required to manufacture the metal plutonium, which by chain reaction can release vast quantities of power. From limited experience to date, the indications are that the cost of harnessing atomic power for electric

generation will be around four times the cost of such high-grade power as can be produced on the Columbia River. There is no place on this continent where the base for atomic energy can be produced as cheaply as on the Columbia River. As we expand the development of atomic energy, we naturally shall want to expand the low-cost power source needed for atomic-material reduction.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator has paused for a moment, let me say that I am wondering how much longer he feels he will take in completing his speech.

Mr. MORSE. I am now on page 10 of my formal remarks. I have 22 pages in all, but as the Senator knows, my extemporaneous remarks always make up the greater part of my Senate speeches. I think I shall conclude in 30 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I simply wondered whether the Senator would mind concluding his speech tomorrow, if we take a recess now.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to accommodate the Senator; but I am interested in the continuity of this speech. It is going to be reprinted for future reference in my State and, I hope, elsewhere. Also, I should like to have it in one issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that my colleagues can read it more easily.

Mr. WHERRY. That is perfectly agreeable to me. I shall be glad to remain here until the Senator concludes his speech. I merely thought that if the Senator would like to have us attempt to take a recess until tomorrow he could resume at that time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, does the same offer go for the Senator from Oregon in case the Senate adjourns tonight? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I take just one ditch at a time. If the Senator from Oregon wishes to have the Senate continue in session now, I think we had better wait and see just what time it is when the Senate either adjourns or takes a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to my good friend from Nebraska if he will permit this good-natured humor to get into the debate—

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the Senator's kind remarks, and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. I am highly complimented to see as many people here as there are. Seldom does almost a third of the Senate listen to any speech by any Senator. I am flattered. I usually, on this subject, have not nearly so large an attendance as I have today. Although I appreciate what the Senator from Nebraska said, I want him to know that I will not object to his leaving, because I know he will read the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. That is right.

Mr. MORSE. I shall take no offense if he leaves.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall remain.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is still another defense and security item. Our military air forces are becoming more and more important. The light and strong metals required for airship construction are nothing more than frozen kilowatts. Therefore, as a Nation

we cannot allow the foundation of this protection to drift into foreign lands by not keeping low-cost hydro-power production in step with an adequate airship construction program.

Airship design trends are now in the direction of supersonic speeds and jet propulsion. To accomplish such designs requires wind-tunnel experimentation under a duplication of stratospheric conditions. To accomplish such experimentation requires huge quantities of power. The only place in this country where these additional amounts of power can be cheaply secured is on the Columbia River. From the defense standpoint alone, which I have briefly outlined, the accelerated construction of McNary Dam and like projects is fully justified. The commercial justification for such projects is just as strong as the security justification.

Now, Mr. President, I cannot disclose certain knowledge which I possess in regard to the relationship between supersonic experimentations and the development of hydroelectric power plants. All I want to say to my colleagues in the Senate is that the amount of electric power required for such experimentation and for the defenses that will grow out of such experimentation is so tremendous that it startles the imagination. The Pacific Northwest is one of the most strategic spots in America for the development of supersonic research. The great power resources in that area should be used for defense experimentation, but the Congress of the United States cannot justify installing experimentation in that area if it drains dry the electric power resources for the civilian economy of the Pacific Northwest. If Government goes ahead with supersonic development in the Pacific Northwest we shall welcome it. We nevertheless need to recognize that the quantity of power required for supersonic research is so great that we would not have sufficient power available for our civilian economy unless we proceed to build the power projects called for by the committee's report.

That is why I stressed as strongly as I did earlier in my arguments, Mr. President, the relationship between the report of the majority of the committee in this instance and our civilian economy and our national security. In fact, I want to compliment the majority of the committee for their foresightedness, for their understanding, for their recognition of the relationship between the development of these projects and our national security and our need for an expanding economy. It is not without significance that the chairman of the particular subcommittee making this report, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], is also chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. He knows the facts. He recognizes the importance of these projects to a sound national defense program. He has available to him through our work in executive sessions of the Armed Services Committee information and data and evidence not available to many Members of the Congress.

I just cannot stress too much, Mr. President, the relationship between his

report in support of these projects and a sound national defense program. As I said earlier I think the issues raised by this bill have more importance than even legislation on manpower, important as manpower legislation is. Large numbers of men in armies, Mr. President, cannot possibly make this Nation secure, if we cannot produce the materials necessary to back up those men in uniform. These projects are necessary for the manufacture of that defense material as well as material necessary for a sound civilian economy.

PAY-OUT

The Columbia River multipurpose power projects have from the start been "sold" to Congress on the basis of reimbursability. Actual performance to date shows that these projects, under the existing laws, are more than making a full return on the Federal power investment. The Bonneville Act of 1937 requires such a return to the Treasury and a rate level to insure this return. This act, similar to the Boulder Canyon Project Act, requires a rate review every 5 years in order to protect the Federal Government on return, so that such projects will not become a burden on the taxpayer. This rate review insurance provision is included in all power sales contracts.

The Columbia River multipurpose projects are among the very few defense projects that are fully paying their way without becoming a burden on the taxpayer. The books of the Bonneville Administration, the Bonneville Dam project—Army engineers' operation—and the Columbia Basin reclamation project of the Bureau of Reclamation have been completely audited by outside independent commercial auditors of national reputation. From the certification of these nationally known auditors I am convinced that no better set of books can be found in the Government. The last audit shows that in the past 7 years these projects have deposited in the Federal Treasury over \$105,000,000 of gross revenues. Included in this \$105,000,000 total is a surplus of \$23,000,000 over all items of cost such as interest, amortization, replacement, operating and maintenance costs.

In addition to meeting all power costs, power revenues from these projects will contribute about \$324,000,000 toward subsidizing such Columbia Basin project reclamation costs which will not be assumed by irrigation and the irrigators. This contribution to reclamation development exceeds the proportionate annual amount paid by private power companies in taxes. If this subsidy was not provided out of power revenues, such reclamation projects would become a burden on the taxpayer or the reclamation features would not be constructed at all. Since the Oregon rate payer receives no direct benefit from this rate contribution it rightly can be considered as a high level tax equivalent. I am raising no objections to this procedure, but am merely showing that the present power rate is meeting all existing elements of cost.

I just cannot emphasize too strongly, Mr. President, what I have said in years gone by here on the floor of the Senate.

You cannot get away from the economic fact, from the mathematical fact that these projects are self-liquidating.

In an attempt to build a background for nonjustifiable rate increases, a large amount of theoretical misinformation has been put out. Such misinformation does not check with the audited statements. To set out the facts in a simplified condensed form I have had the output statistics of the two plants combined with the audited figures and reduced to a series of simple tabulations which should demonstrate accurate facts on performance of the Columbia River projects. Such a series of tables are given at this point, so that material will be available for those who wish to pursue the subject on a sound basis.

I believe, Mr. President, in letting the facts speak for themselves, and the facts are that these projects are returning their cost to the Government in self-liquidating dollars. Therefore I ask that there be printed at this point in my remarks certain tables which I have prepared in connection with this self-liquidating issue.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Generation and sales statistics, calendar year 1947, Bonneville Power Administration

	Calendar year 1947	Increase over 1946	Increase over peak war year 1944
Kilowatt-hour sales millions.....	9,232	+44.6	+2.7
Revenue, sales of energy.....	\$22,082,100	+37.2	-1.2
Revenue per kilowatt-hour, mills.....	2.39	-5.2	-4.0
Bonneville and Grand Coulee: Generation for BPA kilowatt-hours.....	9,794,668,800	+43.4	+2.1
Maximum demand kilowatts.....	1,477,000	+11.2	+5.5

Electric energy account, calendar years 1947 and 1944, Bonneville Power Administration

	1947 (preliminary)	1944, highest war year
Energy received, kilowatt-hours (in millions):		
Energy generated for BPA:		
Bonneville.....	4,059	3,576
Grand Coulee.....	5,736	6,014
Total.....	9,795	9,590
Other energy receipts ¹	286	165
Total received.....	10,081	9,755
Energy delivered, kilowatt-hours (in millions):		
Sales.....	9,232	8,985
Other energy deliveries ²	206	126
Total delivered.....	9,438	9,111
Energy losses, kilowatt-hours (in millions).....	643	644
Percent of total energy received.....	6.4	6.6
Maximum demand on Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants, kilowatts.....	1,477,000	1,400,000
Load factor, percent total generated for BPA.....	75.7	78.0

¹ Includes energy purchases, energy received from BPA storage in reservoirs of other utilities, energy received for transfers, and uncontrolled or unauthorized energy receipts.

² Includes deliveries to storage in reservoirs of other utilities, energy delivered for transfer, and energy used by the Administration.

*Sales of electric energy by classes of customer, calendar year 1947, Bonneville Power Administration**

Class of customer	Number of customers as of Dec. 31, 1947	1947 sales		Mills per kilowatt-hour
		Kilowatt-hours	Revenue	
Publicly owned utilities:		Thous.		
Municipalities.....	14	405.4	\$1,056,700	2.61
Public utility districts.....	15	584.5	1,648,500	2.82
Cooperatives.....	23	129.6	438,300	3.38
Other.....	2	8.5	27,800	3.27
Total.....	54	1,128.0	3,171,300	2.81
Privately owned utilities.....	6	2,734.4	6,805,500	2.49
Military establishments.....	6	30.9	177,500	5.74
Industries.....	17	5,338.3	11,927,800	2.23
Total sales.....	83	9,231.6	22,082,100	2.39

Sales of electric energy by calendar years 1938-47, Bonneville Power Administration

Year	Energy (millions of kilowatt-hours)	Revenue	Mills per kilowatt-hour
July 1938-40.....	508.8	\$1,086,000	2.13
1941.....	1,616.4	3,515,000	2.17
1942.....	3,882.8	8,878,000	2.29
1943.....	6,921.8	16,347,000	2.36
1944.....	8,984.5	22,354,000	2.49
1945.....	7,436.2	22,626,000	3.04
1946.....	6,385.4	16,090,000	2.52
1947.....	9,231.6	22,082,000	2.39
Total to date.....	44,967.5	112,978,000	2.51

Mr. MORSE. Our mass-production industries long ago demonstrated that large volume sales at low unit prices produce greater net revenues than lower volume sales at higher prices. This axiomatic principle runs throughout the revenue figures I have just presented covering the wholesale power outputs of the Bonneville Administration.

This relationship is even more pronounced in the field of retail power sales. My home city of Eugene, under the lowest retail electric rates in the country, has fully paid off the full cost of its electric properties and has set up a sizable surplus. Recently we have had other similar examples throughout Oregon amongst rural cooperatives and municipalities. As an example of this business principle I will cite the experience of the little city of Monmouth.

In 1940 the city of Monmouth constructed its own electric distribution system and power was purchased from the Bonneville Administration. On December 5, 1940, publicly owned power was first used in Monmouth. To construct the power-distribution system a bond issue of \$40,000 was issued. Just recently this municipality celebrated the fact that the last bond of this and other issues had been retired. After 1 year's operation the city of Monmouth made its first rate reduction. This was followed later by another reduction which placed the Monmouth retail rates on a parity with the low rate structure which exists in Eugene and Tacoma.

In 1941, after the first year's operation, the electric revenues of the city of Monmouth totaled in round numbers \$15,900.

At the end of the fiscal year 1947 this revenue had increased to nearly \$41,000, which represents practically a threefold increase in 6 years. It was through this increase in revenue resulting from low rates that the city of Monmouth was able to pay off its entire indebtedness.

I have analyzed similar relationships in the costs of a number of Oregon rural electric activities. I found that the same rapid growth existed in every case that I analyzed.

I made that analysis in connection with another speech I shall deliver at a later date in regard to the whole rural electrification program. I want to say that the power developments are paying out and there can be no denial of the fact on the basis of the figures.

Monmouth is not what can be called an industrial community. It is a farm-marketing center, and the electric income is derived largely from residential sales rather than from commercial or industrial sales. The Monmouth experience represents the normal, natural increase in electric consumption which is typical in the Northwest.

Let me say, Mr. President, that we had all better recognize that the people of the Northwest will find it very difficult to understand any political program which seeks to put on the shelf the development of electric-power projects which they know are vital to their future prosperity. They know these projects are sound, because they have had such experience as the Monmouth experience, which can be multiplied by scores of examples in the Pacific Northwest. They know the relationship between the development of power projects and the economic welfare of the Pacific Northwest.

I am making no sectional argument when I apply this point to the Pacific Northwest, because I repeat that I shall support the same principle in any area of the country, North or South, East or West. I am convinced that the development of our electric-power resources to the maximum extent possible is essential to the prosperity of our country. I am convinced that we can make no sound political argument, economic argument, or national defense argument in support of putting such developments on the shelf until a depression hits us. The people are entitled to better treatment than that, Mr. President, and I think they will demand it, once they come to understand the basic facts involved in this debate.

The agricultural and forestry interests of the Pacific Northwest made outstanding contributions during the war. These contributions were proportionately greater than in World War I in spite of reduced manpower per acre, resulting from the large manpower requirements of the armed services in the last war. With less manpower per unit, a greater unit production was secured through mechanization. This high production rate has been continued since VJ-day and can be materially increased if more electric power were available. The agricultural production rate can be increased east of the Cascades by 200 to 500 percent, depending on the type of crops, through power-pumped supplemental irrigation. To accomplish this

result, under competitive markets and long transportation hauls, power costs must be kept low, while still maintaining a full pay-out. This is easily possible through coordination of all power transmission and distribution facilities, thereby keeping the over-all investment low, as such investment costs are the largest factor in the level of resale rates.

The last large virgin stand of timber in the United States is located in southwestern Oregon.

In fact, my home town of Eugene is now recognized as the lumber capital of the world, though the lumber industry is ever moving southward as we deplete the existing ripe timber.

With diminishing yields in other sections, the southwestern Oregon lumber operations have recently been increased at extremely high rates, and I think, dangerously high rates, from the standpoint of sound forest conservation. That is why I am constantly raising my voice in support of a scientific, sustained-yield program in the field of forestry and lumber production. Lumber operations are highly essential to the veterans' and other housing programs. Formerly timber wastes were used in the mills as fuel, but this type of power production has practically ceased as the amount of slab waste has been reduced by the development of hydraulic debarking machines, and what waste does exist is now more valuable for synthetic products like plastics, rayon, alcohol, and other similar materials and chemicals. With the reduction of timber waste and the high value of the remaining products lumber mills must now depend on electric power. The power situation in southwestern Oregon is so highly critical that unless additional capacity is quickly provided in this area the housing program will consequently be seriously restricted.

To protect the national and regional economy, all of these elements must be considered together and not on an individual basis. If this is not done, an unbalanced development will result. It must be realized that to support one agricultural worker there must be at least four direct and indirect industrial workers, and at least 1½ service workers gainfully employed to consume the agricultural products of one farm worker. It is therefore apparent that the development of reclamation projects must be kept in step with industrial expansion.

POWER LOADS

There is no disagreement in the Northwest as to estimates of power loads that must be met within the next 8 years. All the public and private distribution agencies in the region have reached an agreement on this point, and it is now not necessary to rely entirely on any estimates of the Federal agencies alone. This load agreement was adopted in a meeting at Tacoma, Wash., on January 6, 1948, in which the eight large public and private agencies in the region participated.

This Tacoma agreement is a matter of public record. The one of January 6, 1948, is the second of the two Tacoma agreements, the first having been entered into in 1947. Both of them represent a unity of opinion on the part of the public

power groups and the private utilities as to the need of the development of the projects encompassed in the report I am discussing, insofar as the Pacific Northwest is concerned.

In the last 8 years the kilowatt-hour annual consumption per residential consumer in the Pacific Northwest has increased from 1,225 to 3,200 kilowatt-hours, compared with the United States national increase in this same period from 960 to 1,400 kilowatt-hours.

Mr. President, comparison of those two sets of figures is rich in meaning as to what is happening to the standard of living of the farmers and the city dwellers of the Pacific Northwest. Give them the necessary electric power and we will come much closer to giving them full attainment of that "pursuit of happiness" about which our founding fathers wrote in the Declaration of Independence.

The relationship between available electric power and an increasing standard of living for all our people is a very direct relationship. That is why I want to see its increased production spread throughout the entire country by the development of the power resources in every section of our land. I do not know of one single item, if I had to pick one item, more important to the development of a higher standard of living and a greater happiness on the part of our people—to the extent happiness can be attained through a high standard of living—than the development of electric power. The development of an expanding economy, which will give us a maximum standard of living, can best be brought about by speeding up the completion of such projects as are covered by this bill.

Thus, referring to these figures, I would say that in the same period the commercial and retail power consumption in the Northwest has jumped from 8,100 to 14,800 kilowatt-hours per average consumer, compared with a national figure of 4,100 to 7,200. Therefore, the unit consumption in the Northwest is at least double—and in some cases, much greater than—the national unit increase, and is increasing at a much faster rate than the national figure. In addition to the unit consumption, the population increase, which makes new consumers, has been 4.35 times the national average. The proportionate population increase in Oregon and California has been the greatest in the country in the last 7 years, with the State of Washington closely following.

In fact, it is California first, Oregon second, Washington third, over all the other States of the Union. People are finally finding God's country out there, and we are experiencing a great influx of new citizens. We welcome them, but we are going to need the economic facilities of these proposed projects so that they can help us expand the economy of the Northwest, and thereby the economy of the entire country.

This population increase has been maintained ever since VJ-day. We were told that as soon as the war was over the many thousands of war workers who moved out to the Pacific Northwest and

to California for war work would return to other sections of the country, but they did not. The population increase has continued since VJ-day at a rate similar to its increase preceding VJ-day.

These factors, when projected for the next 8 years, show an annual regional demand increase ranging from 214,000 to over 300,000 kilowatts per year, with an average for the entire period approaching 250,000 kilowatts per year. There has been no time since 1938 that new generation has not been loaded beyond rated capacity as rapidly as the generators have been brought into production. The load estimates definitely show that this condition will be more pronounced in the future than in the past.

BUDGET ESTIMATES

From an analysis of the submitted 1949 budget it is apparent that sufficient funds were not included to maintain the requisite power schedules for defense, resource base correction, and commercial operation. Yet we have the proposal pending before the Senate to reduce them even further, when just the opposite action is the action which should be taken if we are to meet the power demands of the Pacific Northwest. I say this not in a spirit of criticism, but rather to call attention to the fact that these budget items, when they reach this side of the Capitol, should not be treated as routine budget items.

Provision has been made in the budget for 15 generating units at the Grand Coulee plant. Eight units are now installed in this plant. The provision for expansion to 15 units evidently resulted from the Senate floor action on Reclamation's supplemental estimate during the closing days of the last emergency session. At the present time all power facilities in the Northwest are loaded to capacity, with no reserves existing. This is a critical situation, and I am mentioning it to point out the fact that if there are schedule delays in the other plants, compensation will have to be made by adding three generators at Grand Coulee, to be installed in the three remaining vacant flumes at that plant.

To keep the McNary plant schedules in step with power demands will require about a \$40,000,000 appropriation for the next fiscal year. The submitted McNary budget was \$30,000,000, and the difference between \$40,000,000 and \$30,000,000 represents a year's delay in that plant's schedule. One year's delay in completing McNary cannot be justified because the \$10,000,000 postponed in spending during that year would more than be repaid in the first year of McNary's operation.

Why do I speak of a penny-wise and pound-foolish proposal? Because it is just as clear as the nose on one's face that that is exactly what it is. This whole proposal to prevent the appropriation necessary to complete these power projects is a penny-wise and pound-foolish proposal. It is a false economy. It in fact involves tremendous waste. It does not make economic sense. When we stop to think that the first year of operation, after completion, would more than return to the United States Treas-

ury the \$10,000,000 expenditure which would be postponed under this budget proposal it becomes perfectly clear, it seems to me, that those who say that now is not the time to make the expenditure are taking a very unsound position from the standpoint of economy. They know that eventually the expenditure will have to be made, and so it is very apropos, it seems to me, to apply the old saying, "If eventually, why not now?" Now is the time to do it in the interest of economy, in the interest of returning to the Treasury at the earliest possible time the cost of these self-liquidating projects.

The recent House action on the War Department's civil functions bill resulted in a cut from \$30,000,000 to \$20,000,000. Also in the same bill the budget item of \$580,000 covering the Foster Creek blueprints was eliminated. The Foster Creek project is also a defense development of the highest order. The same situation applies to the Willamette River flood-control projects and power adjuncts, and also the Snake River projects.

We are told we cannot have \$580,000, Mr. President, to proceed with the blueprint preparation of Foster Creek, in spite of the fact that there cannot be produced either before the Appropriations Committee or the Armed Services Committee of the Senate a single high military authority in the United States Government but who will testify that Foster Creek is one of the essential links in a chain for national security development in the case of an atomic war. We cannot build it after such a war starts. In that event it will do no good, unless it is ready to proceed to supply the power for the manufacture of atomic weapons and materials essential to that type of war.

We need it also for civilian production. I am satisfied that we need it if we are ever going to meet the debt obligations of the Government, because only out of taxes made possible by such wealth-producing projects can the necessary revenue be derived.

The combined transmission mileage running out of the two existing Columbia River generating plants amounted to 3,021 circuit miles as of January 31, 1947. To move the scheduled power to the Grand Coulee plant will require the following transmission mileages on the dates shown:

Date:	Total circuit miles
June 30, 1949.....	3,360
Dec. 31, 1949.....	3,785
Dec. 31, 1950.....	4,227
Dec. 31, 1951.....	4,584

For this same period the present substation capacity amounts to 2,359,863 kilowatts. This substation capacity must be increased 93 percent to match the approved generating capacity schedule.

Unless the transmission facilities are kept in step with the generation schedules, revenues will be lost in the amount of \$2,100,000 per generator unit per year, and the loads in the shortage areas will not be met.

Anyone who can add figures, Mr. President, can multiply \$2,100,000 per generator per year and demonstrate to

his own satisfaction how economically wasteful and unsound a postponement of the construction of these plants for the installation of these generators actually is. My 12-year-old daughter would not make the mathematical miscalculations which the opponents of these projects are making. Their figures simply do not add up to anything but a result showing false economy.

RATE EFFECT

Unfortunately, as I have pointed out earlier in these remarks, a large amount of misinformation has been put out relative to proposed elevation of the \$17.50 per kilowatt year Columbia River wholesale power rate. Evidently these proposals were brought forward on the theory that the Columbia Basin was drawing industry away from other sections of the country. There is no justification for such a thesis, as the industrial facts speak for themselves. All of the industry established in the Northwest during the past 8 years has been new industry, based entirely on the availability of resources. If this industry were not located in the Northwest it would be located outside of the United States. Again, such proposals cannot be justified on the grounds of insufficiency of revenues. The revenue facts that I have presented are sufficient to form a true appraisal.

If power and resource developments are curtailed in the Northwest we must look for the following effects:

First. A continued depletion of our national resource base through the lack of production of critical chemical and metallurgical products.

Second. The creation of a brake on all industry in other sections, as the basic Northwest materials now go to many sections of the country for fabrication.

Third. A movement of this type of American industry to foreign lands. Scandinavia, South America, and Canada are particularly attractive for this type of industry.

Mr. President, from the standpoint of the prosperity and economic welfare of the American people, I do not like the idea of having large American business concerns establishing branch concerns in Scandinavia, in Canada, and in South America, where they can obtain cheap power by the development of hydroelectric resources there, simply because the Congress of the United States is so shortsighted and so devoted to a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy that it is not willing to proceed now to develop these electric power resources in our own country.

There now exists about 11,500,000 kilowatts of high-class, undeveloped hydro power in Canada, about half being in the eastern section and the balance in British Columbia, which is across the line from the Pacific Northwest. The South American potential hydro powers are all of large proportions and can be developed at a very low cost.

If we allow any such eventuality to mature we will be working against the best interests of this country from the standpoint of defense, national position, and maximum employment for all of our own workers.

In these remarks I have, in the limited time available, pointed out the fundamentals of our national-resource problem. We cannot afford to allow soil erosion and resource depletion to continue without tragic effects on our national position, our national security, and our national economy. Therefore the repair plans for these foundations should be quickly developed, closely examined, and then executed.

Mr. President, I close with the same premise with which I started. I am willing in this debate, and on this issue, as I am in every debate, on every issue, to let the facts speak for themselves. The facts do not support the policy inherent in the recommendation of the minority views. The facts, from the standpoint of national security, from the standpoint of developing our expanding economy, and from the standpoint of giving the American people the most vital material they need for increasing their standard of living, namely, electric power, support my argument that we should proceed now to construct these projects as quickly as possible, and should appropriate the necessary funds with which to do it.

I am willing to accept the issue raised by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The issue involves the question of weighing the importance of different public expenditures. On that issue I say that the importance of these projects is so great and so vital from the standpoint of our security, our economy, and the welfare of our people, that they call for a "must" vote in the Senate of the United States on the part of those who seek to promote the general welfare of all our people. They call for a rejection of the theory that these projects should be put on the shelf until we are faced with the danger of a depression. They call for a renewed faith and confidence in the vitality and expanding potentialities of our capitalistic economy. They call for economic, social, and political foresight. They call for a rejection of the minority report on this bill and for a vote against the motion to recommit the recommendations of the majority report.

The Republican Party in the Senate cannot justify holding back the earliest possible completion of these much-needed power, flood-control, reclamation, and river and harbor developments.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks a letter from Mr. George H. Palmer, president and publisher of *Marine News*, under date of April 30, 1948.

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

MARINE NEWS,
New York, N. Y., April 30, 1948.
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We have read the minority report on the civil function, Department of the Army, appropriation bill, which was reported to the Senate on April 23. We were surprised at the severe criticism of the Army engineers contained in this minority report, particularly the statement that:

"Good and bad, important and inconsequential, large and small, the Army engi-

neers submitted their requests to the committee, and offered their justifications with a straight face."

We believe that this criticism is unfair and unwarranted.

As you know, all river and harbor projects are thoroughly examined by the Corps of Engineers both as to the actual physical construction and as to their economic soundness. No project is approved by the engineers the benefits of which will not in their opinion provide for maintenance, amortization, and interest on the original cost. When a project has been approved it is recommended to the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, who, after hearings have been held by a subcommittee, either include the project in an authorization bill or disapprove it. It seems to us that no project which has gone through this procedure can be either "bad" or "inconsequential."

The minority report also infers that the Army engineers have failed to distinguish between the various classes of projects and have disregarded the importance of the projects and the completion-time element. We believe, on the contrary, that the engineers always make a careful study of the relative importance of projects before they make their request for funds to the Director of the Budget.

The United States Army engineers are probably the finest body of engineers to be found anywhere in the world. Their ability and integrity is unquestioned. Many members of the corps made splendid records as commanding officers in high places during the recent world war. Because of the war river and harbor improvement during the past several years has not kept abreast of other development. We believe that the funds recommended for river and harbor improvement by the Senate Appropriations Committee are necessary and justified.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD BILL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, twice this afternoon I attempted to obtain unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its work today it recess until tomorrow at noon. Both times objection was made by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I did not know what he had in mind, and he did not know what I had in mind, but I think we now each understand what the other intended.

At any rate, there seems to be a question as to just when the motion which the Senator from California has made to discharge the committee from further consideration of the Hawaiian statehood bill should be taken up. During the able address of the Senator from Oregon negotiations have been in progress, and I think a compromise has been reached. The Senator had been assured by the acting majority leader that a motion would be made to adjourn on Friday, so that the question might be taken up in the morning hour on Monday.

The Senator from California feels very strongly about the bill, and believes that every day means something in its behalf. He is of the opinion that it ought to be brought up sooner. I believe I state the situation correctly. The Senator has agreed that a morning hour will be had by adjournment at the conclusion of consideration of the civil functions appropriations bill. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, so that I may make a brief statement, I think the Senator from Nebraska, the acting majority leader, has correctly stated the situation.

If I may state a little background, the junior Senator from California felt that he had a definite understanding that there would be a morning hour last Monday. I appreciate the fact that although I had that assurance from the able Senator from Nebraska, he ran into some problems of his own because of the press of legislative business.

With time running out, and with the general understanding that an adjournment about the 19th of June will be attempted, every day counts in the matter of statehood for Hawaii. For that reason I was not willing to agree to postpone for another week the start of the debate on the question of statehood for Hawaii. Therefore I withheld my consent from the unanimous consent request that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess, because the only way we can have a morning hour is by adjournment. It had been my intention to raise the question of a quorum. If no quorum were available of course the only thing the Senate could do would be to adjourn tonight.

However, I wish to be cooperative with the leadership, as I have always tried to do during the time I have been a Member of the Senate.

With the understanding, which has been joined in by other Senators, that at the conclusion of action on the civil functions appropriations bill the Senate will take an adjournment rather than a recess, and with the further understanding that we shall proceed diligently with the civil-functions bill and not continue to lay it aside for something else, I will withdraw my objection so that the Senator from Nebraska may make his motion or submit his request.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in order that we may clearly understand the question of procedure, do I correctly understand that as soon as the civil functions appropriations bill has been disposed of an adjournment will thereupon immediately be taken, regardless of the day or the time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection to running through until the end of the day, if it is finished tomorrow, or running through until tomorrow night. However, it is the understanding that at the conclusion of consideration of the civil-functions bill and such other miscellaneous matters as may be taken up, there is to be an adjournment of the Senate, which will give us a morning hour, in order that my motion may be presented to the Senate. That will take only 2 hours out of the day in any event.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have only one suggestion to make to Senators involved in this dispute, and that is that I do not see anything to be gained by a 2-hour discussion. What will happen is that the motion will be brought up and debated until 2 o'clock, and then it will automatically go on the calendar. I cannot see why we cannot agree by unanimous consent to place it on the calendar. Then the Senator can move to bring it

up at any time if he can obtain the floor for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is what I am afraid of.

Mr. TAFT. But even if the Senator succeeds, his motion will be debated for 2 hours, and at 2 o'clock it will automatically go on the calendar. I am suggesting that the Senator can achieve that result by unanimous consent, without the necessity for 2 hours of debate. That is my only suggestion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that that proposal has been made and thoroughly discussed with the junior Senator from California. Now I shall let the junior Senator from California speak for himself.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in view of the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio, and in order to clarify the record, I think it should be made perfectly plain why I do not approve of that procedure.

The first great difficulty which the statehood for Hawaii bill has encountered is that, frankly, it is bottled up, by a vote of 7 to 5, in a committee which has no desire to let it out.

The second point is that I believe that, if the attention of the public can be focused upon this subject, there will be sufficient support in the country, and I believe there will be sufficient support in the United States Senate, if the question can be brought to a vote, to get the bill out of committee.

I am hopeful that the proponents of statehood will not take more than approximately half of the 2-hour period, and that the opponents will then state on the floor of the Senate their objections to the proposal and to statehood for Hawaii. One of the great difficulties which the prospective forty-ninth State faces is that it is being whispered against. Charges are being made which I do not think can be sustained.

Those who oppose statehood for Hawaii have a perfectly legitimate right to their position, because everyone has a right to take whatever position he wishes on the question. But I want the arguments to be made on the floor of the Senate rather than in anonymous letters or in statements which I do not think can be sustained, and which are highly detrimental to the people of Hawaii.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator can have that debate at any time on any bill. If he wishes to take the time, I do not object. I am anxious to have the question settled as quickly as possible. So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of the bill. I doubt whether I would be in favor of taking it away from a committee of the Senate.

I am interested in saving the 2 hours of debate. We are pressed for time. If we are to get away from here by the 19th of June, we shall have to speed up action beyond anything we have done up to date. We have for consideration the civil-functions bill, the displaced-persons bill, the Army bill, the long-term agricultural program, and many additional appropriation bills. We must move very rapidly. In fact, it seems to

me that we ought to begin very shortly to meet at 11 o'clock and sit through regularly until 6, or even begin night sessions, and ask committees more or less to suspend operations on additional bills. We shall have practically everything of importance on the calendar within a short time, and I should like to save all the time possible. Any Member of the Senate who insists on having time in which to present his arguments will get such time; there is no way to prevent a Senator from having that opportunity.

So if the Senator insists on proceeding as he has indicated, it is perfectly proper for him to do so and to have that time, and he can have it. But we shall have the same debate over again when the motion to take the bill from the committee comes up, I am sure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield to me, I should like to offer a suggestion. The question which will be before the Senate will be a motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the bill. A vote on the motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration does not necessarily indicate how any Senator will vote on the bill itself when it is before the Senate. I would have to be very strongly persuaded that a committee had been negligent in the performance of its duty before I would vote to take a bill from it. I would wish to listen to all the arguments on that subject; but certainly my vote on the motion to discharge the committee from further consideration would be no indication of how I would vote on the bill when it was before the Senate.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say that when we are dealing with the bill as a practical matter—and that is what the bill relative to Hawaiian statehood is—it should be pointed out that the bill passed the House last year, and the Senate committee has had it since that time. There have been five congressional investigations of this matter. Hawaii has been a Territory for 40 years and has been under the American flag for 50 years. If Hawaii is to succeed in having the Congress pass at this session or during the Eightieth Congress the bill looking toward statehood for Hawaii, in my judgment, the only way that Hawaii can have any possibility of obtaining statehood is by having the bill withdrawn from further consideration by the committee, because the bill is bottled up in the committee by a vote of 7 to 5, and in the committee there is a very clear intention not to release the bill.

I realize that some Senators are very loath to vote to discharge a committee from the further consideration of a bill. I am sure that in my 7 years in the California Legislature and in my 3 years in this body I have been very reluctant to vote to withdraw a bill from a committee. But I say that the only way by which Hawaii will have a practical chance to be admitted as the forty-ninth State—which is what the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior have recommended, and

what the five congressional committees which have studied the question have rendered favorable reports on—is by having the Senate cast a favorable vote on my motion.

Once the bill is before the Senate and on the floor, the Senate—which is the body which will have to pass on this question—will be given an opportunity to consider it. When it is on the floor of the Senate, of course, each Senator should look into all the arguments pro and con, and finally should make up his mind whether he wishes to vote in favor of statehood for Hawaii.

But if a Senator votes against the motion to have the committee discharged from the further consideration of the bill and to have the bill brought up on the floor of the Senate, such a vote will be against statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I would wish to hear from the committee before making up my mind as to how I would vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California this question: If in the negotiations tomorrow the committee would agree to have the bill placed on the calendar, would that satisfy the Senator from California, in respect to his motion and his intention to have a morning hour?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I would be very happy to have that done.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the committee certainly would not agree to do that. The committee might agree to have the motion put on the calendar—but not the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean that the committee might agree to have the bill placed on the calendar. I meant the committee might agree to have the motion placed on the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, that would not be satisfactory, for the reason I have already stated. There is no question that under the very loose rules of the Senate, those of us on this floor—and there are many of us—who favor statehood for Hawaii could take time during the discussion of any bill which was being considered by the Senate to discuss for a very long period of time the question of Hawaiian statehood. But we do not wish to do that. I merely wish to have the proponents have a reasonable length of time to present their views and then have the opponents have a reasonable length of time to present their views.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inadvertently I used the word "bill" instead of the word "motion"; but I wanted the Senator from California to state for the RECORD the reasons why he would not wish to have the motion placed on the calendar, even if the committee would agree to have that done.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am a little puzzled by the tactics of the Senator from California. As I understand, he hopes to obtain 2 hours for the discussion of this matter, 1 hour to be used by the proponents and the other hour to be used by the opposition, during which time the

bill or the objections to it would be discussed. But what assurance does the Senator have that the opposition would discuss the bill, rather than the best way of making New England clam chowder, or some other subject?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, we have no assurance as to that.

Mr. BREWSTER. How is the Senator going to get the reluctant dragons to discuss it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. But assuming that they have valid reasons or objections against statehood for Hawaii, and assuming that we are trying in every reasonable way possible to bring this issue to a head—which is our intention—we have this course in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may say that I have seen the time in the Senate when Senators discussed the question of approving the Journal, rather than the motion or other matter before the Senate. Anything may happen here.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to make sure that I understand the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no such request.

Mr. MORSE. Then I should like to ask a question. Suppose the suggestion that the Senate adjourn were adopted, and suppose the Senate debated the civil functions appropriations bill through to the end of Thursday afternoon, let us say. Would that mean that the Senate would then take an adjournment until Monday, with no session on Friday?

Mr. WHERRY. No. The Senator has made quite plain that there is no objection to continuing the session on Thursday until a reasonable hour, but that at the conclusion of the session on Thursday a motion to adjourn would be made, so that there would be a morning hour on Friday, instead of on Monday.

Is not that the course which is agreeable to the Senator from California?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Absolutely.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I think we are getting our days mixed up. I believe this is Tuesday.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course.

Mr. GURNEY. It is my understanding, speaking only relative to the civil functions appropriations bill—because I wish to be sure that it is the order of business on Wednesday, and also the order of business on Thursday—in case action on the bill is not finished on Wednesday—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the RECORD let me say that regardless of what days have been mentioned, I think I can assure the chairman of the subcommittee, once again, that it is the intention to conclude action on the civil functions appropriations bill before anything else displaces it, whether it be on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. So that the RECORD may be further clarified let me state that it now is the intention of the acting majority leader at the conclusion of the Senate session on the day when action on the civil functions appropriations bill is completed, whether that be Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, to move an adjournment, so that there will be a morning hour the day following, when the Senator from California can take up in the morning hour his motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the Hawaiian statehood bill.

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

Mr. WHERRY. First, I should like to ask whether that is the clear understanding of all Senators involved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Now will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator add one more sentence? Is it the intention of the acting majority leader to have the Senate take up the displaced-persons bill after the civil functions appropriations bill is disposed of, if there is an opportunity to do that later in the afternoon of the day when the civil functions appropriations bill is disposed of, and then to follow the displaced-persons bill with the selective-service bill?

Mr. WHERRY. The intention, as I have announced it several times on the floor of the Senate, is to have the Senate conclude action on the civil functions appropriations bill first. After that is done, it is the intention to have the displaced-persons bill made the unfinished business. After action on that bill is concluded, it is the intention to have the national security bill come up. I may add that after the displaced-persons bill and after the national security bill are disposed of, I think it would be in order to have the Senate take up a conference report, or it might be that the Senate would even desire to take up an appropriation bill. That decision will be up to the Senate itself.

But the unfinished business will be the proposed legislation which has been spoken of, and it will be taken up in the order stated.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I simply wish to observe that the agricultural appropriation bill has been reported by the full committee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. And it is awaiting an opportunity for consideration by the Senate. I believe that at the first opportunity we should move for its consideration, so that it can be acted on and go to conference, and be in conference while other matters are being discussed in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I think the point is well taken, and I think it would be good procedure to do as the Senator has suggested, because no time would be lost if we were to proceed in that way. But I think the Senate should clearly understand what the unfinished business is to be.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that what the Senator from Illinois has just said with regard to the agricultural appropriation bill might also be said with regard to the long-range agricultural program bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. If it appears that the Members of the Senate are reconciled in their views on that bill, so that in a very short time the bill might be passed, and then might go to the House of Representatives, which is waiting for it, I would hope that would be done. However, if it appears that several days will be required for the consideration of that bill in the Senate, I would not ask that it have preference over the armed services bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me restate, as has been announced previously, that the proposed legislation immediately before the Senate and in prospect will be the legislation previously mentioned: First, the civil-functions bill; second, the displaced-persons bill; and third, the national security bill.

Mr. President, I made another announcement this afternoon. It will be found in the RECORD, but it might be of interest to Senators who did not hear the announcement for me to say that it is intended, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, when the session is concluded on Friday, May 28, to recess or adjourn, whichever motion is made, until the following Tuesday, the reason being that Memorial Day comes on Sunday. It will be followed by a legal holiday on Monday, May 31, which we desire to observe. The Senate will therefore recess or adjourn from Friday May 28, until Tuesday noon, June 1.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it appearing that the Senate has concluded its work for today, I move that a recess be taken until tomorrow, Wednesday, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 19, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 18 (legislative day of May 10), 1948:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Roy M. North, Washington, D. C., in place of V. C. Burke, transferred.

INDIANA

Omer D. Hendricks, Hartford City, Ind., in place of Jack Dolan, resigned.

IOWA

George W. Kunzman, Douds, Iowa, in place of M. R. Doud, resigned.

William R. Wilson, Hampton, Iowa, in place of R. A. Fox, resigned.

Mary C. Burns, Neola, Iowa, in place of Grace Ryan, resigned.

William J. Newcomb, Williamsburg, Iowa, in place of W. J. Cash, removed.

LOUISIANA

Bernard Buras, Buras, La., in place of J. C. Ballay, retired.

MARYLAND

William Paul Graham, Mardela Springs, Md., in place of C. E. Hopkins, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Daniel G. Dowd, North Amherst, Mass., in place of Daniel Ottinger, retired.

MICHIGAN

Carl W. Pulkilla, Ewen, Mich., in place of J. A. Campbell, resigned.

NEVADA

Renee C. Gibson, Beatty, Nev., in place of C. E. Merkel, resigned.

Edward L. Gregory, Goldfield, Nev., in place of N. W. Wills, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

James H. O'Connell, Fremont, N. H., in place of M. A. Willey, retired.

NEW JERSEY

John F. Leahy, Sea Girt, N. J., in place of J. S. Devlin, deceased.

Julius B. Scott, Somerdale, N. J., in place of P. F. Whelan, Jr., transferred.

Carl L. Roof, Stillwater, N. J., in place of C. M. Garris, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Calixto Garcia, Central, N. Mex., in place of J. A. Walsh, resigned.

NEW YORK

Sister M. Leontine, Stella Niagara, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

PUERTO RICO

Georgina M. Lamas, Roosevelt, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

TEXAS

Albert N. Pike, Iredell, Tex., in place of C. R. Conley, resigned.

Timmie A. George, Louise, Tex., in place of W. H. Bruns, deceased.

VERMONT

Katherine L. Moore, Cavendish, Vt., in place of A. C. Gibson, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Harry W. Easterly, Lebanon, Va., in place of H. H. Dickenson, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 18 (legislative day of May 10), 1948:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Jess Larson, to be War Assets Administrator.

Rear Adm. Paul L. Mather, United States Navy, retired, to be Associate War Assets Administrator.

GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Brig. Gen. Francis K. Newcomer, United States Army, to be Governor of the Panama Canal.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. John Steward Bragdon, Army of the United States, to be assistant to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for a period of 4 years, effective on date of appointment, and for appointment to the grade of brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Louis Aleck Craig to be the Inspector General, United States Army, for a period of 4 years, effective on date of appointment.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant colonel

Ernest A. Brav, MC [REDACTED]

To be major

Karl A. Youngstrom, MC, [REDACTED]

To be captains

Rollin C. Avenell, DC, [REDACTED]
Henry C. Dorris, MC, [REDACTED]
Walter J. Grant, MC, [REDACTED]
Franklin G. Hoffman, MC, [REDACTED]
James B. Joyce, DC, [REDACTED]
William W. Senn, DC, [REDACTED]
James L. Schricker, Jr., MC, [REDACTED]
Fletcher W. Streck, MC, [REDACTED]
Leo S. Szakalun, MC, [REDACTED]
Richard S. Waldman, DC, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants

Cecil A. Baer, Jr., DC, [REDACTED]
Clifford A. Baldwin, Jr., MC, [REDACTED]
Peter R. Brady, MC, [REDACTED]
Kenneth M. Carroll, MC, [REDACTED]
Robert L. Christensen, MC, [REDACTED]
Robert E. Crompton, MC, [REDACTED]
Paul A. Ervin, Jr., MC, [REDACTED]
Samuel C. Gallup, MC, [REDACTED]
Martin B. Giffen, MC, [REDACTED]
James L. Hansen, MC, [REDACTED]
Frederick G. Harris, MC, [REDACTED]
Payne S. Harris, MC, [REDACTED]
James N. Harten, MC, [REDACTED]
Thomas B. Hauschild, MC, [REDACTED]
Frank Hladky, Jr., MC, [REDACTED]
Robert L. Johnson, MC, [REDACTED]
Robert L. Koenig, MC, [REDACTED]
James E. Lancaster, DC, [REDACTED]
Arthur E. Levy, MC, [REDACTED]
Robert C. MacDuffee, MC, [REDACTED]
Stephen G. May, MC, [REDACTED]
William H. Meroney III, MC, [REDACTED]
Harry J. Misch, MC, [REDACTED]
Francis D. O'Brien, MC, [REDACTED]
Ralph H. Potter, Jr., MC, [REDACTED]
Robert K. Quinnell, MC, [REDACTED]
Donald H. Robinson, MC, [REDACTED]
Ernest A. Sarao, MC, [REDACTED]
Palmer H. Warren, MC, [REDACTED]
Ralph D. Wright, MC, [REDACTED]
Thomas C. Wright, MC, [REDACTED]
Paul C. Yessler, MC, [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenants

Karl H. Borcheller
Albert N. Abelson
Eugene K. Andreasen
John F. Archer
Edward J. Arlinghaus
Thomas Y. Awalt
Guy A. Baber, Jr.
Andrew W. Baird
George M. Barrack, Jr.
Sam L. Barth
Rutland D. Beard, Jr.
Donald J. Beckwith
Richard A. Benefield
Robert B. Bernstorff
George W. Bickerstaff
George H. Bickley
Colon E. Britt, Jr.
William E. Brockmeier
Joseph W. Brouillette, Jr.
Bobby C. Bush
Thomas E. Cantrell
Marco J. Caraccia
Robert E. Carlson
Murray L. Carroll
Esper K. Chandler
William W. Chandler
John W. Chism
Byron R. Clark
William P. Clay
Ray W. Coffey
Samuel N. Cohen
Charles C. Collins
William I. Compton
James Corey
George L. Cross
Harrison P. Crowell
Victor R. Cullens
William J. Cummings
Charles T. deLorimier
Albert P. Dempsey, Jr.

Clinton A. Drury, Jr.
Eugene M. Dutchak
Charles W. Edwards
Earl E. Emerson, Jr.
Irving Feldman
Robert J. Fiscella
Thomas C. Fischer
Harley B. Flisk, Jr.
James R. Flannery
Joe A. Font
Edward F. Foster
Reinhart C. Gauerke
Owen J. Giblin
Warren A. Gilbert, Jr.
John P. Gilman
George W. Gordon
Douglas M. Graham
Edward Greer
Sidney C. Guthrie
M. B. Guyton
Spencer V. Halgren
Elton F. Hammond, Jr.
Albert H. Hanger
Clifton S. Harris, Jr.
Walter R. Harrison, Jr.
Thomas J. Heller
Benjamin C. Hilliard
Charles B. Hinson
William R. Huff
Harold Hutcherson
Clarence H. Jackson
James A. Jeffers
William F. Jester
Charles M. Johnson
Ivor R. Jones
Edward S. Karon
Roy D. Kaylor
Oliver T. Kelly
Clayton A. Kemp
Ernest L. Kerley
John H. Klein, Jr.

Joseph Knight
Irvin S. Kramer
Donald K. Kuehl
George S. Kukuchek
John E. Lambert
Robert D. Lambourne
Delbert E. Lane
Arthur L. Laughry
Francis Lebaron
Henry H. Lentz
Francis E. Lougee
Jose H. Lowry
Benjamin E. Lumpkin, Jr.
John R. Manning
James S. Martin
William R. Massey
Wesley J. Matson
William D. McLean
Homer C. McNamara, Jr.
Donald C. Mead, Jr.
James O. Melton
Robert W. Merchant
Carl J. Merck
Francis Meredith, Jr.
Malachi M. Mills
Guy E. Mitchell, Jr.
Robert D. Monical
Victor O. Morris
John E. Mulhern
Harry F. Mumma
Robert A. Munford
Paul E. Myers
Norman J. Newman
John M. Nolan
Edward H. O'Donnell
Carlo J. Ortenzi
Robert L. Patterson
Trevor J. Perry
Galen W. Pike
Harvey D. Piper
Martin L. Pitts, Jr.
David D. Powell
Leonard L. Preston
Robert M. Quinlan
William R. Ramsey
John M. Reardon

James B. Reed
Roife Robertson
William B. Roth
James J. Rubash
Louis G. Sankaut
Tommy F. Satterfield
Henry A. Schenk
Robert C. Schindling
Robert G. Schmitt
Paul E. Schwab
Robert D. Sheppard, Jr.
Thomas P. Shiely
Cyril Sidun
Orvis H. Skolos
Forest J. Smith, Jr.
Melvin Smith
John E. Steinke
Lorenzo E. Stephenson
John W. Stevenson
Julian R. Story
Robert P. Story
Donald L. Synolds
Hunter G. Taft
Jerrol E. Taylor
Mack Taylor, Jr.
William M. Taylor
Richard H. Timmins
George R. Truex, Jr.
Blaine E. Twitchell
Jack C. Utley
Clifton F. Vincent
Louis H. Wagner
John E. Walden II
Andrew J. Waldrop
Joseph L. Walker, Jr.
Paul A. Watkins
Robert W. Webb
James S. Weeks
John M. Welch
Hal D. White
Charles Wiersch
Robert T. Wilkerson
Theodore C. Williams, Jr.
Charles L. Worley, Jr.
Charles S. Wylie
Walter E. Yerkes

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

To be second lieutenants in the Regular Air Force of the United States

Avan T. Adams
Robert L. Adams
Carl W. Ballard
Melvin R. Bandle
Lester Banks
Herbert B. Barentine
Arnold G. Barker, Jr.
Harold L. Bellairs
Donal D. Bloodgood
John H. Bost
Manuel Bracete, Jr.
Ray B. Bressler, Jr.
Paul L. Briand, Jr.
Pat D. Brinson
Charles Buhman, Jr.
Richard W. Burkholder
Warren F. Chrisman
George H. Christena
William N. Cornett
George A. Crane, Jr.
Benjamin B. Davis
Victor M. Davis, Jr.
William E. Donlon, Jr.
Lawrence A. Doyle
Rudolph W. Ebacher
Shirley J. Eby
William H. Field
Harrell D. Foitik
Richard Foster
Carl R. Frear, Jr.
Joseph E. Hammond
Raymond W. Harlow
Robert L. Harrison
Gerald L. Hendryx, Jr.
William A. Hofacker
Clarence T. Jane
Robert P. Keller
Ulysses S. Knotts, Jr.

Robert L. Lieberman
John H. Lomax
Howard B. Long, Jr.
Frank C. Longwell
Owen L. Lovan
Brice E. Lytle
Edward A. Malone, Jr.
Robert E. McGee
John A. Middleton III
Clay H. Miller, Jr.
Robert B. Monier
Earl M. Monroe
William W. Mullally
James W. Newberry
Alan H. Noyes
William H. O'Bryan
Robert H. Papy, Jr.
Michael N. Parker
Virgil F. Perkins, Jr.
Lorenzo I. Petree
Laverne W. Poland
Donald A. Preble
Charles A. Rodenberger
Wesley K. Sasaki
Robert A. Schlapper
Bennett E. Smith
James A. Snell
Marlowe B. Sorge
Maynard D. Stewart
Francis R. Stokes
Stanley L. Sturgill
Phillip R. Tatnall
Jacques K. Tetrick
John C. Thompson
William J. Thorpe
Richard R. Tibbetts

William A. Toombs, Joe E. Webb
 Jr. Frank R. Williams
 James S. Tucker Harry L. Wytock
 Paul J. Vican Joe E. Zollinger

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

(NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.)

To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 1, 1948

John Edward Lineberger, AO50377.
 Rudolph Junior Schweizer, AO56527.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 2, 1948

William Claude Weldon, Jr., AO56528.

To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 3, 1948

M. L. Buchanan, AO56530.
 X Clayton Darrell Mode, AO38456.
 Bryan Roscoe Jolley, AO56529.

To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 4, 1948

Walter Brooks Badger, AO56533.
 Frank Mann, Jr., AO50378.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 7, 1948

Floyd Harrison Trogdon, AO50381.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 8, 1948

John William Trezise, AO50382.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 9, 1948

Clarence James Douglas, Jr., AO56534.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 10, 1948

Jewel Neal Craft, AO56536.

To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 11, 1948

Walter Scott Crum, AO50383.
 John Malcolm Netterblad, AO50384.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 12, 1948

Joseph Michael Kristoff, AO56538.

To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 13, 1948

James Fred Gruben, AO50387.
 John Joseph Burgmeier, AO50388.
 Harold Wendell Petree, AO56539.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 14, 1948

John Boyd Flaig, AO50390.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 16, 1948

Donald Eugene Dano, AO50391.

To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 17, 1948

Ellis Leroy Fisher, AO38461.
 Robert Allen Novotny, AO56541.

To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 18, 1948

LeRoy Perry Hansen, AO41333.
 Russell Lamar Lewis, AO56542.
 William Everett Davis, Jr., AO41332.
 William Daniel Johnston, Jr., AO50393.
 Frederick Warburton Joy, Jr., AO50394.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 19, 1948

Philip James Crossman, AO56544.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 20, 1948

Andrew Raymond Reeves, Jr., AO38462.

To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 21, 1948

Robert Charles Tomlinson, AO38464.
 Nils Nelson, AO56545.

To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 23, 1948

Robert Dale Miller, AO38465.
 Spencer Crosby Savage, AO56546.

X Francis Harold Potter, AO38466.
 X Cullen Bryant Morgan, AO38467.
 X Alma Lord Potter, AO50399.
 X Jerry William Tom, AO38468.
 Benjamin Wilder Coolidge, AO56547.
 Hoyt Cecil Bethell, AO56548.
 X James Russell Lowell, AO38469.

To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 23, 1948

Smith Lorenzo Von Fossen, AO56552.
 Marlin Clyde Howard, AO56549.
 Martin Luther Stutts, AO38470.
 Kenneth Omar Wofford, AO56550.
 Charles Herbert Proctor, AO56553.
 Robert Marion Denny, AO56555.
 William Orville Lighty, AO56556.
 Robert Wendell Dodson, AO56551.

To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 24, 1948

Vernon Alfred Lindvig, AO56557.
 To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 25, 1948

Keith Gordon Robison, AO56558.
 To be first lieutenant, with rank from May 26, 1948

Donald Raymond Butterfield, AO56559.
 To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 30, 1948

Lyle Albin Wykert, AO50404.
 Douglas James Nelson, AO50405.
 To be first lieutenants, with rank from May 31, 1948

Hewitt Eldridge Lovelace, Jr., AO50406.
 James Stuart Schofield, AO56561.

IN THE NAVY

To be a rear admiral, for temporary and permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps

Capt. William M. Angus
 To be a rear admiral, for temporary appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps

Capt. Andrew G. Bisset
 To be lieutenant commanders, for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps

Wendell C. Thompson
 Harold D. Werner
 To be lieutenants, for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps

Ian M. Laird
 Lewis L. Poynter

To be lieutenant (junior grade), for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps

William C. Williams
 To be ensigns, for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps

Daniel J. Clements, Jr.
 David (N) Dooling
 To be ensign, for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps

Fritz H. Hediger
 To be ensigns with rank from June 4, 1948

Paul F. Abel George M. Bates
 William Abromitis, Richard W. Bates
 Jr. Joseph R. Bayle
 Richard C. Adams David A. Beadling
 Augustine A. Richard L. Beatty
 Albanese Jerry T. Becker
 Thomas E. Alexander Donald R. Behrens
 Benjamin G. Allen Harry E. Beiflower, Jr.
 Hoyt E. Allen Gegory McC. Bell, Jr.
 Robert C. Allen Herbert P. Benton III
 Walter L. Alt Levon Berberian, Jr.
 Gordon A. Anderson Floyd E. Bergeaux
 Roy C. Anderson Robert E. Berggren
 William S. Mac L. Benjamin W. Bevis
 Arnold Oral J. Bilderback
 Edward M. Axtell, Jr. Patrick P. Billingsley
 William R. Ayers Walter T. Blakney
 Robert P. Barber Floyd H. Blizard
 William H. Barnes III Richard V. Bodmer
 Russell Bartmes, Jr. Louis J. Boland
 William H. Barton, Jr. Philip H. Bolger
 William R. Bartow Eugene S. Bowers
 Jack Baruch Franklin L. Bowersox

Claiborne S. Bradley Raymond I. Gornik
 Charles R. Braley, Jr. Jack L. Gracey
 Ralph W. Brown, Jr. Morris R. Grady
 James S. Brunson Warren C. Graham,
 Paul G. Brunton Jr.
 Douglas G. Buchanan Frederick H. Gralow
 Beaumont M. Buck Ernest J. Gray
 Robert G. Buechler Harold Gurman
 Norwood W. Donald B. Hall
 Bullington, Jr. Norman L. Halladay
 Ronald S. Burton Albert B. Hallman
 James E. Callahan, Jr. David R. Hamlin
 James H. H. Robert W. Hanby, Jr.
 Carrington Kevin Hanlon
 Charles C. Carter, Jr. Harley S. Harris, Jr.
 Ernest C. Castle Wade H. Harris
 Nicholas A. David L. Hartshorn
 Castruccio Charles E. Hathaway
 John D. Caylor Douglas B. Hatmaker
 William D. Stanley R. Hawe
 Chandler 3d Edward B. Hebden II
 Edwin Mac M. Leonard M. Hendrix
 Chapline Albert G. Henry, Jr.
 Roger A. Chapman John D. Herlihy, Jr.
 Thomas P. Cheesman Lawrence C. Hernandez, Jr.
 Robert S. Chew, Jr. Charles W. Hines
 Matthew A. Chiara William R. Hintz
 Michael L. Childress Richard B. Hodson
 William T. Chipman, Hugh S. Holder
 Jr. Tennyson J. Hull III
 Robert G. Claitor Harvey R. Humphrey
 Wyndham S. Clark, Jr. Robert D. Hunting-
 Richard J. Clas ton, Jr.
 John D. Clithero David A. Hurt, Jr.
 Richard A. Cochran Karl H. Huss, Jr.
 James N. Comerford William G. Ikard II
 Jack H. Conable James M. Ivey, Jr.
 Robert C. Conolly II Frederick D. Jackson,
 Albert E. Conord Jr.
 Charles P. Coulter John W. James
 Jack Cowden Alan L. Jansen
 Howard S. Crosby Leonard A. Jay, Jr.
 James S. Crosby, Jr. John L. Jensen, Jr.
 John R. Crumpton, Francis C. Johnson
 Jr. Henry B. Johnson
 Thomas W. Cuddy William E. Johnston
 Daniel W. Cullivan Harry L. Jones
 Bradley L. Daley William A. Kanaka-
 Bennie V. Damberg nui, Jr.
 James E. Davenport, Jack C. Kays
 Jr. William H. Keen
 John M. Davis Kenneth Kely
 John DeGoede Robert E. Kenyon
 Daniel T. Deibler Harry N. Key, Jr.
 Leonard V. Delling Thomas F. Kilduff, Jr.
 Dean D. DeWitt Robert E. King
 George W. Dittmann Burton H. Kleinman
 William D. Dittmar Herbert S. Kline
 Claude E. Dorris John W. Klinefelter
 Laurens Dorsey Edward L. Korb
 Benjamin S. Dowd, Seymour L. Kunin
 Jr. Frederick R. Lafferty,
 Norman L. Duncan Jr.
 Robert D. Duncan Arthur Landis, Jr.
 Richard T. Duncan, Jr. Charles M. Lane
 James W. Dupree, Jr. Charles H. Langton
 William F. Easterlin, William J. Lauben-
 Jr. dorfer
 Rex C. Eaton, Jr. Jason F. Law
 Dewey A. Ellis, Jr. Paul D. Lawler
 Gordon R. Engel Hugh O. Lea
 Leland F. Estes Robert L. Lee, Jr.
 John Evasovich William W. Lee, Jr.
 John L. Everngam, Jr. Edgar S. Levy, Jr.
 Emil M. Eyer William W. Lewis, Jr.
 William R. Fisher, Jr. Aubrey L. Loeffler
 Edward B. Fleming Hubert B. Loheed
 John A. Fletcher II John R. Lowdenslager
 Francis C. Fogarty Robert B. Lyden
 Donald D. Foulds Arthur L. Markel
 Andrew L. Frahler Marvin D. Marsh
 Ian N. Fraser George W. Marshall
 Edward Frothing- Paul V. Martenson
 ham, Jr. Thomas E. Matia
 Wallace S. Gabriel Frank E. Matthews
 Stanton B. Garner Elmer A. McCallum,
 Herbert K. Gates, Jr. Jr.
 Sidney W. Gaylord, Jr. William L. McClure
 George E. Goodwin John K. McConeghy,
 Hugh H. Goodwin, Jr. Jr.
 Ralph T. Goodwin, Jr. John W. McCord

Milton C. McFarland
Robert S. McGihon
Andrew McIntyre
Donald A. McIver
Russell R. McKechnie
Marvin "M" McKinley, Jr.
Edward F. McLaughlin, Jr.
John R. McMahon, Jr.
Robert H. Meenan
Robert E. Melhorn
James I. Mellencamp
Murray Menkes
Charles Mertz 3d
Edward W. Meyers
Howard B. Moore
James R. Moore, Jr.
Roderick B. Moore
Sumner K. Moore
William V. Moore
Donald R. Morris
Eugene C. Moss
Peter R. Moureau
Leonard W. Mulbry
James E. Myrick
Robert R. Neely, Jr.
Frederick L. Nelson
Richard E. Nicholson
Eugene J. Noblet
Dan R. Nolen
Robert P. Nottingham
Thomas H. Nugent, Jr.
John L. Oberrieder
Mark J. O'Friel
Robert W. O'Reilly
Frank W. Orr, Jr.
Edward J. Ortleib
Gerald L. Palmer, Jr.
Benjamin H. Pester
John D. Peterson
James E. Peterson, Jr.
William C. Pierson
Ray C. Pittman
Alonzo M. Poteet, Jr.
Delton B. Pruner
Robert O. Pyle, Jr.
Paul L. Quinn
Charles E. Ransom, Jr.
Hugh B. Rardin
Walter L. Rees
Harvey E. Rennacker
Earl F. Resch
Edwin C. Rice
Ward P. Riggins, Jr.
Guy W. Riggs
Knight M. Robbins
Harold L. Robiner
Rufo W. Robinson
Edward B. Rogers, Jr.
Joseph P. Rogers, Jr.
William A. Rogers, Jr.
Donald S. Ross
Ernest H. Ross, Jr.
Terry A. Ross
Andrew T. Roulston
Richard B. Rubenstein
John A. Russell
William F. Sallada
William G. Sawyer
Albert R. Schofield, Jr.

To be ensigns in the Supply Corps from June 4, 1948

Edmund S. Armstrong
William H. Borchert
William G. Brendle
John W. Bruner
Donald H. Corson, Jr.
James A. Cox
William F. Doddy
Kenneth W. Dunwoody, Jr.
William H. Evans, Jr.
John P. Gaffigan
Robert L. Ghormley, Jr.
Lewis E. Gleason
Richard I. Henderson

Robert A. Schultz
Robert E.
Schwoeffermann
Richard U. Scott
Robert H. Searle
Ruell A. Searson
Henry T. Settle, Jr.
Charles A. Sheehan
Peter N. Sherrill
Jack N. Sherwood
Albert F. Shimmel
Richard E. Shimshak
Jack R. Silvey
William N. Small
Harold F. Smith, Jr.
Robert C. Smith, Jr.
Nicholas W. Smusyn
Thomas C. Spalding
Wilburn A. Speer, Jr.
Richard H. Sprince
Richard J. Springe
Edward F. Stacy
Thomas E. Stanley
Don R. Stephens
Charles G. Strahley
Hart R. Stringfellow, Jr.
Richard Struyk
Robert T. Styer
George H. Sullivan, Jr.
Edward P. Supancic
Francis J. Suttill, Jr.
Joseph P. Tagliente
Robert McE. Tatum
Boone C. Taylor
Karl R. Thiele
Albert J. Thompson
David R. Thornhill
Frank S. Tiernan
Herbert N. Townsend
Kenneth M. Treadwell
Howard A. True
John C. Tsiknas
Robert W. Van Kirk, Jr.
Carlos C. Villarreal
John E. Vinsel
Quentin W. Wagenfield
Robert E. Wainwright
Daniel P. Walchko
James F. Ward II
William Wegner
Elbert N. Wells
James K. Welsh, Jr.
Richard O. Wheeler
John F. White, Jr.
Joseph P. White
Warren P. White
Charles A. Whitmore, Jr.
Gilbert Wilkes III
Stanwix M. Williams
Joseph A. Wilson
Thomas B. Wilson, Jr.
Thomas Woods II
David L. Wright
George S. Wright
Robert E. Wurlitzer
Ellis M. Zacharias, Jr.
Jack P. Zimmerman
Dudley Holstein
Howard N. Kay
William N. Langone
Charles L. Lewis
Harold B. Lipschutz
Edward A. McManus
Kennedy Niland
James H. Smeds
David M. Smith
Edgar N. Smith
Morris M. Smith
Charles L. Suit III
Robert C. Vance
Kenneth B. Webster
Marvin A. Weir

To be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps from June 4, 1948

Robert G. Carroll
James C. Day, Jr.
Sydney W. Dunn, Jr.
Richard M. Fluss
George L. Hoffman
Charles B. Hogan

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS

William T. Clement to temporary grade of major general.
Louis E. Woods to permanent grade of major general.
William L. McKittrick to permanent grade of brigadier general.
Manuel F. Castro to second lieutenant.
Harry B. Liversedge to temporary grade of brigadier general.

To be permanent commissioned warrant officers to rank with but after second lieutenants

Philip J. Costello
Harry E. Detwiler
Hubert H. Dunlap
Roy L. Green
Roy E. Hagerdon
Edgar C. Hughes
John G. Johnson

IN THE NAVY

To be ensigns from June 1948

Robert W. Corey
Robert J. Cutler
Raymond R. Demrick
James H. Foxgrover
Robert J. Harlow
Romeo D. Hinkston
Leslie C. Hofto
Frederick W. Holler, Jr.

To be ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948

Philip A. Amidon

To be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from June 4, 1948

Ray W. Foreaker, Jr.
Charles W. Gulick, Jr.
Nicholas F. Troug

To be ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps, in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps as previously nominated, to correct spelling of name

Francis W. Day

To be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy

Betty J. Alexander
Virginia M. Cardillo
Josephine A. Franks
Lois W. Gass
Mary E. Hagan
Lois C. McCuller

To be commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Greydon G. Boyd

To be lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Donald G. MacKinnon

To be lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Arvin T. Henderson

To be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Kenneth S. Axelsen
John J. Carroll
Donald E. Lloyd
Wallace S. Sekul

To be commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy

James R. Justice
Niels H. Martin

To be lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy

Norman D. Hines

To be lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy

Wallace S. Andrews
Hewitt J. Beauvais, Jr.
Joseph J. Bonello

To be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy

Anthony P. Giammusso
so
Walter J. Krumbeck

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

Henry R. O'Brien
A. William Reggio

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Arthur G. Malucky

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

John L. Lewis, Jr.
Ralph Alperin
William Weingarten
Holman R. Wherritt
Stanley H. Moulton
Edgar A. Swartz

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Paul Fremont-Smith
David L. Rodgers
Robert M. Paine
Laurence Finberg
Carlyle F. Stout
John P. Utz
Charles O. Metzmaker
Arthur D. Fisher
David H. Solomon
Norman G. Hepper
James V. Woodworth, Jr.
Leonard J. Ganser
Charles M. Gillikin
Daniel M. Emerson
Arthur S. Keats
Wendell L. Pierce
Robert F. Wettingfeld

To be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Edward J. Driscoll
Charles J. Gillooly

To be assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

William J. Braye
Edmond G. Vanden
Bosche

To be dietitian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Fonda L. Dickson

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Sylvia Ginsberg
Anne M. Leffingwell
M. Dolores Howley

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Patricia B. Geiser
Frances Moskowitz
Helen M. Ely
M. Elizabeth Leeds
Enid L. Taylor
Mary A. French
Dorothy G. Young

To be junior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Norma Russell

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, for days of health, for nights of quiet rest, for the bounty of Thy goodness, and for all Thy blessings bestowed for our need, we give Thee thanks. We praise Thee for our country, our schools, our homes, and for all the opportunities which make us grow into self-reliant manhood.

For all who do not share these blessings, we ask Thy merciful goodness to abide with them; give to those who suffer that peace which nothing can outweary, because their minds are stayed on Thee. Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love Thee. Peace be within Thy walls and prosperity within Thy palaces. In the name of Him who gave His life for all mankind. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. 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 May 14, 1948:

H. R. 1353. An act for the relief of Edward W. Bigger; and

H. R. 5262. An act to authorize the sale of individual Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934, and under the act of June 26, 1936.

On May 17, 1948:

H. R. 345. An act for the relief of Ollie McNeill and Ester B. McNeill;

H. R. 1953. An act for the relief of John F. Reeves; and

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Joe Parry, a minor.

On May 18, 1948:

H. R. 1189. An act to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service;

H. R. 1562. An act to increase temporarily the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;

H. R. 4129. An act for the relief of Jerline Floyd Givens, and the legal guardian of William Earl Searight, a minor; and

H. R. 5035. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to make corrections in the enrollment of H. R. 3350.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3566) entitled "An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the

Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILEY, Mr. REVERCOMB, and Mr. EASTLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4236) entitled "An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LANGER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. CHAVEZ to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Doctor, My Statistics Feel Funny." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$159.75, 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. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include a radio address by Jack Beall entitled "Communism."

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper account of the McMillin case.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made to the convention of the First District Young Republicans.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include a résumé of South Dakota veterans' laws, two editorials on an Iwo Jima hero, and a table prepared by the Legislative Reference Service on the cost of the foreign-aid program.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday 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 45 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE] be excused from attendance of the House all of this week on account of death in his family.

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

There was no objection.

PROPOSAL TO SQUANDER OUR FATS AND OILS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to our colleagues on the Select Committee on Foreign Aid for the very illuminating study of European trade patterns prepared with the assistance of the United States Tariff Commission and other organizations.

I found some mighty interesting figures on page 3. There we find some of the fats and oils estimates of the Bevin committee's Paris report. This committee estimated that Norway would need to import 99,000,000 pounds of fats and oils. The Tariff Commission studied this situation and came up with a report that Norway would have no need to import fats and oils. In fact, the Commission found that Norway should have an exportable surplus of 280,000,000 pounds.

For the small agricultural country of Denmark, with a population of only a little over 4,000,000 persons, the Paris Conference reported an import requirement of 440,000,000 pounds of fats and oils, or more than 100 pounds per person. When the Tariff Commission analyzed the fat and oil situation of Denmark, it found this dairy raising country should have a surplus of 100,000,000 pounds of fats and oils.

It is probably only human nature to ask for more than you need. Just think how much profit there would be in disposing of millions of pounds of unneeded fats and oils. I cannot help but wonder if all the requirements are not similarly padded. We can only hope that the Appropriations Committee will scrutinize these figures carefully.

There are not many items with higher prices today than the fats and oils which every family needs to keep clean and properly fed. We owe it to our constituents to see that no supplies are shipped abroad unless they are absolutely needed for the relief or recovery of the recipients, and, by recovery, I do not mean the shipment of goods which can be re-exported for unearned income. There must be no squandering of our resources if we are to keep our prices within reasonable bounds.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Nation's Business, May 1948.

Mr. MUHLENBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a bill, H. R. 6525, which he introduced.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Sunday Herald Tribune.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an article appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer and in the other an article on crime prevention by Nochem S. Winnet.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts appearing in the Chicago Tribune May 17.

DEWEY AND STASSEN DEBATE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, last evening you may have had the opportunity to listen to the two young giants who are aspiring to the Presidency of the United States. If so, you would have observed that the one who had the affirmative of the issue, That the Communist Party should be outlawed," did not state how that could be successfully accomplished under our Constitution, but limited his remarks to an approval of that portion of the so-called Mundt bill which would prohibit the establishment in this country of a totalitarian dictatorship under the control of a foreign nation by any person or group of persons. He very properly stated that the other portions of the bill with reference to restrictions upon individual actions should be modified. His opponent, who had the negative of the issue, then very cleverly brought forth that the Mundt bill did not attempt to outlaw the Communist Party, and while he intimated that the present laws would accomplish the main objective sought by the passage of that bill, he did not disclose his position thereon in any way. It is unfortunate that neither aspirant possesses the frankness and candor that has been exhibited by Members of Congress who are known to desire occupancy in the well-known house at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It surely appears that active participation and leadership in Congress constitutes the best proving ground for the test of the knowledge, capability, and trustworthiness of one who would occupy that exalted position.

VETERANS' HOMESTEAD HOUSING BILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, some members have questioned whether individual home units can be constructed under the recently reported veterans' homestead bill, which is an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. The answer is emphatically yes. Not only can they be constructed by the individual associations, but I believe they will be constructed at a price much below that of current offerings.

It will work something like this: The veteran—urban or rural—will ask his association to build a house for him; the house will be built according to his plans and specifications; the association will carry the necessary charges and arrange for the construction loan, and all the other necessary expenses until the house is completed. Thus, the house will be built according to the desires of the individual veteran; he will have the saving resulting from group building, and will not have to borrow money for a construction loan. I submit these are very real advantages and savings for the individual veteran purchaser.

When he has accepted the house, the veteran then must obtain his financing the same as any other veteran who wishes to participate under the GI bill of rights—under present law the interest rate cannot exceed 4 percent for such financing and by purchasing through an association the loan could be amortized over a 32-year period. This feature is one of the strongest parts of the veterans' homestead housing bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper statements.

Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and in one to include an article entitled "The Trade Agreement Act Must Be Renewed," by Hon. W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, from the Democratic Digest of April 1948, and in the other to include a copy of a letter dated May 4, 1948, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means by Mr. Gerard Swope, chairman, Citizens Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, enclosing a statement by Hon. Cordell Hull in support of the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, Americans were as amazed as was the rest of

the world when President Truman turned another political somersault and recognized the abortive state of Israel. On the front page of the New York Times of Sunday, a British Foreign Office spokesman is quoted as saying:

There is no need to hurry * * * there is no election in this country until 1950.

Even foreigners know that our President has delivered another body blow to United Nations and has probably jeopardized the peace of the world, primarily to secure the votes of some 3,000,000 Jews in the city of New York. We have made fools of ourselves again. Does anybody know what our foreign policy is? Can any nation trust in our sincerity? Are we to continue to play Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in foreign affairs? Have we become morally and spiritually bankrupt? A nation can recover from Pearl Harbors, terrible as they may be. A nation cannot recover from a complete loss of honor and integrity. We are surrendering to communism in one-half of the world while pretending to fight it in the other half.

Unless America awakens at once, her best sons will soon be spilling their innocent blood in the sands of the un-Holy Land. Americans should cry out against the political prostitution that is bringing us upon such evil days.

FOOD-CONSERVATION PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Members to a phase of the food-conservation program of the Department of Agriculture. This program is a simple approach to encourage voluntary measures on the part of consumers which will conserve food and, at the same time, stabilize or help reduce the cost of living. I want to emphasize that so far the plan is merely an experimental test, and is in response to a statute enacted last year in which the Department was called upon to encourage voluntary measures which will increase our utilization of food.

I am proud of the fact that the Department has selected Pennsylvania for this test, and the selection of York and Lancaster is a compliment to those communities. One reason for this was the fact that the people living there have an established reputation for their ability to carefully manage food, and also a reputation of sturdy, practical, Americanism, and thrift.

As of now 1,500 retail food stores are cooperating, and after the first week's trial, the local chairman of the communities had this to say, among other things:

It gives us great satisfaction to report the apparent success of this test. This is most gratifying to the men in the food supply business.

Further quoting from these chairmen:

It also helps farmers by providing a more stable market for their produce. Our farmers in York and Lancaster can be assisted

directly by finding a bigger market for their produce, especially those in plentiful supply.

If the Dutch farmers of Pennsylvania, the consumers, known to be frugal and economical in their food consumption, and the conservative retail food stores businessmen all approve of the plan after further continuing tests, it can then be expanded to other communities throughout the country which desire it.

The Congress was wise to pass the act. The Agriculture Department is to be commended for adopting a test program, and Pennsylvania and the Lancaster and York areas are to be congratulated on being selected for this wholesome attack on the shortage of food supplies. I might add that the Department estimates that a family's food budget can be cut by at least 10 percent, and perhaps as much as 30 percent on meat costs alone.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

PRESIDENT TRUMAN RECOGNIZES ISRAEL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to commend and congratulate the President of the United States on his great, honorable, and statesmanlike deed in recognizing the new Jewish state of Israel. I think he has gained the gratitude of a majority of the people in this country, regardless of race, religion, or creed because he is recognizing a state which is a true democracy and which eventually will be developed into one of the really great democracies in that part of the world, where democracy is all too rare. I would like as well to congratulate the new President of Israel, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, and Mr. David Ben-Gurion, Moshe Shertok, and all those other men and women who through the years, with blood, sweat, and tears, brought about the realization of a Jewish state—which the Jews of the world have been awaiting for over 2,000 years. We hope the new Jewish state will grow and prosper, just as America did from its birth in 1776, and will eventually become one of the great democracies, just as our beloved country has grown to become the greatest democracy in the world.

Mr. Speaker, without in any way detracting from the nobility of the President's prompt action and without depreciating the gratitude we feel, I must point out that there remains much to be done before this new nation, struggling for stability in a hostile world, can stand alone.

Before anything else, the defenseless Jews in Israel must have weapons of defense.

The one-sided arms embargo to the Middle East, which I am convinced was imposed by State and National Defense Department officials opposed to the President's policies, must be lifted. It has operated to keep the Jews without

weapons, while the Arabs are armed by the British.

The new state will need funds with which to operate, and the simplest and best way is to obtain loans and credits from the United States.

I hope that Members of the House will lend to this project every possible support. Such credits will be safe and sound investments from every point of view—social, economic, political, and financial.

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

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

There was no objection?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's recognition of the new Republic of Israel could hardly be called a body blow to the United Nations as was charged by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]. On the contrary, that statesmanlike decision gave flesh and blood and sinew to the body of the United Nations decision, that historic decision of November 29 last, which declared for the partition of Palestine. Israel's cup of happiness was overflowing on Saturday when the declaration of independence was sounded by the voice of Premier David Ben-Gurion from Tel-Aviv, and rejoicing reached fever pitch with the announcement of the President that the new de facto state had been recognized. That action of the President was quite consistent with American tradition. How could we, who have so zealously guarded and protected our independence for over 150 years, deny that independence to the Jews who sought it for 2,000 years? Indeed, the decision of the President was as refreshing as a cool breeze in the heat of summer, and his recognition will be followed by the recognition of many more nations. There will indeed be a queue of nations gladly bestowing recognition of the new state composed of a brave people. I hope the President will follow up his recognition with the according to Israel of belligerent rights to the end that the arms embargo be lifted, so that these valiant people will be given the wherewithal to defend themselves against unlawful marauders and guerillas from neighboring Arab states.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he delivered at Memphis, Tenn.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN RECOGNIZES ISRAEL

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I too, want to add my congratulations and words of commendation to the President of the United States for his prompt and

speedy recognition of the new democratic state in the Middle East, Israel. This recognition has been bought by the blood of patriotic men who have served in the wastes of North Africa in World War II fighting the Nazis under Rommel. It was bought by the blood of Jewish volunteers who fought on the side of the allies against the Turks in World War I. The Jewish people of Palestine were the allies of the democracies, both in World War I and World War II, and in the recognition of Israel, we have fulfilled the pledge which was given in the League of Nations mandate that the Jews should have a national home eventually in Palestine. I confidently believe that we have fulfilled the promise contained in holy writ and a sacred prophecy has come true, that again Palestine would be given to the Jews, and that they would have a land of their own. We can look forward to cooperation from the new state of Israel in the fight against communism, because anyone who knows anything about Zionism knows that it is a religious movement. It is a movement of people who believe in the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It is not atheistic. It is a movement which believes also in political democracy. Therefore, we will have their cooperation in any possible war of the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Pennsylvania Farmer entitled, "Cure for Communism," by J. A. Boak.

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

Mr. HAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on labor unions.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent from the city of Seattle supporting the Mundt bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Milton H. Button, director of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Wisconsin, addressed to Senator MILLIKIN, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

SAVING FOOD

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] concerning the food-saving plan now in progress in York and Lancaster Counties, Pa., the Department told me last week that every farmer's stall in the markets would have one of their placards on display in the Saturday markets. I went into the

markets and did not find a single one there. The people ought to know that the Department has five or six men up there in the district, and will keep them there for 2 weeks, to make a report on the progress of their food-saving program, and that the report was written before they ever started the program. If I write a report it will be quite different from one already written down in the Department.

In the chain stores where the cards appeared, urging the people to make the best buys, they are featuring such things as California products, citrus fruit, and so on.

They do not mention Pennsylvania apples, which are home grown and priced off the market. They are not doing a thing to help agriculture or to help the housewives. They are featuring certain commodities in large supply not at reduced prices. Some of the commodities are cheap because they are the cheap kind. They are simply trying to unload a lot of surpluses which have been created by subsidies paid to certain farmers. And the same price supports continue which mean greater production next year for the taxpayers to pay for. The whole thing is phony and it ought to be exposed. One of my local newspapers has asked the Associated Press to get them the story from this end. He was given the story, which was a statement of fact, but when it appeared in his paper it was greatly distorted. They were unethical enough to change the Associated Press story before printing it. The Department agents, now vacationing in York and Lancaster, should be doing productive labor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross] has expired.

COMMUNISM

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the membership a letter which I have inserted in the Appendix from Mr. Milton H. Button, director of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Wisconsin, which I think the Members will find interesting and educational.

In the remainder of my 1 minute I would like to bring to you a poem which appeared in one of the newspapers in my district. An amateur poet wrote it, I am sure, but it is interesting.

HI, JOE

Oh, the Commies are a funny lot
And capable of every stunt,
But if you want to get them hot
Just mention that guy, MUNDY.

One enviable trick they have is this—
They double talk from both the corners
Of their mouths, while in between they hiss;
Simultaneously being revilers and mourners.

Our Constitution they agree,
Is old, out dated, mythical.
They scorn it to a high degree
In terms that seem unethical.

But when the going's getting tough—

What is their cry? It's quite conventional.
Yes, when MUNDY or others make it rough,
The Commies yell, "Unconstitutional!"
—Allay Tea.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein an address by Dr. Warren H. Leonard, of Denver, Colo., on agricultural problems in the administration of the Marshall plan in Europe.

AIR POWER

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was highly gratifying to me when the Congress recognized in its recent actions the overwhelming necessity for this country to have a powerful air force. The momentous decision in passing the 70-group air forces bill marks a major milestone of progress in building a modern bulwark of defense for this country.

Air power is our first line of defense—and our last. There can be no substitute to being powerful defensively in the air. In the present necessity, there can be no middle ground and no compromise. We cannot gamble with the security of this Nation. To do so, is to flirt with disaster.

In passing this important measure, Congress has translated the determination of this country to remain secure from attack into forceful action to assure that protection.

This so-called peace that we are trying to enjoy after 4 years of war is a timid and precarious peace. It is an unhealthy peace. We cannot say that we have moved away from the lighted keg—or that the fuse to the dynamite has been snuffed out.

Even with the usual secrecy that surrounds any nation's preparations for military action, we have already been appraised of some of the steps which others are taking in a purely militaristic way. We can assume that there is much more going on about which we do not have specific information.

We know that we are not the only nation who is attempting to build the atom bomb, and we can only hope that their industry along that line is not being blessed with a great degree of progress. When the war ended, the people of this country were ready to forge its swords into plowshares and believed that other nations held similar hopes of lasting peace. Toward that end, we allowed our powerful air force to be virtually scuttled, so that there is little left to reflect its past glory, and what is left is almost obsolete. In Russia, because its course was clearly and unmistakably one of aggression, and in larger and larger doses, air power was not allowed to dis-

integrate. Indeed, it seems to have been increased. In other military fields we have been told that Russia is continuing to build a strong war machine.

As we go about our daily jobs we should never forget that this great Nation has enemies. These enemies would not hesitate to bring death to millions in this country.

We can prevent this by one means, and one means only. The prevention is national preparedness. Our national defenses, both for our military forces and for our civilians, must be so strong that no nation on earth would dare point a hostile finger. A strong air force is a major step in that direction.

We cannot build an air force overnight. It takes years to put a plane in the air. Despite the thrilling spectacle of the mighty planes our Air Force put into the skies during the war, we did not have a single craft that was not started before we got into the conflict. It can readily be seen how urgent is the necessity to act immediately in order to feel safe 5 years from now.

Congress has acted with forethought in voting out the bill to set up a 70-group air force. We have been told that a force of that size is too big for our needs. But only 4,200 planes will be built under this measure. When I think of the warning that has been given to us by President Truman's Air Policy Commission, I am inclined to think we are being too economical even with 70 groups. The Commission, I am sure you will recall, warned some time ago that this country would be in serious danger of an atomic attack after December 31, 1952, less than 5 years away. That Commission has also warned that this country will need a starter atom defense air force of more than 20,000 planes of the most modern type.

Under such a prospect, how can this country fail to provide an air arm of at least reasonable strength. It has been said that this 70-group air force would be the cheapest insurance that this country can buy. I agree 100 percent and fervently hope that this Nation will continue to stay awake to the dangers that exist in the world and will face them squarely and with determination to keep ourselves strong while we pray for peace. We cannot afford complacency.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AND RUSSIAN PUBLICATIONS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have long been critical of the Library of Congress, and my criticism has been based upon the fact that they do not render proper service to Members of Congress, but they do enormous numbers of other things that should not be done. My criticism has resulted from my own careful review of their works.

They have just started, in April of 1948, a new publication entitled "Monthly List of Russian Accessions." I have that

document here before me listing about 400 different volumes that they have taken on. That will be very convenient for the Commies to examine. Is not that nice? When the Congress is trying to meet its responsibilities to maintain the United States and has under consideration a bill like the Mundt bill to keep them in line, keep them from doing damage, to have that creature of the Congress cutting this kind of caper.

Frankly, I am unable to read it, because I do not understand Russian, but I am calling it to the attention of the House in the hope that some of our numerous Russian scholars here on the floor will give it a quick reading and advise me as to whether or not they consider it of value to the membership.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the full minute.

In the light of the remarks that have just been made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, may I make the suggestion to him that his committee recommend to the House the appropriation of a reasonable amount of money to provide for the burning of the books. That would be in consonance both with the Mundt bill and with the remarks made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the confusion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], which he manifests over the Russian language pamphlets issued by the Library of Congress. There are many other reasons why he should be confused.

Having read Candidate TART's speech night before last advocating the sending of an armed force to Palestine, which seemed to have the ring of Onward Christian Soldiers; having read the exchange of interviews between Henry Wallace and Joe Stalin on international affairs; and having witnessed the mental somersaults which the President turned overnight in recognizing Palestine, I too became confused.

That confusion was intensified last night as I listened to the oratorical dog-fall between Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and ex-Gov. Harold Stassen, of Minnesota. When debate wound up you could not tell Dewey's moustache from Stassen's eyebrows.

Having gone through all that I can appreciate the confusion of my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. TABER].

Of course, this Russian language document issued by the Library of Congress adds to that confusion.

It all reminds me of the words of a very able colored preacher down at home, who went off to a regional church meeting and came back with some long words in his vocabulary. One was "status quo." He got up and told the congregation that he was glad to find everything in "status quo." It disturbed the congregation to hear him using such language, and after the service one of the brethren took him aside and asked him: "Pahson, what does this here thing status quo mean?"

"Well," said the preacher, "that is the kind of language we educated preachers use. What it really means is, you is in a helluvafix."

I just want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that with these communistic documents published in Russia and coming out of the Library of Congress, together with what has happened in the last 48 hours, all adds up to the fact that we are getting into a "helluvafix."

ISRAEL

Mr. ISACSON. 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. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday night I stood on the lawn of the Jewish Agency in Washington. And, as the hands of time crept beyond the hour of 6, heralding the new day of May 15 in Israel, a proud new flag fluttered forth from the gleaming white building. It was the flag of Israel, the blue and the white and the Mogen David.

And as the brave new flag furled out into the breeze proclaiming the new Jewish state, joyously we burst into the Hatikvah. The Jewish state, dream of twenty centuries, was a reality.

A few moments later came the second fateful news: The new state of Israel had been recognized by our Government.

Now the celebration really began; there was dancing and singing and everywhere could be heard the word "Mazelto, Mazelto."

Yes, Mazelto.

Mazelto to the heroic defenders of the Yishov whose courage and gallantry and sacrifice defy even now the combined armies of Transjordan and Egypt and Syria and all the other Arab nations which would infest Israel like a devastating pestilence.

Mazelto to the thousands of Jews interned as displaced persons in concentration camps in Europe, the skeletal remnants of our proud people who survived the crematoria and lime pits of the Nazi terror.

Mazelto to the delegates of the United Nations, the delegates of Poland and Norway and Guatemala and the Soviet Union who never for a single moment wavered in their steadfast support of the partition plan which created the basis for the Jewish state.

Mazelto to you, the people of America, Jew and Christian, white and black. For it was you by your united and determined outcry against the infamy of betrayal who forced our country to honor its

pledged word. It was you who defeated the treacherous, traitorous, and treasonable forces who would have sold our national honor as well as world peace for a few barrels of Arab oil.

Mazelto for all, yes. But we must keep on fighting. This is no time to relax our vigilance.

For myself I shall continue my fight until the American embargo against the shipment of arms to Israel is lifted, until the Security Council notifies the Arab League that it will not tolerate any invasion of Israel, until the whole truth of what is happening in Palestine is made known.

To that end, it is generally known that I have received my passport to go to Palestine. The British did not grant me a visa. I am applying for that visa to the new provisional government of Israel.

I salute the new Jewish state.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the President's recognition of the provisional government of Palestine as the de facto government on May 14 represents not only a major contribution to the cause of Hebrew freedom and national self-determination, but is a most encouraging forward step toward world peace. I am firmly convinced that this step is in complete accordance with America's traditional foreign policy, and with the ideals of the United Nations, and I take this opportunity to commend the President and to declare my full support of this decision. I am confident that this decisive, positive action taken by President Truman has the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people, as well as the millions of people the world over, who today pray and hope for peace.

However, the Jewish people's struggle for national independence is not over. The Arab armies of Egypt, Transjordan, Syria, and Iraq are attacking, and the new state of Israel is today fighting for its life. Artillery shells and bombs are falling in the city of Jerusalem, and the army of Israel is fighting in defense of the Holy Land on many fronts. Positive steps by the United States and the United Nations to implement the establishment of the new state are now in order.

In my opinion, the next logical steps needed to guarantee the continued existence of Israel should be:

First. The United States should immediately exchange diplomatic representatives with Israel, and urge all nations which have extended recognition to do the same;

Second. The United States should lift the arms embargo against Israel to permit the new state to purchase arms for the purpose of equipping its army to check Arab aggression;

Third. The United States should grant financial assistance and credit to Israel

for the purchase of arms, and for the economic reconstruction and development of that country; and

Fourth. The United States representatives to the Security Council of the United Nations should exert all possible influence to obtain a UN decision to halt Arab attacks. The Security Council should declare the aggressive warfare of the Arab states to be a breach of the peace and a threat to world peace. If necessary, UN sanctions should be applied, even to the extent of using force to expel Arab armies from the soil of Israel.

It is my hope that actions along these lines may soon be forthcoming. Such steps would be the logical sequence of United States recognition of Israel, and our new policy on Palestine. Such steps are necessary to enable the long-suffering Jewish people to long-last realize their goal of national independence.

MR. PRESIDENT, MANY, MANY THANKS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, in the city of New York, we celebrated I-Am-An-American Day. In connection with that celebration the Reverend William C. Kernan had this to say:

In the face of so much Communist propaganda designed to make us disparage all things American, we need, on this "I-Am-An-American Day," the encouragement which arises from realizing how mightily America has wrought for human freedom in the past, how bravely and effectively America fights for freedom in this living present.

Mr. Speaker, in consonance with those remarks, I take this time to congratulate our President for his speedy action in recognizing a new democracy in the Middle East, the Republic of Israel, which I am sure will go far toward spreading democracy through that part of the world and will also be a credit to the democracies of the world.

Similarly, I cannot let this moment go by without extolling the courage of our President in promptly after recognizing the new state, instructing our delegation to the United Nations to urge upon the UN immediate action looking toward the restoration of peace in the Middle East.

I am confident that our President will follow these two courageous steps with a third, to wit, the lifting of the embargo on arms to the Republic of Israel, so that it may aid the UN in restoring peace.

Mr. President, on behalf of one-half million people living in my congressional district—many, many thanks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

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

Appendix of the RECORD and include a poem.

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

INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPOSITION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 384 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Industrial Exposition, Inc., an international exposition, to be held at Atlantic City, N. J., from June 26 to September 11, 1948, inclusive, by the International Industrial Exposition, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the said exhibition, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said exposition to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the International Industrial Exposition, Inc., a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this Act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisal, release,

or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the International Industrial Exposition, Inc., a corporation, to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C. 1940 edition, title 19, sec. 1524).

The House joint resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY FREE IMPORTATION OF LEAD

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6489) to provide for the temporary free importation of lead.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the import duties imposed under paragraphs 391 and 392 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on lead-bearing ores, fine dust, and mattes of all kinds, lead bullion or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead dross, reclaimed lead, scrap lead, antimonial lead, and antimonial scrap lead shall not apply with respect to imports entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning with the day following the date of the enactment of this act and ending with the close of June 30, 1949.

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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered recently in Boston.

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

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1878) to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 7, strike out "persons" and insert "aliens."

Amend the title so as to read as follows: "An act to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of aliens who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5193) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "is serving or."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "World War II" and insert "during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "are serving or."

Page 3, strike out lines 6, 7, and 8.

Page 3, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive.

Page 3, line 13, strike out "(6)" and insert "(4)."

Page 3, line 20, strike out "(7)" and insert "(5)."

Page 4, line 2, strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)."

Page 4, line 6, strike out "is serving or."

Page 4, line 8, strike out "World War II" and insert "during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946."

Page 4, line 9, strike out "(8)" and insert "(6)."

Page 4, line 15, strike out "World War II" and insert "during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946."

Page 4, line 17, strike out "(9)" and insert "(7)."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3219) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or official of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him may appoint uniformed guards of said Agency as special policemen without additional compensation for duty in connection with the policing of public buildings and other areas under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency. Such special policemen shall have the same powers as sheriffs and constables upon such Federal property to enforce the laws enacted for the protection of persons and property,

and to prevent breaches of the peace, to suppress affrays or unlawful assemblies, and to enforce any rules and regulations made and promulgated by the Administrator or such duly authorized officials of the Federal Works Agency for the property under their jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the jurisdiction and policing powers of such special policemen shall not extend to the service of civil process and shall be restricted to Federal property over which the United States has acquired exclusive or concurrent criminal jurisdiction.

"Sec. 2. The Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him are hereby authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for the Government of the Federal property under their charge and control, and to annex to such rules and regulations such reasonable penalties, within the limits prescribed in section 4 of this act, as will insure their enforcement: *Provided*, That such rules and regulations shall be posted and kept posted in a conspicuous place on such Federal property.

"Sec. 3. Upon the application of the head of any department or agency of the United States having property of the United States under its administration and control and over which the United States has acquired exclusive or concurrent criminal jurisdiction, the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him are authorized to detail any such special policemen for the protection of such property and if he deems it desirable, to extend to such property the applicability of any such regulations and to enforce the same as herein set forth; and the Federal Works Administrator or official of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him, whenever it is deemed economical and in the public interest, may utilize the facilities and services of existing Federal law-enforcement agencies, and, with the consent of any State or local agency, the facilities and services of such State or local law-enforcement agencies.

"Sec. 4. Whoever shall violate any rule or regulation promulgated pursuant to section 2 of this act shall be fined not more than \$50 or imprisoned not more than 30 days, or both."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC AIRPORT IN ALASKA

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3510) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "operate", insert "improve."

Page 1, line 6, after "Alaska", insert "a public airport."

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "such place as he may deem most appropriate" and insert "or near Anchorage and."

Page 1, line 7, after "airport", insert "at or near Fairbanks."

Page 2, line 9, after "maintenance", insert "improvement."

Page 2, line 10, strike out all after "said" down to and including "acres" in line 12 and insert "airports."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

Page 2, after line 20, insert:

"The Administrator is authorized to construct any public highways or bridges from the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks to whatever airport locations may be selected. Upon completion said highways and bridges shall be transferred to the Territory of Alaska without charge and thereafter be maintained by the Territory."

Page 2, line 22, after "maintenance", insert "improvement."

Page 2, line 23, strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

Page 3, line 9, strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

Page 3, line 13, strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

Page 3, line 14, strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

Page 4, line 5, after "maintenance", insert "improvement."

Page 4, line 6, strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

Page 4, line 18, strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$13,000,000."

Page 4, line 22, after "maintenance", insert "improvement."

Page 5, line 1, strike out "airport" and insert "airports."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 656)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 4 (b) (6) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, there is transmitted herewith the first special report on the operations and policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, covering the first 2 years of operations of these institutions.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 1948.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AIR MAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2588) requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of a city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service, to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a rule has been granted on this bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2286) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILES BY CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4007) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 332 (A) OF THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5886) to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ARKANSAS-MISSISSIPPI BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3915) to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the second paragraph of section 7 of the act entitled "An Act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939 (53 Stat. 747), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The present Commission of 6 members shall remain intact and, in addition thereto, the Secretary of Agriculture shall appoint 12 members, 6 of whom shall be residents

and citizens of the State of Mississippi, and 6 residents and citizens of the State of Arkansas."

SEC. 2. The times for commencing and completing the construction of such bridge are hereby further extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from the date of the enactment of this act.

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

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the second paragraph of section 7 of the act entitled 'An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes', approved May 17, 1939 (53 Stat. 747), as amended, is hereby amended to provide that 'Federal Works Administrator' shall be substituted for 'Secretary of Agriculture' wherever the latter term appears in said paragraph and that the membership of the Commission created by section 7 of said act shall be increased to 18 by the appointment of 12 additional members, 6 of said additional members to be residents and citizens of the State of Mississippi, and the other 6 to be residents and citizens of the State of Arkansas."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ORIGINAL JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 127) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection.

EXPERIMENT STATION IN APPALACHIAN REGION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5153) to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Appalachian region for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on May 3 this bill was passed over on the calendar without prejudice. I understand the doubts of the gentleman who asked that it be passed over have now been satisfied by an amendment drawn by the author of the bill, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS], and I shall offer that amendment at the proper time.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is authorized and directed to establish, equip, and maintain an experiment station in the Appalachian region to

conduct researches and investigations on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas. Such station shall be planned as a center for information and assistance in matters pertaining to conserving resources for national defense; to the more efficient production, processing and refining, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas in the Appalachian region; and other matters relating to problems of the petroleum and natural-gas industries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act the Secretary is authorized and directed to cooperate with other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, States, and State agencies and institutions, counties, municipalities, business or other organizations, corporations, associations, universities, scientific societies, and individuals, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe. The Secretary, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, may receive and accept money and property, real or personal, or interests therein, and services, as a gift, bequest, or contribution. Any money so received shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a special fund or funds for disbursement by the Bureau of Mines, and shall remain available for the purposes for which received and accepted until expended.

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of (a) \$1,000,000 for the erection and equipment of a building or buildings, including plumbing, lighting, heating, general service, and experimental equipment and apparatus, the necessary roads, walks, and ground improvement, and land for the site of the station if the land is not donated; and (b) \$500,000 annually for the maintenance and operation of the experiment station, including personal services, supplies, equipment, and expenses of travel and subsistence.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM: On page 1, strike out the entire section 1, beginning on line 1, and substitute the following:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is authorized and directed to establish, equip, and maintain an experiment station in the Appalachian region to conduct researches and investigations on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas produced in such region. Such station shall be planned as a center for information and assistance in matters pertaining to conserving petroleum, natural gas, or their products for national defense, to aid the more efficient production, processing and refining, and utilization of petroleum and natural gas, and other matters relating to problems of the petroleum and natural-gas industries in the Appalachian region."

The amendment was 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.

COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT FUND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5901) to provide for the distribution among the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming of the receipts of the Colorado River Development Fund for use in the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, on a basis which is as nearly equal as practicable and to make available other funds for the investigation and construction of projects in any of

the States of the Colorado River Basin in addition to appropriation for said purposes from the Colorado River Development Fund.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (d) of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 43, sec. 618a (d)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) Transfer, subject to the provisions of section 3 hereof, from the Colorado River Dam Fund to a special fund in the Treasury, hereby established and designated the 'Colorado River Development Fund', of the sum of \$500,000 for the year of operation ending May 31, 1938, and the like sum of \$500,000 for each year of operation thereafter, until and including the year of operation ending May 31, 1987. The transfer of the said sum of \$500,000 for each year of operation shall be made on or before July 31 next following the close of the year of operation for which it is made: *Provided*, That any such transfer for any year of operation which shall have ended at the time this section 2 (d) shall become effective shall be made, without interest, from revenues received in the Colorado River Dam Fund, as expeditiously as administration of this act will permit, and without readvances from the general funds of the Treasury. Receipts of the Colorado River Development Fund for the years of operation ending in 1938, 1939, and 1940 (or in the event of reduced receipts during any of said years, due to adjustments under section 3 hereof, then the first receipts of said fund up to \$1,500,000), are authorized to be appropriated only for the continuation and extension, under the direction of the Secretary, of studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation for the formulation of a comprehensive plan for the utilization of waters of the Colorado River system for irrigation, electrical power, and other purposes, in the States of the upper division and the States of the lower division, including studies of quantity and quality of water and all other relevant factors. The next such receipts up to and including the receipts for the year of operation ending in 1955 are authorized to be appropriated only for the investigation and construction of projects for such utilization in and equitably distributed among the four States of the upper division: *Provided, however*, That in view of distributions heretofore made, and in order to expedite the development and utilization of water projects within all of the States of the upper division, the distribution of such funds for use in the fiscal years 1949 to 1955, inclusive, shall be on a basis which is as nearly equal as practicable. Such receipts for the years of operation ending in 1956 to 1987, inclusive, are authorized to be appropriated for the investigation and construction of projects for such utilization in and equitably distributed among the States of the upper division and the States of the lower division. The terms 'Colorado River system', 'States of the upper division', and 'States of the lower division' as so used shall have the respective meanings defined in the Colorado River compact mentioned in the project act. Such projects shall be only such as are found by the Secretary to be physically feasible, economically justified, and consistent with such formulation of a comprehensive plan. Nothing in this act shall be construed so as to prevent the authorization and construction of any such projects prior to the completion of said plan of comprehensive development; nor shall this act be construed as affecting the right of any State to proceed independently of this act or its provisions with the investigation or construction of any project or projects. Transfers under this section 2 (d) shall be deemed contractual obligations of the United States,

subject to the provisions of section 8 of this act."

Sec. 2. The availability of appropriations from the Colorado River development fund for the investigation and construction of projects in any of the States of the Colorado River Basin shall not be held to forbid the expenditure of other funds for those purposes in any of those States where such funds are otherwise available therefor.

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.

COMPENSATING SWITZERLAND FOR WORLD WAR II DAMAGES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1605) to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed \$12,000,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by the United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3194) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LANGLADE COUNTY, WIS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6113) to transfer certain land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the written consent of the majority of directors, Wisconsin Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to convey, grant, transfer, and quitclaim forthwith to the United States, for subsequent administration as a part of the Nicolet National Forest and subject to the rules and regulations applicable to national-forest lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended, all right, title, claim, interest, equity, and estate in and to the following-described lands administered by the Secretary as trustee, under an agreement of transfer dated May 16, 1937, with the Wisconsin Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, and situated in the county of Langlade, State of Wisconsin, together with the improvements thereon and the rights and the appurtenances thereunto belonging or appertaining: Township 33 north, range 9 east, fourth principal meridian, section 16, northwest quarter, north half northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, and north half south half; section 17, northeast quarter; section 22, east half northwest quarter.

Sec. 2. The Chief of the Forest Service is hereby directed to utilize, insofar as practicable, the property transferred pursuant to this act as an experimental and demonstration forest. Such use is found to be in the general interest of rural rehabilitation.

Sec. 3. Any such transfer shall not be deemed to impose any liability upon the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to his obligation under such agreement to transfer of May 16, 1937.

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 TITLE I OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6114) to amend title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the interest rate on title I loans, to provide for the redemption of non-delinquent insured mortgages, to authorize advances for the preservation and protection of the insured loan security, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sections of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, are hereby amended as follows:

Sec. 1. Amend subsection (b) (2) of section 3 to read:

"(2) provide for the payment of interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at the rate of 4 percent per annum;"

Sec. 2. Amend subsection (c) (4) of section 12 to read:

"(4) the mortgage instruments shall comply with section 3 (b), except that the base rate of interest shall be 3 percent per annum;"

Sec. 3. Amend subsection (e) (1) of section 12 to read:

"The Secretary shall collect from the mortgagor for mortgage insurance an annual charge at the rate of 1 percent of the outstanding principal obligation of the mortgage; the initial charge shall be collected simultaneously with the insurance of the mortgage and shall cover the period from the date of loan closing to the date of the first installment payable on the loan; the next and each succeeding charge shall be computed on the outstanding principal obligation remaining unpaid after the due date of each installment payable on the loan, and shall be payable on or before the next succeeding due date of an installment of principal and interest. If the principal obligation of the mortgage is paid in full in less than 5 years after the time when the mortgage was entered into, the Secretary may require payment by the mortgagor of the entire annual charge computed for the year then current, and an additional charge equal to the annual charge for such year. The Secretary may modify existing contracts so as to require future payments thereunder in accordance with the provisions of this section."

Sec. 4. Amend subsection (f) of section 12 by striking out subsections (2) and (3), and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections (2), (3), and (4).

"(2) If the mortgagor has failed to pay to the Secretary the full amount of any installment on or before the due date thereof, the Secretary shall pay promptly the unpaid amount of such installment of principal and interest to the mortgagee, less the amount of any previous prepayments except payments from proceeds from the voluntary or involuntary sale of any part of the mortgaged property or from royalties from leases under which the value of the security is depreciated.

"(3) If the mortgagor fails to pay any amounts due for taxes, special assessments, water rates, and other amounts which may become liens prior to the mortgage, and any

amounts due for property insurance premiums, such amounts may be paid by the Secretary, either before or after assignment of the insured mortgage to the Secretary for the account of the mortgagor as provided in paragraph (4) below.

"(4) Payments by the Secretary under paragraphs (2) and (3) shall be advanced out of the funds for the account of the mortgagor. Such advances shall be repaid to the fund out of the first available collections received from the mortgagor. Such advances shall bear interest at the rate fixed in the insured mortgage payable out of any subsequent collections, and, until repaid, the advance and interest thereon shall be added to subsequent installments."

SEC. 5. Amend section 12 by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (j).

"(j) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements from time to time with the holder of a mortgage heretofore or hereafter insured under this title that any holder thereof, at the holder's option, shall be entitled, upon assignment of such mortgage to the Secretary within 1 year after the expiration of a period fixed by such agreement, to have the mortgage purchased by the Secretary even though the mortgage is not then in default, provided the initial fixed period shall be not less than 5 years from the date of the insured mortgage. Such assignment shall be accomplished in the same manner and the value of such mortgage shall be determined on the same basis as provided by section 13 for mortgages in default. The Secretary may purchase any such mortgage with moneys in the fund and may sell it at its value likewise determined in accordance with section 13 at the time he sells it, and reinsure it, if necessary, or he may retain it for the account of the fund until the indebtedness is discharged through refinancing by the mortgagor, by foreclosure, or otherwise. The value of all such mortgages retained for the fund as here-in provided shall not be included in computing the aggregate amount of mortgage obligations that may be insured in any one fiscal year, as provided in section 12 (b). If there should not be sufficient cash in the fund to enable the Secretary to make payments to purchase mortgages as provided in this subsection, in order to obtain funds to make such payments notes may be issued and purchased in the same manner as provided in section 13."

SEC. 6. Amend subsection (a) of section 14 by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "Expenses and fees incident to foreclosure may be advanced out of the fund for the account of the mortgagor."

SEC. 7. Amend subsection (b) of section 14 to read:

"(b) Amounts realized under section 51 on account of property which was subject to an insured mortgage shall be deposited in the fund. Amounts payable by the Secretary under section 50 with respect to such property, and any necessary costs and expenditures for the operation, preservation, and protection of such property, shall be paid out of the fund."

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 VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5508) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such Act to certain mothers of veterans.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) clause (5) of section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "and were widows at the time of the

death or disability of their ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter."

(b) Clause (6) of section 2 of such Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "(B) the mother was divorced or legally separated from the father of said ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter, and (C) said ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter is the only child of said mother", and inserting in lieu thereof "and (B) the mother was divorced or legally separated from the father of said ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1 strike out beginning with line 7 through line 14 and insert the following:

"(b) Clause (6) of section 2 of such Act, as amended, is amended by striking out '(B) The mother was divorced or legally separated from the father of said ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter, and (C) said ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter is the only child of said mother,' and inserting in lieu thereof '(B) The mother was divorced or separated from the father of said ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter, and (C) the mother has not remarried.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5960) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDING THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6116) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 33. No return may be made pursuant to section 9 or 32 unless notice of claim has been filed: (a) in the case of any property or interest acquired by the United States prior to December 18, 1941, by August 9, 1948; or (b) in the case of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941, by July 31, 1949, or 2 years from the vesting of the property or interest in respect of which the claim is made, whichever is later. No suit pursuant to section 9 may be instituted after August 9, 1948, or after the expiration of 2 years from the date of the seizure by or vesting in the Alien Property Custodian, as the case may be, of the property or interest in respect of which relief is sought, whichever is later, but in computing such 2 years there shall be excluded any period during which there was pending a suit or claim for return pursuant to section 9 or 32 (a) hereof."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 8, after the comma insert "whichever is later."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

INLAND WATERWAYS CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5318) to provide for the continuation of the transportation services of the Inland Waterways Corp., for the disposition of its property and other interests, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4964) to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) any letter carrier or clerk in the postal service entitled as a preference eligible to 10 points under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, in addition to his earned rating who, on or after the date of enactment of this act, transfers from the position of letter carrier to that of clerk or from the position of clerk to that of letter carrier, as the case may be, shall not incur loss of seniority by reason of such transfer if, within 30 days after such transfer, he presents to the Civil Service Commission evidence satisfactory to the Commission that such transfer was necessitated principally by reason of a disability which he received on active duty in the armed forces of the United States.

(b) Any such letter carrier or clerk who, prior to the date of enactment of this act, has transferred from the position of letter carrier to that of clerk or from the position of clerk to that of letter carrier, as the case may be, and has incurred loss of seniority by reason of such transfer, shall be restored the seniority to which he would have been entitled if such transfer had not occurred if he presents to the Civil Service Commission evidence satisfactory to the Commission that such transfer was necessitated principally by reason of a disability which he received on active duty in the armed forces of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 15, add the following: "(c) No regular employee shall be reduced to substitute status to accord the benefits of this act to another employee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PROMOTING MINING OF POTASH ON PUBLIC DOMAIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1050) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of potash on the public domain," approved February 7, 1947, 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 dis-

position of potassium," approved October 2, 1917.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I believe a rule has been granted on this bill, and it is now on the calendar. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COMPENSATING HOLDERS OF GRAZING PERMITS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1874) authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for national-defense purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for national-defense purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654, 43 U. S. C., sec 315p), is amended by inserting the words "or national defense" between the word "war" and the word "purposes" wherever the latter two words appear in that act.

Sec. 2. This amendment is to take effect as of July 25, 1947.

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.

DEL NORTE COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4874) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the county of Del Norte, State of California, to Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue patent to the county of Del Norte, State of California, to Pelican Rock, containing about 1 acre, located northerly from Whaler Island in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif., for the purposes of a public wharf or for such other purposes as it may be of use in the construction, maintenance, and operation of Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to take such action as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the island known as Pelican Rock, containing an estimated area of about 1 acre, and situated in the Pacific Ocean in the northern portion of section 33, township 16 north, range 1 west, Humboldt meridian, California, approximately a quarter of a mile north of Whaler Island, shown to be located in latitude 41 degrees 44 minutes 40 seconds north, and longitude 124 degrees 11 minutes 10 seconds west, on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey Chart entitled 'St. George Reef and Crescent City, Calif.,' is hereby conveyed to the County of Del Norte, State of California, for the purpose of a public wharf or for such other purposes as it may be of use in the construction, maintenance, and operation of Crescent City Harbor."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to transfer Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif., to that county."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC-LAND LAWS IN OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5071) to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the public-land laws of the United States be, and the same are hereby, extended to the public lands in that part of the Red River between the medial line and the south bank of the river, in Oklahoma, between the ninety-eighth meridian and the east boundary of the territory established as Greer County by the act of May 4, 1896 (29 Stat. 113): *Provided,* That such lands shall not be subject to disposition, settlement, or occupation until after the same have been classified and opened to entry, and other disposal by the Secretary of the Interior according to law.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to recognize equitable claims to such lands based on settlement made prior to January 1, 1934, and all homestead entries of such lands, the allowance of which was erroneous because the lands were not subject to entry, and all suspended entries and applications to make final proof, are hereby validated if otherwise regular.

Sec. 3. Patents on nonmineral entries, sections, or locations of such lands shall contain a reservation to the United States of all minerals therein, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws relating to such minerals: *Provided,* That the proceeds accruing to the United States from leases of the oil and gas deposits in such lands shall continue to be disposed of as provided by existing law.

Sec. 4. Except as to existing valid rights, the act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1448) is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 5, insert "and directed."

Page 2, line 10, after the word "regular", insert "as of the date of the regular application."

Page 2, line 12, strike out all of section 3, and page 2, line 20, strike out "4" and insert "3."

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.

SURPLUS GOVERNMENT LANDS IN THE STATES OF GEORGIA AND TENNESSEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5936) to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the States of Georgia and Tennessee, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective upon publication of notice, as hereinafter provided, there shall be added to the Chickamauga

and Chattanooga National Military Park, a strip of land, comprising not more than 100 acres, lying generally north of the present south line of Fort Oglethorpe and westward from the southeast corner thereof. The exact boundaries of the area added to the park shall be agreed upon by the Administrator, War Assets Administration, and the Director of the National Park Service.

When the boundaries of the aforesaid area have been agreed upon, the War Assets Administration shall furnish to the National Park Service a legal description of the lands to be added to the park, together with a map showing the boundaries and the acreage of the area.

Upon the receipt by the National Park Service of such legal description and map of the area, public notice that such lands are to become a part of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, effective on the date of publication of such notice, shall be given in the Federal Register.

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.

FORT VANCOUVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5957) to provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Co. stockade, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of establishing a Federal area of national historical importance for the benefit of the people of the United States, to be known as the "Fort Vancouver National Monument," the Administrator of the War Assets Administration and the Secretary of the Army are authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without exchange of funds, administrative jurisdiction over such federally owned lands and other property, real or personal, under their jurisdiction, including the site of the old Hudson's Bay Co. stockade in the State of Washington, as they shall find to be surplus to the needs of their respective agencies, such properties to be selected, with their approval, by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion within the national monument.

Sec. 2. The total area of the national monument as established or as enlarged by transfers pursuant to this act shall not exceed 125 acres. Establishment of the monument shall be effective, upon publication in the Federal Register of notice of such establishment, following the transfer to the Secretary of the Interior of administrative jurisdiction over such lands as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem to be sufficient for purposes of establishing the national monument. Additional lands may be added to the monument in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 1 hereof, governing surplus properties, or by donation, subject to the maximum acreage limitation prescribed by this act, upon publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

Sec. 3. The administration, protection, and development of the aforesaid national monument shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "125" and insert "90."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR GRAZING AND RELATED PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6073) to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (a) of section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269, 1272), as amended by the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976; 43 U. S. C., sec. 315g), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That where such action will promote the purposes of a district or facilitate the administration of the public lands, the Secretary is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States any lands within or without the exterior boundaries of a grazing district as a gift."

SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 9 of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269, 1273), is hereby amended by substituting for the words "the district" the following: "lands within or without the exterior boundaries of a grazing district."

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.

EXTENSION OF LEASES OF CERTAIN LAND IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6229) to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That where a lessee of water-front lands in the Territory of Hawaii under lease on April 1, 1946, has spent substantial sums in repairing or replacing improvements on such lands damaged or destroyed by the tidal wave of that date, then notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act of Hawaii (31 Stat. 141), as amended, or of the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii, at the request of the lessee, in his discretion may extend the term of the lease at the original rental: *Provided,* That no lease is extended beyond March 31, 1967.

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.

MINERAL LEASING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6302) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to permit the exercise of certain options on or before August 8, 1950.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso of section 27 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 30, sec. 184), is hereby amended by striking out "within 2 years after the passage of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or before August 8, 1950."

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.

CONTRACT OF PURCHASE OF CERTAIN LANDS AND MINERAL DEPOSITS FROM CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 363, providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the amount involved is too great for the Consent Calendar, and therefore I object.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve the right to object?

Mr. KEAN. I reserve the right.

Mr. ALBERT. This particular legislation is approval of a contract pursuant to a previous authorization granted in 1944. I just wondered whether the same objection would obtain under those circumstances.

Mr. KEAN. It would. I object.

AMENDING SECTION 303 (E) OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6078) to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 303 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) Notwithstanding any provision of this part the Commission may, by order, from time to time, upon application, or upon its own initiative without application, exempt from the requirements of this part the transportation of passengers between points in the United States by way of a foreign port or ports, upon a finding that application of such requirements thereto is not necessary to carry out the national transportation policy declared in this act.

"(2) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to exclude from the provisions of this part, in addition to the transportation otherwise excluded under this section, transportation by contract carriers by water which, by reason of the inherent nature of the commodities transported, their requirement of special equipment or their shipment in bulk, is not actually and substantially competitive with transportation by any common carrier subject to this part or part I or part II. Upon application of a carrier, made in such manner and form as the Commission may by regulations prescribe, the Commission shall, subject to such reasonable conditions and limitations as the Commission may prescribe, by order exempt from the provisions of this part such of the transportation engaged in by such carrier as it finds necessary to carry out the policy above declared. A carrier (other than a carrier subject, at the time this part takes effect, to the provisions of the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, as amended) making such application prior to January 1, 1941, shall be exempt from the provisions of this part until a final determination has been made upon such application if such carrier or a predecessor in interest was in bona fide operation as a contract carrier by water on January 1, 1940, over the route or routes or between the ports with respect to which application is made and has so operated since that time (or, if engaged in furnishing seasonal service only, was in bona fide operation during the seasonal period prior to or including such date, for operations of the character in question)

except, in either event, for interruptions of service over which such carrier or its predecessor in interest had no control."

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

GETTYSBURG NATIONAL CEMETERY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4688) to enlarge the Gettysburg National Cemetery.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the following-described land in the Borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pa.:

Beginning at a point at the corner of South Washington Street (also known as Taneytown Road) and the United States Government National Cemetery; thence along said street north 1½ degrees west 356 feet to a point; thence north 57 degrees east 321 feet to a point at the corner of lands of Paul H. Ketterman; thence north 57 degrees west 179½ feet to a point at corner of lands of Paul H. Ketterman on Steinwehr Avenue; thence along Steinwehr Avenue north 33 degrees east 179½ feet to a point at corner of lands of Thomas J. Winebrenner and Son; thence south 35 degrees east 236½ feet to a point at corner of lands of Emma Noel estate; thence north 59 degrees east 137 feet to a point at corner of lands of Emma Noel estate and lands of Harry Koch; thence south 30 degrees east 129½ feet to a point; thence north 57 degrees east 200 feet to a point on Baltimore Street; thence south 30 degrees east along Baltimore Street 50 feet to a point at corner of lands of Margaret E. Kissinger; thence south 57 degrees west 312 feet to a point; thence south 30 degrees east 120½ feet to a point along the north side of United States Government National Cemetery; thence along same south 57 degrees west 616 feet to a point, the place of beginning. Containing 5 acres and 4 perches, more or less.

SEC. 2. The land acquired pursuant to the first section of this act shall constitute a part of the Gettysburg National Cemetery and shall be reserved for the burial of World War I and World War II veterans and such other persons as may be entitled to interment in national cemeteries.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of \$10,000 to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 25, strike out the words "beginning. Containing" and insert "beginning, containing."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

TO AUTHORIZE THE COAST GUARD TO ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN AIDS TO NAVIGATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1853) to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to guide navigation and to prevent disasters, collisions, and wrecks of vessels and aircraft, the Coast Guard is authorized to establish, maintain, and operate within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and

beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located, and elsewhere—

(a) aids to maritime navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces or of the commerce of the United States;

(b) aids to air navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States as requested by the Secretary of the appropriate department within the National Military Establishment; and

(c) Loran stations (1) required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States; or (2) required to serve the needs of the maritime commerce of the United States; or (3) required to serve the needs of the air commerce of the United States as determined by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The Coast Guard in establishing, maintaining, or operating any aids to air navigation herein provided shall solicit the cooperation of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the end that the personnel and facilities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will be utilized to the fullest possible advantage. Before locating and operating any such aid on military or naval bases or regions, the consent of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, shall first be obtained. No such aid shall be located within the territorial jurisdiction of any foreign country without the consent of the government thereof. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to limit the authority granted by the provisions of section 77 of the act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 621), or by section 5 (f) of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (49 U. S. C. 175), or by title III of Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 451 and the following).

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That in order to aid navigation and to prevent disasters, collisions, and wrecks of vessels and aircraft, the Coast Guard is authorized to establish, maintain, and operate—

"(a) aids to maritime navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces or of the commerce of the United States;

"(b) aids to air navigation required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States as requested by the Secretary of the appropriate Department within the National Military Establishment; and

"(c) Loran stations (1) required to serve the needs of the armed forces of the United States; or (2) required to serve the needs of the maritime commerce of the United States; or (3) required to serve the needs of the air commerce of the United States.

"Sec. 2. Such aids to navigation other than Loran stations shall be established and operated only within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States at places where naval or military bases of the United States are or may be located, and at other places where such aids to navigation have been established on the date of the enactment of this act."

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.

AUTHORIZING THE COAST GUARD TO OPERATE AND MAINTAIN OCEAN STATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2122) to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations.

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

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the cost of this bill is too great for the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I object.

INTERNATIONAL AIR-TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6407) to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "International Aviation Facilities Act."

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this act:

(1) The term "Air Coordinating Committee" means the committee established by Executive Order No. 9781, dated September 19, 1946, or such successor agency or agencies as may exercise the same or equivalent powers whether created by Executive order or legislative enactment.

(2) The term "airport property" means any property, real or personal, or any interest therein, used or useful, directly or indirectly, in connection with the administration, operation, or maintenance of an airport, including but not limited to (1) land; (2) runways, strips, taxiways, and parking aprons; (3) buildings, structures, improvements, and facilities, whether or not used in connection with the landing and take-off of aircraft; and (4) equipment (including parts and components thereof), furniture, vehicles, and supplies.

(3) The term "airway property" means any property, real or personal, or any interest therein, used or useful, directly or indirectly, in connection with the administration, operation, or maintenance of any ground installation, facility, or equipment (including parts and components thereof) necessary or desirable for the orderly and safe operation of air traffic, including but not limited to air navigation, air-traffic control, airways, communications, and meteorological facilities.

(4) The term "foreign territory" means any area of land or water over which no nation or a nation other than the United States exercises the incidents of sovereignty (including territory of undetermined sovereignty and the high seas), any area of land or water temporarily under military occupation by the United States, and any area of land or water occupied or administered by the United States or any other nation under any international agreement.

ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION, IN FOREIGN TERRITORY, OF FACILITIES RELATED TO AVIATION

Sec. 3. After consultation with the Air Coordinating Committee and subject to concurrence of the Secretary of State, and with due regard for the objectives of the International Civil Aviation Organization, the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") and the Chief of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce, within their respective fields, are authorized, by contract or otherwise, whenever funds therefor have been specifically appropriated by the Congress, to acquire, establish, and construct airport property and airway property in foreign territory, and to conduct related services.

TRAINING OF FOREIGN NATIONALS IN AERONAUTICAL AND RELATED SUBJECTS

Sec. 4. Subject to the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Administrator and

the Chief of the Weather Bureau, within their respective fields, are authorized within or outside the United States to train foreign nationals directly, or in conjunction with any other United States Government agency, or through any United States public or private agency (including any State or municipal educational institution), or through any international organization, in aeronautical and related subjects essential to the orderly and safe operation of civil aircraft.

ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS FOR FACILITIES SUPPLIED OR SERVICES PERFORMED FOR A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT OR AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Sec. 5. The Administrator and the Chief of the Weather Bureau, respectively, are authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, funds from any foreign government or from any international organization as payment for any facilities supplied or services performed for such government or international organization by the Administrator or the Chief of the Weather Bureau, either directly or indirectly, under authority of this act or of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, including the operation of airport property and airway property in such countries, the training of foreign nationals, the rendering of technical assistance and advice to such countries, and the performance of other similar services. Funds so received may be credited (A) to appropriations current at the time the expenditures are to be or have been paid, (B) to appropriations current at the time such amounts are received, or (C) in part as provided under clause (A) and in part as provided under clause (B).

TRANSFER OF AIRPORT PROPERTY OR AIRWAY PROPERTY TO A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT OR AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Sec. 6. With the unanimous approval of the Air Coordinating Committee, the Administrator or the Chief of the Weather Bureau, as the case may be, upon request of the foreign government involved or of any international organization, may transfer any airport property or airway property operated and maintained by him within foreign territory, pursuant to the provisions of this act, to the foreign government involved or to any international organization. The Administrator or the Chief of the Weather Bureau, as the case may be, is authorized to make such transfer upon such terms and conditions as he deems proper, including provision for receiving, on behalf of the United States, such payment or other consideration for the property so transferred as may be agreed upon through negotiations with the foreign government or international organization involved.

FACILITIES, SERVICE, AND PROPERTY IN THE CANAL ZONE AND IN THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Sec. 7. (a) Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator is authorized to provide air navigation, communications, and air traffic control facilities and service in the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama and to do all things necessary in connection with the operation and maintenance thereof.

(b) In exercising and performing his powers and duties under this section, the Administrator shall do so consistently with any obligation assumed by the United States in any treaty, convention, or agreement that may be in force between the United States and the Republic of Panama.

(c) Any department of the National Military Establishment is authorized in its discretion to transfer without charge therefor to the Administrator any airport property or airway property or other real or personal property which (1) is located in the Canal Zone or the Republic of Panama, and (2) is determined by the Administrator to be, or likely to become, useful in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(d) The authority conferred by this section may be exercised without regard to sections 3 and 8 (a) of this act.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY FROM THE NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OR THE WEATHER BUREAU

SEC. 8. (a) When considered consistent with the needs of national defense, and subject to such conditions, if any, as may be agreed upon in specific cases between the parties, any department of the National Military Establishment is authorized to transfer at its discretion to the Administrator, without charge therefor, airport property and airway property, exclusive of meteorological facilities, installed by or in the possession of such department in territory (including Alaska) outside the continental limits of the United States, which such department has found to be no longer required exclusively for military purposes and which in the opinion of the Administrator are, or are likely to become, necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act. Transfer of property in foreign territory shall be made hereunder only after consultation with the Air Coordinating Committee.

(b) When considered consistent with the needs of national defense, and subject to such conditions, if any, as may be agreed upon in specific cases between the parties, any department of the National Military Establishment is authorized to transfer at its discretion to the Chief of the Weather Bureau without charge therefor, meteorological facilities installed by or in the possession of such department in territory (including Alaska) outside the continental limits of the United States, which such department has found to be no longer required exclusively for military purposes, and which, in the opinion of the Chief of the Weather Bureau are, or are likely to become, necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act. Transfer of property in foreign territory shall be made hereunder only after consultation with the Air Coordinating Committee.

(c) All property transferred to the Department of Commerce under the provisions of Executive Order 9709, dated March 29, 1946, and Executive Order 9797, dated November 6, 1946, and which is in the possession of the Department of Commerce on the date of the enactment of this act shall be considered as property transferred pursuant to this section.

AUTHORITY TO RETAKE PROPERTY TRANSFERRED UNDER SECTION 7 OR 8

SEC. 9. When necessary to meet military requirements, as determined by the Secretary of the department which made the transfer, such department is authorized immediately to retake any property transferred under section 7 or section 8, together with any improvements or additions made thereto: *Provided*, That the Secretary of such department, upon the recommendation of the Administrator or the Chief of the Weather Bureau, as the case may be, is authorized in any case to waive any right or privilege conferred or reserved by this section. In the event property is retaken which incorporates improvements or additions not made at Government expense, reasonable compensation shall be paid to the person or persons who made such improvements or additions, or to their successors in interest. The Secretary of the department which made the transfer, or his duly authorized representative, shall determine, for purposes of this section, what is reasonable compensation for such improvements or additions.

POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR AND CHIEF OF WEATHER BUREAU WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AIRPORT PROPERTY AND AIRWAY PROPERTY

SEC. 10. (a) With regard to airport property and airway property in territory (including Alaska) outside the continental limits of the United States which he has acquired pursuant to this act or any other provision of law, the Administrator is empowered and directed to do and perform, by contract or otherwise, all acts and things necessary or incident to their consolidation, operation, protection, maintenance, improve-

ment, and administration, including but not limited to the power (1) to adapt, from time to time, such properties to the needs of civil aeronautics by construction, installation, re-engineering, relocation, or otherwise; (2) to make and amend such reasonable rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to the proper exercise of the powers granted by this section; (3) to lease under such conditions as he may deem proper and for such periods as may be desirable (not to exceed 20 years) space or property for purposes essential or appropriate to their consolidation, operation, protection, and administration under this act; (4) to contract for, or to provide directly for, the sale of fuel, oil, equipment, food and supplies, hotel accommodations, and other facilities and services necessary or desirable for the operation and administration of such properties; (5) to make just and reasonable charges for aeronautical services (including fees for use of navigational aids, communication services, landing facilities, and similar services); and (6) to acquire, by purchase or otherwise, real or personal property, or interest therein, which he may consider necessary for the purposes of this section. Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any rule or regulation issued by the Administrator under clause (2) of this section, if such violation is committed in any area under the civil jurisdiction of the United States, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$500 or to imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

(b) With regard to meteorological facilities in territory (including Alaska) outside the continental limits of the United States which he has acquired pursuant to this act or any other provision of law, the Chief of the Weather Bureau is vested with all powers to consolidate, operate, protect, maintain, improve, and administer granted the Administrator by subsection (a) with respect to facilities the latter has acquired.

(c) All funds received under this section, as a result of direct sale or charge by the Administrator or the Chief of the Weather Bureau and which, in the judgment of the Administrator or the Chief of the Weather Bureau, as the case may be, are equivalent to the cost, including handling charges, of the fuel, oil, equipment, food, supplies, services, shelter, or other assistance or services sold or furnished shall be credited to the appropriation from which the cost thereof was paid, and the balance, if any, shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts.

UTILIZATION OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES OF OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 11. The Administrator and the Chief of the Weather Bureau are authorized and directed, in carrying out the provisions of this act, insofar as they find it practicable, to arrange for the use of appropriate facilities or services of other United States Government agencies, and to reimburse any such agency for such service out of funds appropriated to the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the Weather Bureau, as the case may be, to the end that personnel and facilities of existing United States Government agencies shall be utilized to the fullest possible advantage and not be unnecessarily duplicated.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

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.

EXCHANGE OF WILDLIFE-REFUGE LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6030) to authorize the exchange of wildlife-

refuge lands within the State of Washington.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, at any time within 10 years from the date of the approval of this act, to accept from the State of Washington on behalf of the United States title to any lands in the State of Washington which he deems chiefly valuable for wildlife refuge purposes, and which are equivalent in value to the lands of the United States within the Skagit National Wildlife Refuge, and in exchange therefor to convey by deed on behalf of the United States to the State of Washington the said lands of the United States in the Skagit National Wildlife Refuge.

SEC. 2. Any lands acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under the terms of this act, if located within or adjacent to an existing wildlife refuge or reservation, immediately shall become a part of such refuge or reservation and shall be administered under the laws and regulations applicable thereto, and, if not so located, may be administered as a migratory-waterfowl management area, refuge, reservation, or breeding ground in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), and acts supplementary thereto.

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.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6204) to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 963), as now or hereafter amended, relating to the granting of annual leave and compensation for leave accumulated in excess of 60 days on August 31, 1946, shall apply to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the same extent and with the same relative conditions as are provided therein for commissioned officers of the armed forces: *Provided*, That the term "Secretary" as used in such act shall mean, in the case of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Secretary of Commerce: *And provided further*, That in any case in which a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on active duty on September 1, 1946, excepting officers on terminal leave on that date, had to his credit on August 31, 1946, accumulated or accrued leave aggregating in excess of 60 days, such leave in excess of 60 days not subsequently taken shall be settled and compensated for in cash on the basis of the rate of pay and allowances applicable to such officer on August 31, 1946, if application is made therefor to the Secretary of Commerce within 1 year after the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 2. Funds appropriated by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663, 79th Cong.), to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, are hereby made available for carrying out the provisions of this act and may be allotted to the Department of Commerce by transfer to and merger with appropriations thereof or otherwise, in such amounts as may be determined by the Director of the Budget.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall be effective from August 9, 1946.

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.

CHANGES IN TIME OF HOLDING COURT IN CERTAIN DIVISIONS IN THE EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5106) to provide for changes in the time of holding court in certain divisions in the eastern and western districts of South Carolina.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 105 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 28, sec. 186), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 105. The State of South Carolina is divided into two districts to be known as the eastern and western districts of South Carolina.

"The western district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July 1910 in the counties of Abbeville, Anderson, Cherokee, Chester, Edgefield, Fairfield, Greenville, Greenwood, Lancaster, Laurens, Newberry, Oconee, Pickens, Saluda, Spartanburg, Union, and York.

"The western district of South Carolina is divided into five divisions, to be known as the Anderson, Greenville, Greenwood, Rock Hill, and Spartanburg divisions. The Anderson division shall include the territory embraced in the counties of Anderson, Oconee, and Pickens. The Greenville division shall include the territory embraced in the counties of Greenville and Laurens. The Greenwood division shall include the territory embraced in the counties of Abbeville, Edgefield, Greenwood, McCormick, Newberry, and Saluda. The Rock Hill division shall include the territory embraced in the counties of Chester, Fairfield, Lancaster, and York. The Spartanburg division shall include the territory embraced in the counties of Cherokee, Spartanburg, and Union. The terms of the district court for the Anderson division shall be held at Anderson, for the Greenville division at Greenville, for the Greenwood division at Greenwood, for the Rock Hill division at Rock Hill, and for the Spartanburg division at Spartanburg. Terms of the district court for the western district shall be held at Anderson on the second Monday in May and the third Monday in November; at Spartanburg on the first Monday in April and the first Monday in October; at Greenwood on the third Monday in May and the first Monday in December; at Rock Hill on the second Monday in March and the fourth Monday in September; and at Greenville on the third Monday in February and the fourth Monday in October.

"The eastern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July 1910 in the counties of Aiken, Bamberg, Barnwell, Beaufort, Berkeley, Calhoun, Charleston, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Colleton, Darlington, Dillon, Dorchester, Florence, Georgetown, Hampton, Horry, Kershaw, Lee, Lexington, Marion, Marlboro, Orangeburg, Richland, Sumter, and Williamsburg.

"The eastern district of South Carolina is divided into five divisions, to be known as the Aiken, Charleston, Columbia, Florence, and Orangeburg divisions. The Aiken division shall include the territory embraced in the counties of Aiken, Allendale, Barnwell, and Hampton. The Charleston division shall include the territory embraced in the counties of Beaufort, Berkeley, Charleston, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Georgetown, and Jasper. The Columbia division shall include the territory embraced in the counties of Kershaw, Lee, Lexington, Richland, and Sumter. The Florence division shall include the territory embraced in the counties of Chesterfield, Darlington, Dillon, Florence, Horry, Marion, Marlboro, and Williamsburg. The Orangeburg division shall include the territory embraced in the counties of Calhoun, Bamberg, and Orangeburg. The terms of the district

court for the Aiken division shall be held at Aiken, for the Charleston division at Charleston, for the Columbia division at Columbia, for the Florence division at Florence, and for the Orangeburg division at Orangeburg.

"Terms of the district court for the eastern district shall be held at Aiken on the fourth Monday in March and the third Monday in September; at Charleston on the third Monday in January, the second Monday in May, and the second Monday in October; at Columbia on the third Monday in February, the third Monday in June, and the fourth Monday in October; at Florence on the fourth Monday in April and the first Monday in December; and at Orangeburg on the second Monday in April and the third Monday in November: *Provided*, That facilities for holding court at Orangeburg are furnished free of expense to the United States. The office of the clerk of the district court for the western district shall be at Greenville and the office of the clerk of the district court for the eastern district shall be at Charleston.

"All criminal cases shall be tried in the division in which the offense was committed, unless upon proper showing the venue would be changed by the judge from one division to another, and this change be made only upon affidavits and motion made in open court after 4 days' notice to the adverse party."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "1910" and insert in lieu thereof "1947."

Page 2, line 2, insert "McCormack", after the name "Laurens."

Page 3, line 8, strike out "1910" and insert in lieu thereof "1947."

Page 3, line 9, insert "Allendale", after the name "Aiken."

Page 3, line 11, insert "Jasper", at the end of the line.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRYSON:

On page 3, line 1, strike out the word "second" and insert in lieu thereof the word "third."

On page 3, line 4, strike out the word "third" and insert in lieu thereof the word "second."

On page 4, line 15, strike out the word "third" and insert in lieu thereof the word "first."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. BRYSON. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. I may say to the gentleman from South Carolina that it is a little unusual to have an amendment offered after we have let a bill go through. Usually the Members will come to the objectors and tell them that they are going to offer such-and-such an amendment so the objectors can decide whether they want to let the bill come up by unanimous consent.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I spoke to two Members of his committee. I am sorry I did not speak to him.

Mr. KEAN. All right.

Mr. BRYSON. I may say to the gentleman that we have three Federal judges in our State, one of them known as a floating judge. There are two Federal

districts. This is just a rearrangement of the time of holding court in the different districts. It involves no additional cost whatever.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was 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.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN CHOPAWAMASIC PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6246) to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy control and jurisdiction over those parcels of land within the Chopawamsic Park, known hereafter as the Prince William Forest Park, a part of the park system of the National Capital and its environs by act of Congress of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 785), comprising approximately 5,000 acres, lying south of the Joplin Road and contiguous to the marine base at Quantico, Va., with the exception of approximately 4 acres at the intersection of roads 626 and 620, which land contains the fire tower, upon assurance that the Secretary of the Navy will guarantee the potability and the undamaged source of water of the South Branch of Quantico Creek to the lands lying east of route 619, now or hereafter acquired for the Chopawamsic Park: *Provided, however*, That the transfer of jurisdiction herein authorized shall not be effectuated until funds have been made available by the Congress for the acquisition of the lands referred to in section 3 of this act.

Sec. 2. That all of the lands that were formerly acquired by the War Department and that are now surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army within and adjacent to the Chopawamsic Park, comprising approximately 1,138⁶²/₁₀₀ acres, are hereby added to and made a part of that park, and shall be subject to all the laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy be, and they are hereby, authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States, by donation or purchase, lands adjoining or contiguous to the Chopawamsic Park, in the State of Virginia, as may be necessary for the proper rounding out of the boundaries of that park, but not exceeding 1,500 acres. The title to real property acquired pursuant to this act shall be satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States. All property acquired by the United States pursuant to this act shall become a part of the Chopawamsic Park upon acceptance of title thereto, and shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto.

Sec. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 3 of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 11, strike out the word "are" and insert in lieu thereof the word "is"; strike out the word "such" and insert in lieu thereof the word "not."

Page 3, line 12, strike out the words "sums as may be necessary" and insert in lieu thereof the words "to exceed the sum of \$10,000."

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.

MILEAGE ALLOWANCE FOR UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 692) to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents per mile for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TITLE 3 OF UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6412) to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President."

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

Be it enacted, etc., That title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President," is codified and enacted into positive law and may be cited as "3 U. S. C., § —," as follows:

TITLE 3—THE PRESIDENT

Sec.

1. Presidential elections and vacancies. 1
2. Office and compensation of President. 101
3. Protection of the President; the White House Police. 201

CHAPTER 1—PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS AND VACANCIES

Sec.

1. Time of appointing electors.
2. Failure to make choice on prescribed day.
3. Number of electors.
4. Vacancies in electoral college.
5. Determination of controversy as to appointment of electors.
6. Credentials of electors; transmission to Secretary of State and to Congress; public inspection.
7. Meeting and vote of electors.
8. Manner of voting.
9. Certificates of votes for President and Vice President.
10. Sealing and endorsing certificates.
11. Disposition of certificates.
12. Failure of certificates of electors to reach President of Senate or Secretary of State; demand on State for certificate.
13. Same; demand on district judge for certificate.
14. Forfeiture for messenger's neglect of duty.
15. Counting electoral votes in Congress.
16. Same; seats for officers and Members of two Houses in joint meeting.
17. Same; limit of debate in each House.
18. Same; parliamentary procedure at joint meeting.
19. Vacancy in Offices of both President and Vice President; officers eligible to act.
20. Resignation or refusal of office.

CHAPTER 1—PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS AND VACANCIES

TIME OF APPOINTING ELECTORS

§ 1. The electors of President and Vice President shall be appointed, in each State, on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, in every fourth year succeeding every election of a President and Vice President.

FAILURE TO MAKE CHOICE ON PRESCRIBED DAY

§ 2. Whenever any State has held an election for the purpose of choosing electors, and

has failed to make a choice on the day prescribed by law, the electors may be appointed on a subsequent day in such a manner as the legislature of such State may direct.

NUMBER OF ELECTORS

§ 3. The number of electors shall be equal to the number of Senators and Representatives to which the several States are by law entitled at the time when the President and Vice President to be chosen come into office; except, that where no apportionment of Representatives has been made after any enumeration, at the time of choosing electors, the number of electors shall be according to the then existing apportionment of Senators and Representatives.

VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL COLLEGE

§ 4. Each State may, by law, provide for the filling of any vacancies which may occur in its college of electors when such college meets to give its electoral vote.

DETERMINATION OF CONTROVERSY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF ELECTORS

§ 5. If any State shall have provided, by laws enacted prior to the day fixed for the appointment of the electors, for its final determination of any controversy or contest concerning the appointment of all or any of the electors of such State, by judicial or other methods or procedures, and such determination shall have been made at least 6 days before the time fixed for the meeting of the electors, such determination made pursuant to such law so existing on said day, and made at least 6 days prior to said time of meeting of the electors, shall be conclusive, and shall govern in the counting of the electoral votes as provided in the Constitution, and as hereinafter regulated, so far as the ascertainment of the electors appointed by such State is concerned.

CREDENTIALS OF ELECTORS; TRANSMISSION TO SECRETARY OF STATE AND TO CONGRESS; PUBLIC INSPECTION

§ 6. It shall be the duty of the executives of each State, as soon as practicable after the conclusion of the appointment of the electors in such State by the final ascertainment, under and in pursuance of the laws of such State providing for such ascertainment, to communicate by registered mail under the seal of the State to the Secretary of State of the United States a certificate of such ascertainment of the electors appointed, setting forth the names of such electors and the canvass or other ascertainment under the laws of such State of the number of votes given or cast for each person for whose appointment any and all votes have been given or cast; and it shall also thereupon be the duty of the executive of each State to deliver to the electors of such State, on or before the day on which they are required by section 7 of this title to meet, six duplicate originals of the same certificate under the seal of the State; and if there shall have been any final determination in a State in the manner provided for by law of a controversy or contest concerning the appointment of all or any of the electors of such State, it shall be the duty of the executive of such State, as soon as practicable after such determination, to communicate under the seal of the State to the Secretary of State of the United States a certificate of such determination in form and manner as the same shall have been made; and the certificate or certificates so received by the Secretary of State shall be preserved by him for 1 year and shall be a part of the public records of his office and shall be open to public inspection; and the Secretary of State of the United States at the first meeting of Congress thereafter shall transmit to the two Houses of Congress copies in full of each and every such certificate so received at the State Department.

MEETING AND VOTE OF ELECTORS

§ 7. The electors of President and Vice President of each State shall meet and give their votes on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December next following their appointment at such place in each State as the legislature of such State shall direct.

MANNER OF VOTING

§ 8. The electors shall vote for President and Vice President, respectively, in the manner directed by the Constitution.

CERTIFICATES OF VOTES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

§ 9. The electors shall make and sign six certificates of all the votes given by them, each of which certificates shall contain two distinct lists, one of the votes for President and the other of the votes for Vice President, and shall annex to each of the certificates one of the lists of the electors which shall have been furnished to them by direction of the executive of the State.

SEALING AND ENDORSING CERTIFICATES

§ 10. The electors shall seal up the certificates so made by them, and certify upon each that the lists of all the votes of such State given for President, and of all the votes given for Vice President, are contained therein.

DISPOSITION OF CERTIFICATES

§ 11. The electors shall dispose of the certificates so made by them and the lists attached thereto in the following manner:

First. They shall forthwith forward by registered mail one of the same to the President of the Senate at the seat of government.

Second. Two of the same shall be delivered to the secretary of state of the State, one of which shall be held subject to the order of the President of the Senate, the other to be preserved by him for 1 year and shall be a part of the public records of his office and shall be open to public inspection.

Third. On the day thereafter they shall forward by registered mail two of such certificates and lists to the Secretary of State at the seat of government, one of which shall be held subject to the order of the President of the Senate. The other shall be preserved by the Secretary of State for 1 year and shall be a part of the public records of his office and shall be open to public inspection.

Fourth. They shall forthwith cause the other of the certificates and lists to be delivered to the judge of the district in which the electors shall have assembled.

FAILURE OF CERTIFICATES OF ELECTORS TO REACH PRESIDENT OF SENATE OR SECRETARY OF STATE; DEMAND ON STATE FOR CERTIFICATE

§ 12. When no certificate of vote and list mentioned in sections 9 and 11 of this title from any State shall have been received by the President of the Senate or by the Secretary of State by the fourth Wednesday in December, after the meeting of the electors shall have been held, the President of the Senate or, if he be absent from the seat of government, the Secretary of State shall request, by the most expeditious method available, the secretary of state of the State to send up the certificate and list lodged with him by the electors of such State; and it shall be his duty upon receipt of such request immediately to transmit same by registered mail to the President of the Senate at the seat of government.

SAME; DEMAND ON DISTRICT JUDGE FOR CERTIFICATE

§ 13. When no certificates of votes from any State shall have been received at the seat of government on the fourth Wednesday in December, after the meeting of the electors shall have been held, the President of the Senate or, if he be absent from the seat of government, the Secretary of State shall send a special messenger to the district judge

in whose custody one certificate of votes from that State has been lodged, and such judge shall forthwith transmit that list by the hand of such messenger to the seat of government.

FORFEITURE FOR MESSENGER'S NEGLIGENCE OF DUTY

§ 14. Every person who, having been appointed, pursuant to section 13 of this title, to deliver the certificates of the votes of the electors to the President of the Senate, and having accepted such appointment, shall neglect to perform the services required from him, shall forfeit the sum of \$1,000.

COUNTING ELECTORAL VOTES IN CONGRESS

§ 15. Congress shall be in session on the 6th day of January succeeding every meeting of the electors. The Senate and House of Representatives shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives at the hour of 1 o'clock in the afternoon on that day, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer. Two tellers shall be previously appointed on the part of the Senate and two on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted according to the rules in this subchapter provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses. Upon such reading of any such certificate or paper, the President of the Senate shall call for objections, if any. Every objection shall be made in writing, and shall state clearly and concisely, and without argument, the ground thereof, and shall be signed by at least one Senator and one Member of the House of Representatives before the same shall be received. When all objections so made to any vote or paper from a State shall have been received and read, the Senate shall thereupon withdraw, and such objections shall be submitted to the Senate for its decision; and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, in like manner, submit such objections to the House of Representatives for its decision; and no electoral vote or votes from any State which shall have been regularly given by electors whose appointment has been lawfully certified to according to section 6 of this title from which but one return has been received shall be rejected, but the two Houses concurrently may reject the vote or votes when they agree that such vote or votes have not been so regularly given by electors whose appointment has been so certified. If more than one return or paper purporting to be a return from a State shall have been received by the President of the Senate, those votes, and those only, shall be counted which shall have been regularly given by the electors who are shown by the determination mentioned in section 5 of this title to have been appointed, if the determination in said section provided for shall have been made, or by such successors or substitutes, in case of a vacancy in the board of electors so ascertained, as have been appointed to fill such vacancy in the mode provided by the laws of the State; but in case there shall arise the question which of two or more of such State

authorities determining what electors have been appointed, as mentioned in section 5 of this title, is the lawful tribunal of such State, the votes regularly given of those electors, and those only, of such State shall be counted whose title as electors the two Houses, acting separately, shall concurrently decide is supported by the decision of such State so authorized by its law; and in such case of more than one return or paper purporting to be a return from a State, if there shall have been no such determination of the question in the State aforesaid, then those votes, and those only, shall be counted which the two Houses shall concurrently decide were cast by lawful electors appointed in accordance with the laws of the State, unless the two Houses, acting separately, shall concurrently decide such votes not to be the lawful votes of the legally appointed electors of such State. But if the two Houses shall disagree in respect of the counting of such votes, then, and in that case, the votes of the electors whose appointment shall have been certified by the executive of the State, under the seal thereof, shall be counted. When the two Houses have voted, they shall immediately again meet, and the presiding officer shall then announce the decision of the questions submitted. No votes or papers from any other State shall be acted upon until the objections previously made to the votes or papers from any State shall have been finally disposed of.

SAME; SEATS FOR OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF TWO HOUSES IN JOINT MEETING

§ 16. At such joint meeting of the two Houses seats shall be provided as follows: For the President of the Senate, the Speaker's chair; for the Speaker, immediately upon his left; the Senators, in the body of the Hall upon the right of the presiding officer; for the Representatives, in the body of the Hall not provided for the Senators; for the tellers, Secretary of the Senate, and Clerk of the House of Representatives at the Clerk's desk; for the other officers of the two Houses, in front of the Clerk's desk and upon each side of the Speaker's platform. Such joint meeting shall not be dissolved until the count of electoral votes shall be completed and the result declared; and no recess shall be taken unless a question shall have arisen in regard to counting any such votes, or otherwise under this subchapter, in which case it shall be competent for either House, acting separately, in the manner hereinbefore provided, to direct a recess of such House not beyond the next calendar day, Sunday excepted at the hour of 10 o'clock in the forenoon. But if the counting of the electoral votes and the declaration of the result shall not have been completed before the fifth calendar day next after such first meeting of the two Houses, no further or other recess shall be taken by either House.

SAME; LIMIT OF DEBATE IN EACH HOUSE

§ 17. When the two Houses separate to decide upon an objection that may have been made to the counting of any electoral vote or votes from any State, or other question arising in the matter, each Senator and Representative may speak to such objection or question 5 minutes, and not more than once; but after such debate shall have lasted 2 hours it shall be the duty of the presiding officer of each House to put the main question without further debate.

SAME; PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE AT JOINT MEETING

§ 18. While the two Houses shall be in meeting as provided in this subchapter, the President of the Senate shall have power to preserve order; and no debate shall be allowed and no question shall be put by the presiding officer except to either House on a motion to withdraw.

VACANCY IN OFFICES OF BOTH PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT; OFFICERS ELIGIBLE TO ACT

§ 19. (a) (1) If, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is neither a President nor Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress, act as President.

(2) The same rule shall apply in the case of the death, resignation, removal from office, or inability of an individual acting as President under this subsection.

(b) If, at the time when under subsection (a) of this section a Speaker is to begin the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President, there is no Speaker, or the Speaker fails to qualify as Acting President, then the President pro tempore of the Senate shall, upon his resignation as President pro tempore and as Senator, act as President.

(c) An individual acting as President under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of this section shall continue to act until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, except that—

(1) if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the failure of both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect to qualify, then he shall act only until a President or Vice President qualifies; and

(2) if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the inability of the President or Vice President, then he shall act only until the removal of the disability of one of such individuals.

(d) (1) If, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is no President pro tempore to act as President under subsection (b) of this section, then the officer of the United States who is highest on the following list, and who is not under disability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President shall act as President: Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Defense, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor.

(2) An individual acting as President under this subsection shall continue so to do until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, but not after a qualified and prior-entitled individual is able to act, except that the removal of the disability of an individual higher on the list contained in paragraph (1) of this subsection or the ability to qualify on the part of an individual higher on such list shall not terminate his service.

(3) The taking of the oath of office by an individual specified in the list in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be held to constitute his resignation from the office by virtue of the holding of which he qualifies to act as President.

(e) Subsections (a), (b), and (d) of this section shall apply only to such officers as are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution. Subsection (d) of this section shall apply only to officers appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, prior to the time of the death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, of the President pro tempore, and only to officers not under impeachment by the House of Representatives at the time the powers and duties of the office of President devolve upon them.

(f) During the period that any individual acts as President under this section, his compensation shall be at the rate then provided by law in the case of the President.

RESIGNATION OR REFUSAL OF OFFICE

§ 20. The only evidence of a refusal to accept, or of a resignation of the office of President or Vice President, shall be an instrument in writing, declaring the same, and subscribed by the person refusing to accept or resigning, as the case may be, and delivered into the office of the Secretary of State.

CHAPTER 2—OFFICE AND COMPENSATION OF PRESIDENT

Sec.

101. Commencement of term of office.
102. Salary.
103. Traveling expenses.
104. Salary of the Vice President.
105. Secretary to President; compensation.
106. Administrative assistants.
107. Detail of employees of executive departments to office of President.
108. Accommodations for vehicles.
109. Public property in and belonging to Executive Mansion.
110. Furniture for White House.
111. Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President; annual appropriation; salary of Director.

COMMENCEMENT OF TERM OF OFFICE

§ 101. The term of 4 years for which a President and Vice President shall be elected, shall, in all cases, commence on the 20th day of January next succeeding the day on which the votes of the electors have been given.

SALARY

§ 102. The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected the sum of \$75,000 a year, to be paid monthly, and shall be entitled to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion.

TRAVELING EXPENSES

§ 103. There may be expended for or on account of the traveling expenses of the President of the United States such sum as Congress may from time to time appropriate, not exceeding \$40,000 per annum, such sum when appropriated to be expended in the discretion of the President and accounted for on his certificate solely.

SALARY OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

§ 104. The Vice President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected the sum of \$20,000 a year, to be paid monthly.

SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT; COMPENSATION

§ 105. The compensation for the position of Secretary to the President shall be at the rate of \$10,000 per annum.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS

§ 106. The President is authorized to appoint not to exceed six administrative assistants and to fix the compensation of each at the rate of not more than \$10,000 per annum. Each such administrative assistant shall perform such duties as the President may prescribe.

DETAIL OF EMPLOYEES OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

§ 107. Employees of the executive departments and independent establishments of the executive branch of the Government may be detailed from time to time to the White House Office for temporary assistance.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR VEHICLES

§ 108. The Quartermaster General of the Army shall provide suitable accommodations for the horses, carriages, and other vehicles of the President and of the Executive Office, in the stables maintained in the District of Columbia by and for the use of his department.

PUBLIC PROPERTY IN AND BELONGING TO EXECUTIVE MANSION

§ 109. The steward, housekeeper, or such other employee of the Executive Mansion as the President may designate, shall, under the direction of the President, have the charge and custody of and be responsible for the plate, furniture, and public property therein, and shall, before entering upon the duties of the office, give bond for the faithful discharge thereof, said bond to be in the sum of \$10,000, and to be approved by the Director of the National Park Service. A complete inventory, in proper books, shall be made annually in the month of June, under the direction of the Director of the National Park Service, of all the public property in and belonging to the Executive Mansion, showing when purchased, its cost, condition, and final disposition. This inventory shall be submitted to the President for his approval, and shall then be kept for reference in the office of the Director of the National Park Service, which shall furnish a copy thereof to the steward, housekeeper, or other employees responsible for the property.

FURNITURE FOR WHITE HOUSE

§ 110. All furniture purchased for the use of the President's House shall be, as far as practicable, of domestic manufacture. With a view to conserving in the White House the best specimens of the early American furniture and furnishings, and for the purpose of maintaining the interior of the White House in keeping with its original design, the Director of the National Park Service is authorized and directed, with the approval of the President, to accept donations of furniture and furnishings for use in the White House, all such articles thus donated to become the property of the United States and to be accounted for as such. The said Director of the National Park Service is further authorized and directed, with the approval of the President, to appoint a temporary committee composed of one representative of the American Federation of Arts, one representative of the National Commission of Fine Arts, one representative of the National Academy of Design, one member of the American Institute of Architects, and five members representing the public at large; the said committee to have full power to select and pass on the articles in question and to recommend the same for acceptance.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT; ANNUAL APPROPRIATION; SALARY OF DIRECTOR

§ 111. There is authorized to be appropriated annually to the Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President a sum not exceeding \$1,500,000 in order to (a) provide a central clearinghouse through which individual citizens, organizations of citizens, and State or local governmental bodies may transmit inquiries and complaints and receive advice and information; (b) assist the President in dealing with special problems requiring the clearance of information between the Federal Government and State and local governments and private institutions; (c) collect and distribute information concerning the purposes and activities of executive departments and agencies for the use of the Congress, administrative officials, and the public; and (d) keep the President currently informed of the opinions, desires, and complaints of citizens and groups of citizens and of State and local governments with respect to the work of Federal agencies: *Provided*, That, in the expenditure of such funds, section 5 of title 41 shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$50: *Provided further*, That

the President may fix the salary of the Director of the Office of Government Reports at a rate of not more than \$10,000 per annum.

CHAPTER 3—PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENT; THE WHITE HOUSE POLICE

Sec.

201. Protection of President and family authorized.
202. White House police; establishment, control, and supervision; privileges, powers, and duties.
203. Personnel; appointment; vacancies.
204. Grades, salaries, and transfers of appointees.
205. Appointment in accordance with civil-service laws.
206. Privileges of civil-service appointees.
207. Participation in police and firemen's relief fund.
208. Refunds to members appointed from United States Park Police force.
209. Appropriation to carry out provisions.

PROTECTION OF PRESIDENT AND FAMILY AUTHORIZED

§ 201. The protection of the person of the President and the members of his immediate family and of the person chosen to be President of the United States is authorized.

WHITE HOUSE POLICE; ESTABLISHMENT, CONTROL, AND SUPERVISION; PRIVILEGES, POWERS, AND DUTIES

§ 202. There is hereby created and established for the protection of the Executive Mansion and grounds in the District of Columbia a permanent police force, to be known as the "White House Police." Such force shall be under the control and direct supervision of the Chief of the Secret Service Division. The members of such force shall possess privileges and powers and perform duties similar to those of the members of the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia, and such additional privileges and duties as the Chief of the Secret Service Division may prescribe.

PERSONNEL, APPOINTMENT, AND VACANCIES

§ 203. (a) The White House Police force shall consist of such number of officers, with grades corresponding to similar officers of the Metropolitan Police force, and of such number of privates, with grade corresponding to that of private of the highest grade in the Metropolitan Police force, as may be necessary, but not exceeding 110 in number. Members of the White House Police shall be appointed from the members of the Metropolitan Police force and the United States Park Police force from lists furnished by the officers in charge of such forces. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner.

(b) Any vacancy in the Metropolitan Police force or in the United States Park Police force caused by appointments to the White House Police force shall be filled in the manner provided by law.

GRADES, SALARIES, AND TRANSFERS OF APPOINTEES

§ 204. (a) No person shall be appointed a member of the White House Police force at a grade lower than the grade held by him as a member of the Metropolitan Police force or of the United States Park Police force at the time of his appointment.

(b) A member of the White House Police force shall receive a salary at the rate provided for the corresponding grade in the Metropolitan Police force, and he shall be furnished with uniforms and other necessary equipment similar to the uniforms and equipment furnished the United States Park Police, and he shall be entitled to the same leave allowances as a member of the United States Park Police force.

(c) Any member of the White House Police force appointed thereto from the Metropolitan Police force or the United States Park Police force may be transferred to the

organization of which he was a member at the time of such appointment.

APPOINTMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH CIVIL-SERVICE LAWS

§ 205. In addition to appointment from members of the Metropolitan Police force and the United States Park Police force, as provided in section 203 (a) of this title, members of the White House Police force may be appointed, and vacancies in such force filled, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the regulations issued pursuant thereto.

PRIVILEGES OF CIVIL-SERVICE APPOINTEES

§ 206. Members appointed pursuant to section 205 of this title shall be entitled to the same privileges as to salary, grade, uniforms, equipment, transfer, leave, relief funds, retirement, and refunds as members appointed from the Metropolitan Police force and the United States Park Police force.

PARTICIPATION IN POLICE AND FIREMEN'S RELIEF FUND

§ 207. (a) A member of the United States Park Police force appointed to the White House Police force shall be included within the provisions of section 12 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved September 1, 1916, as amended, upon payment into the policemen and firemen's relief fund, District of Columbia, of an amount equal to 1½ percent of the total basic salary received by him since September 1, 1916, as a member of such United States Park Police force and as a watchman of the United States in any public square or reservation of the District of Columbia.

(b) For the purposes of retirement under such act, service with the United States Park Police force and service as a watchman of the United States in any public square or reservation of the District of Columbia shall be deemed service with the White House Police force.

(c) Any member of the Metropolitan Police force appointed to the White House Police force shall continue to be subject to the provisions of section 12 of such act, and appointment of such member to the White House Police force or transfer of such member to his former organization shall not affect any right, privilege, or duty of such member under the provisions of such section of such act.

REFUNDS TO MEMBERS APPOINTED FROM UNITED STATES PARK POLICE FORCE

§ 208. A member of the United States Park Police force appointed to the White House Police force shall be paid a refund as provided for in section 724 of title 5, and upon transfer to the United States Park Police force he shall be paid a refund from the policemen and firemen's relief fund of all money paid by him as salary deductions into such fund, and he shall be reinstated and included within the provisions of sections 691, 693, 698, 707, 709-715, 716-719, 720-725, 727-729, and 730 of title 5 upon payment to the Secretary of the Treasury of an amount equal to the amount refunded to him, at the time of such appointment, under the provisions of section 724 of title 5, plus an amount equal to 2½ percent of the total basic salary received by him during the period of his service as a member of the White House Police force. For the purposes of retirement under sections 691, 693, 698, 707, 709-715, 716-719, 720-725, 727-729, and 730 of title 5, service with the White House Police force shall be deemed service with the United States Park Police force.

APPROPRIATION TO CARRY OUT PROVISIONS

§ 209. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury

not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections 202-204, 207, and 208 of this title.

Sec. 2. The provisions of title 3, "The President," set out in section 1 of this act, shall be construed as a continuation of existing law and no loss of rights, interruption of jurisdiction, nor prejudice to matters pending on the effective date of this act shall result from its enactment.

Sec. 3. The sections or parts thereof of the Revised Statutes or Statutes at Large enumerated in the following schedule are hereby repealed. Any rights or liabilities now existing under such sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by this repeal.

Revised Statutes	U. S. Code	
	Title	Section
Section:		
131 ¹	3	1.
132	3	2.
133	3	3.
134	3	4.
137	3	8.
138	3	9, note.
139	3	10.
140	3	11, not..
141	3	13, note.
143	3	14, note.
144	3	15, note.
145	3	16.
151	3	23.
152	3	41.
153	3	42.
154	3	44.
1829	3	49.
1832 ²	3	50, note.
1833 ³	3	51, note.

Date	Statutes at Large			U. S. Code		
	Chapter	Section	Volume	Page	Title	Section
1887—Feb. 3...	90	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.	24	373-375	3	5 note, 6 7 note, 17-20.
1888—Oct. 19...	1216	1, 2...	25	613	3	11 note, 12 note, 13 note.
1906—June 23...	3523		34	454	3	43.
1907—Feb. 26...	1635	4 ⁴	34	993	3	44.
1909—Mar. 4...	297	1	35	859	3	42.
1910—June 25...	384	9	36	773	3	48.
1911—Mar. 4...	285	1	36	1404	3	47.
1913—June 23...	3	1	38	723	3	53.
1922—June 12...	218		42	636	3	46.
Sept. 14.	308	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.	42	841-843	3	61-65, 66 note, 67.
1923—Feb. 13...	72		42	1227	3	46.
1924—June 7...	292	1	43	521	3	46.
1925—Feb. 28...	377	1, 2	43	1091	3	49.
1925—Mar. 3...	468	1	43	1198, 1199	3	46.
Mar. 4...	549	4	43	1301	3	44.
1926—Apr. 22...	171	1	44	305	3	45.
Apr. 22...	171	1	44	305	3	46.
1927—Feb. 11...	104	1	44	1069	3	46.
1928—May 16...	580	1	45	573	3	46.
May 29...	859	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.	45	945-947	3	5a, 7a, 9a, 11a, 11b, 11c.
1929—Feb. 20...	270	1	45	1230	3	46.
1930—Apr. 19...	201	1	46	229	3	46.
May 14...	277	1, 2, 3, 4.	46	328, 329	3	61-63, 67.
1931—Feb. 23...	281	1	46	1355	3	46.
1932—June 30...	330	1	47	452	3	46.
1933—June 16...	101	1	48	284	3	46.
1934—Mar. 28...	102	1	48	509	3	46.
June 5...	390	1, 6, 7...	48	879	3	5a, 11b, 11c, 17, 41.
1935—Feb. 2...	3	1	49	6	3	46.
May 28...	154	1	49	304	3	62.
1936—Mar. 19...	156	1	49	1168	3	46.
1937—June 28...	396	1	50	330	3	46.
1938—May 23...	259	1	52	411	3	46.
1939—Mar. 16...	11	1	53	524	3	46.
Apr. 3...	36	301	53	565	3	45a.

Footnotes at end of table.

Date	Statutes at Large			U. S. Code		
	Chapter	Section	Volume	Page	Title	Section
1940—Apr. 8...	107	1	54	112	3	46.
Apr. 22...	133		54	156	3	62.
1941—Apr. 5...	40	1	55	93	3	46.
1942—June 27...	450	1	56	392	3	46.
Oct. 9...	582	1, 2	56	778	3	62a, 62b.
1943—June 26...	145	101	57	169	3	46.
1944—June 27...	286	101	58	361	3	46.
1945—May 3...	106	101	59	106	3	46.
1946—Mar. 28...	113	101	60	61	3	46.
Aug. 2...	744	17 (c)	60	811	3	43.
Aug. 2...	753	601 (a), 14	60	850	3	44.
1947—June 9...	102		61	132	3	62.
July 18...	264	1 (a-f)	61	380, 381	3	24.
July 26...	343	311	61	809	3	24.
July 30...	359	101	61	585	3	46.

¹ All provisions not heretofore affected or modified by act Jan. 19, 1886, ch. 4, sec. 3, 24 Stat. 2.

² Only the words, "the President's House," appearing in this section.

³ Only the word, "Extension" following the words, "Architect of the Capitol;" and the words, "and the President's House," appearing in this section.

⁴ Only the words, "the Vice President of the United States", appearing in this section.

⁵ Only the words, "and after the 3d of March, 1909, the compensation of the President of the United States shall be \$75,000 per annum", in the eighth full paragraph appearing on this page.

⁶ Only the following paragraph appearing on this page: "The Quartermaster General of the Army shall provide suitable accommodations for the horses, carriages, and other vehicles of the President and of the Executive Office, in the stables maintained in the District of Columbia by and for the use of his department."

⁷ Only the words, "which protection is hereafter authorized," in the first paragraph appearing on this page.

⁸ Only the proviso in the first paragraph under the heading, "Office of the President", appearing on this page.

⁹ Only the proviso in the first paragraph under the heading, "Office of the President", on page 1198, said proviso commencing on page 1198, and ending on page 1199.

¹⁰ Only the quoted words, "the Vice President of the United States", appearing in the provisions amending act Feb. 26, 1907, ch. 1635, sec. 4, 34 Stat. 993.

¹¹ Only the following words: "and on and after July 1, 1926, the compensation for such position shall be at the rate of \$10,000 per annum", in the first paragraph under the heading, "Office of the President", appearing on this page.

¹² Only the proviso in the first paragraph under the heading, "The White House Office", appearing on this page.

¹³ Only the second proviso in the paragraph under the heading, "The White House Office", said proviso appearing on this page.

¹⁴ Only the words, "and the Vice President of the United States", appearing in subsection (a) of section 601.

Mr. REED of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 6412, to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President," has been favorably reported to the House by unanimous vote of the Committee on the Judiciary, as part of a comprehensive plan to enact the entire 50 titles of the code as legal evidence of the law. I wish to emphasize that this bill is not intended to make any substantive changes in existing law. As in the case of the bills enacting titles 1, 4, 6, 9, and 17, all of which have become law during this Congress, the sections of the present title of the code which are still in force and effect are reenacted without change. These provisions are derived from numerous sections of the Revised Statutes and Statutes at Large,

as amended. This bill repeals, without prejudice to existing rights or obligations, the many separate enactments which are incorporated in the proposed title thereby making it entirely unnecessary to have recourse to scores of volumes of the Statutes at Large and the Revised Statutes to determine the present status of the law.

As you know, title 3 of the United States Code in its existing form is only prima facie evidence of the law—the only legal evidence being in the Revised Statutes and the Statutes at Large. When this bill is enacted title 3 will be legal evidence and there will then be only one primary source of the laws on the subject. The title will thereafter be amended directly whenever amendment is desirable or necessary, and greater certainty and clarity will prevail—to say nothing of the convenience in finding the law in one place instead of scores of places.

The committee amendments to the bill are intended to eliminate provisions which are now obsolete and which should not be reenacted.

REASONS FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Section 111, relating to the Office of Government Reports, was based upon the act of June 9, 1941, authorizing an annual appropriation for the Office of Government Reports. This Office was consolidated with the Office of War Information which was subsequently abolished by Executive Order 9608. Thereafter, Executive Order 9809 of December 12, 1946, reestablished the Office of Government Reports, but no appropriation was made for such office in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1948, and the conference committee on that bill recommended that the office be liquidated. The amendment therefore would eliminate this section from the proposed title 3 of the United States Code as obsolete.

The amendment which strikes out subsection (a) of section 207 is intended to restate the law as it exists today. Subsection (a) is obsolete in view of section 5 of the act of July 1, 1930, which provides that there should be deducted for the benefit of the policemen and firemen's relief fund 3½ percent of the monthly pay of each member of the United States Park Police and White House police force. It is understood that all the present White House policemen who were recruited from the Park Police force are, in fact, subject to this provision.

The amendment to subsection (b) of section 207 is in the nature of a clarifying amendment and to restate the law as it exists today by eliminating the provisions relating to watchmen of the United States in public squares of the District of Columbia, inasmuch as such designation was changed by section 3 of the act of December 5, 1919.

The amendment eliminating section 208 from the bill is intended to restate title 3 by eliminating obsolete provisions. It is believed that section 5 of the act of September 14, 1922, has been superseded and made obsolete by subsequent legislation which removed United States park police from the coverage of the civil-service retirement law and made them subject to section 12 of the act of September 1, 1916, as amended. See, in this

connection, sections 7 and 8 of the act of May 27, 1924—Forty-third United States Statutes, page 176—and section 5 of the act of July 1, 1930—Forty-sixth United States Statutes, page 840.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action by the House on this bill.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 16, strike out the last two lines of the chapter analysis reading:

"111. Office of Government Reports in the Executive Office of the President; annual appropriation; salary of Director."

Strike out section 111 commencing on page 20, line 8, and ending on page 21, line 8.

Page 21, strike out the line in the chapter analysis reading:

"208. Refunds to members appointed from United States Park Police force."

Strike out "209" in the next line and insert in lieu thereof: "208."

Page 24, strike out lines 9 through 21; and on line 22, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "§ 207. (a)" and strike out the words "such act" and insert in lieu thereof: "Section 12 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations to provide for the expense of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes,' approved September 1, 1916, as amended."

Line 23, strike out the words "and service as a watchman of the United States in any public square or reservation of the District of Columbia."

Page 25, line 4, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)."

Strike out section 208 appearing on pages 25 and 26, and renumber section 209 to read "208."

Page 28, in the tabulation of Statutes at Large to be repealed, strike out the seventh line reading "June 9 * * * 189 * * * 55 247, 248 3 54."

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.

CHOCTAW COAL & RAILWAY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5891) to repeal an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation, and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company," and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto.

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

Whereas Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad Co., a corporation created under and by virtue of the act approved August 24, 1894, having become insolvent, and title to all of its railways and other properties, and ownership of all of its shares of capital stock, having passed to and become vested in Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation of the State of Delaware, and all of its indebtedness discharged, by virtue of and pursuant to consummation order and final decree entered by the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, on December 30, 1947: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and fran-

chises vested in that company" (28 Stat. L. 502), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, be, and the same are hereby, repealed; and all the rights, powers, immunities, privileges, and franchises, which have been heretofore granted to or conferred upon Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad Co. by any act or acts of Congress shall be, and the same are, terminated.

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.

PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

The Clerk called the bill (S. 657) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize crediting of service as a cadet, midshipman, or aviation cadet for pay purposes, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TRANSPORTATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1525) to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force shall determine that the effective conduct of the affairs of his department requires assured and adequate transportation facilities to and from their places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by such department including, during any period of war, personnel attached to or employed by private plants engaged in the manufacture of material for such departments, he is hereby authorized in the absence of adequate private or other facilities to provide such transportation, by motor vehicle or water carrier, subject, however, to the following provisions and conditions:

1. The equipment required to provide such transportation facilities may be either purchased, leased, or chartered for operation by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and when so obtained may be maintained and operated either by enlisted personnel, civil employees of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force or by private personnel under contract with such departments. Equipment so obtained may also be leased or chartered to private or public carriers for operation under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, or such official within their respective departments as they may designate, shall determine necessary and advisable under the existing circumstances: *Provided,* That any equipment purchased, leased, or operated by authority of this act shall have a seating capacity of 12 or more passengers.

2. That in each case where transportation facilities are provided hereunder, reasonable rates of fare for the service furnished shall be established and charged under such regulations as the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force shall prescribe; the receipts from such fares, and the proceeds from the leasing or chartering of any equipment as provided in the foregoing paragraph, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

3. The facilities and service authorized hereunder shall be utilized only for the transportation of personnel heretofore enumerated and for the purpose heretofore stated, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by authority of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force: *Provided, however,* That where the equipment and facilities herein provided for are pooled under lease or charter agreements, the reciprocal use of Government-owned and private-owned equipment shall be deemed to be within the intent of this paragraph.

4. The authority herein granted the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall be exercised in each case only after a determination by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, or such official within their respective departments as they may designate, as the case may be, that existing private and other facilities are not and cannot be rendered adequate by other means, that reasonable effort has been made to induce operators of private facilities to provide the necessary service, and that its exercise will result in the most efficient method of supplying transportation to the personnel concerned and a proper utilization of transportation facilities.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, to file with the Congress, within sixty days after the end of the fiscal year a summarized report of the exercise of the authority herein granted, which report shall include (1) location, nature, and size of the activity for which transportation facilities were provided; (2) type, amount, and original cost of equipment furnished; (3) outline of lease or charter for rented or reciprocally used equipment with total costs for period of use or operation; (4) citation of authority of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force under which exercised; and (5) for each activity for which transportation facilities were provided, the maximum number of motor vehicles or water carriers used, the total miles operated, the total revenue from fares or proceeds from the leasing or chartering of equipment, the operating and maintenance expense, depreciation, gross cost, and net cost.

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved December 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 1024), as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of section 1 of the act of April 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 86), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "war", insert "or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President."

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.

EXCHANGING CERTAIN PROPERTY WITH THE CITY OF KEARNEY, NEBR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5181) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange certain property with the city of Kearney, Nebr.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill (S. 2077) for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to convey approximately seventeen acres of land and improvements thereon owned by the United States in Buffalo County, Nebr., lying in the south half southeast quarter section 27, township 9 north, range 15 west of the sixth principal meridian, and the Government-owned improvements located on land leased from the city of Kearney, Nebr., in said section 27 constructed by the Army for an automotive equipment repair shop, to the city of Kearney, Nebr., in exchange for approximately four hundred and forty-two and seventy-four one-hundredths acres of land in Buffalo County, Nebr., described as a tract of land situated in section 27, township 9 north, range 15 west, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the northeast corner of section 27; thence south along the east section line two thousand eight hundred and thirty-five feet, more or less; thence in a westerly direction one thousand six hundred and seventy-five feet, more or less; thence in a southwesterly direction one thousand two hundred and eighty-five feet, more or less; thence south parallel to the east line of section 27 eight hundred and seventy-five feet, more or less; thence west and parallel to the south line of section 27 two thousand five hundred and seventy feet, more or less; thence north along the west line of section 27 four thousand four hundred and sixty feet, more or less, to the northwest corner of section 27; thence east five thousand two hundred and eighty feet, more or less, along the north line of section 27 to place of beginning, which is to be conveyed to the United States by the city of Kearney, Nebr., as a part of the Kearney Army Air Field, Nebr.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 5181) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PARAGRAPH 1007 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5608) to amend paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what this bill does.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to correct an inequity in the present tariff on linen fire hose. It affects five manufacturers in this country, one in my own district, two in New York City, one in California, and one in New Jersey. It will enable these domestic producers to compete with imports on a more reasonable basis.

The Tariff Commission tells us that it is the usual tariff practice to impose a higher rate of duty on a finished product than on the commodity which principally goes into its manufacture. At the present time there is no such differential as to linen fire hose.

The ad valorem equivalent of the tariff on the finished product today is about 30 percent. The tariff on the principal raw material component, plied yarn is 30 percent ad valorem.

I believe it is considered good tariff practice to have a differential of from 10 percent to 15 percent ad valorem in favor of the finished product to take care of the substantially higher cost of domestic manufacture.

This bill will provide a differential of about 10 percent ad valorem. This product, linen fire hose, is used largely by conservation and forestry divisions of government, both Federal, and State, for fire-fighting. It is also used in apartment houses, hotels, hospitals, department stores, and public buildings. It is the type of unlined fire hose used extensively by transportation companies as well as the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission.

While the industry affected by this bill is not a large one, it is important for the national security.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The rate will be 40 percent ad valorem if this bill is passed?

Mr. GOODWIN. Forty percent ad valorem.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FREE IMPORTATION OF EVERGREEN TREES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5612) to provide for the free importation of evergreen Christmas trees.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FREE IMPORTATION OF SALT BRINE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5641) to provide for the free importation of salt brine.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1766 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "salt brine containing not less than 15 percent nor more than 28 percent of sodium chloride."

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.

EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT, ALAMEDA, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5642) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, an easement for the construction and operation of a water main in and under certain Government-owned lands comprising a part of the United States naval air station, Alameda, Calif.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill, S. 2233, for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant and convey to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, an agency of the State of California, without cost to the said utility district, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper, a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, operation, renewal, replacement, and repair of a water-pipe line or lines within a strip of land 10 feet wide extending a distance of 739.91 feet along the eastern boundary of lands comprising a part of the United States naval air station, Alameda, Calif., contiguous to Webster Street, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 5642) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING CERTAIN RELATIVES TO RECEIVE BENEFITS OF ARMED FORCES LEAVE BONDS OF DECEASED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5758) to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters, and nieces and nephews, of deceased members and former members of the armed forces.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 2 and 6 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby amended as follows:

(a) Section 2. At the end thereof add a new paragraph as follows:

"(h) The terms 'brother' and 'sister' include brothers and sisters of the half blood as well as those of the whole blood, step-brothers and stepsisters, and brothers and sisters through adoption."

(b) Section 6. In paragraph (2) of subsection (a) delete "to such holder's surviving spouse and children, if any, in equal shares; and if such holder leaves no surviving spouse or child or children, then in equal shares to such holder's surviving parents, if any", and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(i) to such holder's surviving spouse and children, if any, in equal shares;

"(ii) if such holder leaves no surviving spouse or child or children, then in equal shares to such holder's surviving parents, if any;

"(iii) if such holder leaves no surviving spouse, child, or parent, then in equal shares to such holder's surviving brothers and sisters, if any; and

"(iv) if such holder leaves no surviving spouse, child, parent, brother, or sister, then in equal shares to the surviving child or children, if any, of such holder's deceased brothers and sisters."

(c) Section 6. In subsection (b) delete "To such member's or former member's surviving spouse and children, if any, in equal shares; and if such member or former mem-

ber leaves no surviving spouse or child or children, then in equal shares to his surviving parents, if any", and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(i) to such member's or former member's surviving spouse and children, if any, in equal shares;

"(ii) if such member or former member leaves no surviving spouse or child or children, then in equal shares to such member's or former member's surviving parents, if any;

"(iii) if such member or former member leaves no surviving spouse, child, or parent, then in equal shares to such member's or former member's surviving brothers and sisters, if any; and

"(iv) if such member or former member leaves no surviving spouse, child, parent, brother, or sister, then in equal shares to the surviving child or children, if any, of such member's or former member's deceased brothers and sisters."

Sec. 2. A sum equal to the amount of any bond or check heretofore covered into the general fund of the Treasury, for lack of survivors pursuant to section 6, paragraph (2), of subsection (a), of the Armed Forces Leave Act, shall be payable, upon request, to any survivor entitled thereto under the provisions of said section 6, paragraph (2) of subsection (a), as amended by this act.

Sec. 3. The provisions of this act shall be effective from August 9, 1946.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 24, after the colon insert the following: "Provided, That in any case where payment under the provisions of section 6, paragraph 2 of subsection (a) has been refused to a person not a survivor, as defined by the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 as heretofore in force, and the bond has not been retired or the proceeds of the check been paid into the general fund, payment shall be made upon application by those persons now entitled to payment under the provisions of section 6, paragraph 2 of subsection (a) as amended by this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CONTINUE SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTIES ON SCRAP METAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6242) to continue until the close of June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 13, 1942, entitled "An act to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of tariff duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap," as amended (Public Law 497, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 171; Public Law 384, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

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 PARAGRAPH 813 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5965) to amend paragraph 813 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 813 of schedule 8 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 813. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the duties imposed on beverages in this schedule which are subject also to internal revenue taxes shall be imposed only on the quantities subject to such taxes."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall be effective as to such merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on and after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this act and shall apply to entries and withdrawals before that date which have not become final by operation of law.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all of section 2 and insert: "Sec. 2. This amendment shall be effective as to all such merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the day following the date of the enactment of this act and shall apply also to any such merchandise entered or withdrawn before that day with respect to which the liquidation of the entry or withdrawal, the exaction, or the decision as to dutiable quantity has not become final by reason of section 514, Tariff Act of 1930."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AMEND SECTION 24 OF THE FEDERAL POWER ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1305) to amend section 24 of the Federal Power Act so as to provide that the States may apply for reservation of portions of power sites released for entry, location, or selection to the States for highway purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 24 of the Federal Power Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first proviso thereof a colon and the following new proviso: "Provided further, That before any lands applied for, or heretofore or hereafter reserved, or classified as power sites, are declared open to location, entry, or selection by the Secretary of the Interior, notice of intention to make such declaration shall be given to the Governor of the State within which such lands are located, and such State shall have 90 days from the date of such notice within which to file, under any statute or regulation applicable thereto, an application for the reservation to the State, or any political subdivision thereof, of any lands required as a right-of-way for a public highway or as a source of materials for the construction and maintenance of such highways, and a copy of such application shall be filed with the Federal Power Commission; and any location, entry, or selection of such lands, or subsequent patent thereof, shall be subject to any rights granted the State pursuant to such application."

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.

TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER
PROBATIONERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2766) to amend section 2 of an act, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of an act, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. When directed by the court, the probation officer shall report to the court, with a statement of the conduct of the probationer while on probation. The court may thereupon discharge the probationer from further supervision and may terminate the proceedings against him, or may extend the probation, as shall seem advisable.

"Whenever during the period of his probation, a probationer heretofore or hereafter placed on probation, goes from the district in which he is being supervised to another district, jurisdiction over him may be transferred, in the discretion of the court, from the court for the district from which he goes to the court for the other district, with the concurrence of the latter court. Thereupon the court for the district to which jurisdiction is transferred shall have all power with respect to the probationer that was previously possessed by the court for the district from which the transfer is made. This process under the same conditions may be repeated whenever during the period of his probation the probationer goes from the district in which he is being supervised to another district.

"At any time within the probation period the probation officer may for cause arrest the probationer wherever found, without a warrant, or the court for the district in which the probationer is being supervised may issue a warrant for his arrest. Such warrant may be executed by either the probation officer or the United States marshal of either the district in which the probationer is being supervised or of any district in which the probationer shall be found. If the probationer shall be so arrested in a district other than that in which he is being supervised, he shall be returned to the district out of which such warrant shall have been issued, unless jurisdiction over him is transferred as above provided to the district in which he is found, and in that case he shall be detained pending further proceedings in such district. As speedily as possible after arrest the probationer shall be taken before the court for the district having jurisdiction over him. At any time after the probation period, but within the maximum period of probation permitted by section 1 of this act, the court for the district in which the defendant was last being supervised, may issue a warrant and cause the defendant to be arrested and brought before the court. Thereupon the court may revoke the probation or the suspension of sentence. If there was no previous sentence, the court upon the revocation of probation may impose any sentence which might originally have been imposed. If there was a previous sentence, the court may confirm it or set it aside and impose a new sentence not longer than the previous sentence."

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REEVES: Page 2, line 14, after the word "made", change the

period to a comma and add the following: "except that the period of probation shall not be changed without the consent of the sentencing court."

The amendment was 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.

EXTEND MATURITY DATE OF CERTAIN
BRIDGE BONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3402) to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 5 (e) of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of certain bridges and to extend the times for commencing and/or completing the construction of other bridges over the navigable waters of the United States," approved March 4, 1933, is amended by striking out "20 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "30 years."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the comma, insert: "as it relates to the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "years", insert a semicolon and the following: "and the second sentence of section 5 (e) of said act is amended by striking out the language 'or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management.'"

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.

TRANSFER ARMY VESSEL "HYGIENE"
TO ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3883) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene*.

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

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title of the United States to a certain Army vessel, known as the *Hygiene*, listed in the records of the War Department as Army vessel FS-35, and which the War Department has heretofore made available on a temporary basis for use by the Alaska Territorial Health Service. The transfer of said vessel shall be without charge to the Territory of Alaska.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

Page 1, line 6 strike out "War and after the word "Department" insert "of the Army."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "War" and after the word "Department" insert "of the Army."

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene*."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELEGATION OF CERTAIN POWERS TO
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4032) to amend certain provision of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill relative to the delegation of authority to the Secretary of the Navy. I understand that the Armed Services Committee has been holding hearings on the Executive order that permits the retired admirals and others to have three or four assistants for life. Does this bill go to the heart of that matter, or is this another approach to it? I am hesitant about giving the Secretary of the Navy or the President some additional powers that might add three or four more assistants for those people who are retired from military service. I would like to have an explanation of the bill before I permit it to be considered.

Hearing no explanation, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4114) to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 301 (d) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 241 (d)), is amended by changing the semicolon at the end thereof to a comma and adding: "and include in the grants for any such project grants of penicillin and other antibiotic compounds for use in such project;"

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (a) of section 321 of such act (42 U. S. C. 248 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Control, manage, and operate all institutions, hospitals, and stations of the Service, including minor repairs and maintenance and provide for the care, treatment, and hospitalization of patients, including the furnishing of prosthetic and orthopedic devices, and tobacco; and from time to time, with the approval of the President, select suitable sites for and establish such additional institutions, hospitals, and stations in the States and possessions of the United States as in his judgment are necessary to enable the Service to discharge its functions and duties;"

(b) Subsection (d) of such section (42 U. S. C. 248 (d)) is amended by striking out

the period at the end of such subsection and inserting the following in lieu thereof: ", and for the payment of expenses of preparing and transporting the remains of, or the payment of reasonable burial expenses for, any patient dying in a hospital or station."

Sec. 3. Subsection (e) of section 322 of such act (42 U. S. C. 249 (e)) is amended by inserting after the phrase "Persons entitled to care and treatment under subsection (a) of this section" the words "and persons whose care and treatment is authorized by subsection (c)."

Sec. 4. Section 331 of such act (42 U. S. C. 255) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such funds shall also be available, subject to regulations, for transportation of recovered indigent leper patients to their homes within the continental United States, including subsistence allowance while traveling."

Sec. 5. Subsection (b) of section 344 of such act (42 U. S. C. 260 (b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Appropriations available for the care and treatment of addicts admitted to a hospital of the Service under this section shall be available, subject to regulations, for paying the cost of transportation to any place within the continental United States, including subsistence allowance while traveling, for any such addict who is discharged as cured."

Sec. 6. Section 504 of such act (42 U. S. C. 222) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Funds available for the operation of such hospitals, institutions, and stations of the Service shall also be available for expenditure to meet court costs and other expenses incident to proceedings for the commitment, to St. Elizabeths Hospital or to any hospital, institution, or station of the Service, of any mentally incompetent person entitled to treatment by the Service."

Sec. 7. Section 509 of such act (42 U. S. C. 227) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 509. Appropriations for carrying out the purposes of this act shall be available for expenditure for personal services and rent at the seat of Government; books of reference, periodicals, and exhibits; printing and binding; transporting in Government-owned automotive equipment, to and from school, children of personnel who have quarters for themselves and their families at stations determined by the Surgeon General to be isolated stations; expenses incurred in pursuing, identifying, and returning prisoners who escape from any hospital, institution, or station of the Service or from the custody of any officer or employee of the Service, including rewards for the capture of such prisoners; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning such wearing apparel as may be prescribed by the Surgeon General for use by employees in the performance of their official duties; reimbursing officers and employees, subject to regulations of the Administrator, for the cost of repairing or replacing their personal belongings damaged or destroyed by patients while such officers or employees are engaged in the performance of their official duties; and maintenance of buildings of the National Institute of Health."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Such section is further amended by striking out the word 'and' at the end of paragraph (c), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (d) and inserting in lieu thereof '; and,' and by inserting after paragraph (d) the following new paragraph:

"(e) Provide, to the extent the Surgeon General determines that other public or private funds are not available therefor, for the payment of expenses of repairing and

transporting the remains of, or the payment of reasonable burial expenses for, any patient dying in a hospital or station."

Page 3, line 21, strike out "such" and insert "indigent."

Page 4, line 3, after "expenses", insert "of the Service."

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.

AMENDMENT OF GENERAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1946

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4190) to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1651) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Bridge Act of 1946 be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out section 506 thereof and by inserting in lieu of said section a new section to be designated as section 506 and to read as follows:

"Sec. 506. If tolls are charged for the use of an interstate bridge constructed or taken over or acquired by a State or States or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, under the provisions of this title, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the date of completing or acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested."

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.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4190) was laid on the table.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4816) to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of \$250,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS SAND AT FORT STORY, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5283) to provide for the disposal of surplus sand at Fort Story, Va.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and empowered to dispose of surplus sand on Government-owned lands at Fort Story, Va., by sale, upon such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him.

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.

DEFENSE HOMES CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5509) to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the committee having charge of the bill with regard to the progress they are making on a bill to take care of the school and buildings for the Booker T. Washington group. I understand this bill was substituted for one to transfer this property to the Booker T. Washington Memorial. Is any work being done now to take care of that organization?

Mr. DONDERO. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] to speak for the committee on that matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR. As the gentleman knows, two bills were introduced, one by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] to transfer Carver and Slowe Halls to the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, and one by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] to transfer the ownership of the property to Howard University. These two buildings were constructed a number of years ago for one specific purpose, to provide housing for the colored workers of the District of Columbia.

We went into this matter very carefully because we felt we wanted to do everything we possibly could for the Booker T. Washington Memorial, as we recognized the splendid work they are doing, but we also recognized that Howard University is, after all, what might be considered a Federal institution, and we are providing money for its upkeep. After careful examination we felt that the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial would find it practically impossible to recondition Slowe and Carver Halls for their particular use. We have met with representatives of the District government. We thought we had it ironed out, as the gentleman from Nebraska knows. However, since that time we have found that the parking units are going right through that area. We now have another meeting scheduled with them, which we hope will be within the next 10 days or 2 weeks, so that we will have facilities to give some aid to the Booker T. Washington Memorial.

The reason we are seeking to pass this bill today is that the Defense Homes Corporation ceases to exist on June 30, which means that time is of the essence, and it is necessary that some kind of legislation be passed so that the Defense Homes Corporation will know what to do with Carver and Slowe Halls. I feel we are making progress on the gentleman's request to give some aid to the Booker T. Washington Memorial, because we all recognize the splendid work they are doing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As the gentleman knows, the Booker T. Washington group is doing a splendid work and taking care of some 95 percent of the colored people who are not able to go to universities. I realize there are going to be some problems that will have to be worked out between the Defense Homes Corporation and the Commissioners of the city of Washington. I would think it would be a fine thing if this bill could be passed over without prejudice, in order to bring those two bills along together, because you may have to compromise some differences between the District Commissioners and the Defense Homes Corporation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5842) to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be re-committed to the Committee on Public Works for further consideration and hearings.

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

There was no objection.

REENTRY PERMITS TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5922) relating to the issuance of reentry permits to certain aliens.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 10 of the act of May 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 158; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 210 (b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) If the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization finds (1) that the alien has been legally admitted to the United States, or (2) that the alien has been legally admitted to the United States between July 1, 1924, and July 5, 1932, both dates inclusive, under clause (6) of section 3, and has continually resided in the United States since such entry, and that the application is made in good faith, he shall, with the approval of the Attorney General, issue the permit, specifying therein the length of time, not exceeding 1 year, during which it shall be valid. The permit shall be in such form as shall be by regulations prescribed and shall have permanently attached thereto the photograph of the alien to whom issued, together with such other matter as may be deemed necessary for the complete identification of the alien."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute therefor the following:

"That section 10 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 158-159; 8 U. S. C. 210 (a)-210 (f)), is hereby amended by adding a new subsection, to be known as subsection (g), and to read as follows:

"(g) An alien lawfully admitted to the United States, pursuant to clause 6, section 3 of this act, between July 1, 1924, and July 5, 1932, both dates inclusive, who since entry has maintained the status required of him at the time of his admission and who desires to visit abroad and return to the United States to resume the status existing at time of his departure for such visit, may apply to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization for a Treaty Merchants Return Permit which may be issued by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Attorney General, if he finds that the applicant is entitled thereto. Such a permit shall, in the possession of the persons to whom issued, be accepted in lieu of any visa otherwise required from nonimmigrants under this act or section 30 of the Alien Registration Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 673; 8 U. S. C. 451). Each permit shall be valid for a period therein designated not exceeding 1 year, but may be extended for good cause shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization for a period or periods not exceeding 6 months each. For the issuance of any such permit or any extension thereof there shall be paid to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization a fee of \$3 which shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The necessary forms and other requirements to effect the purposes of this subsection shall be prescribed by regulations of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General. Subsection (e) shall be applicable to this subsection."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EXTENDING PROVISIONS OF TITLE VI OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5889) to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6293) to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives.

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

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill covers a matter in which the Committee on Appropriations has some concern. Until the Committee on Appropriations can investigate, I ask unani-

mous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING TITLE VI OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6339) 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.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 623 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended to read:

"(d) If any State, prior to July 1, 1948, has not enacted legislation providing that compliance with minimum standards of maintenance and operation shall be required prior to that date (or, at the option of the State, required within such time after enactment of the legislation as the Surgeon General finds reasonable) in the case of hospitals which shall have received Federal aid under this title, such State shall not be entitled to any further allotments under section 624 until such time as such State has enacted such legislation. Upon enactment of such legislation after July 1, 1948, the prohibition in this subsection against further allotments to such State under this part shall no longer be effective and such State shall, subject to the other requirements of this part, be entitled to allotments under section 624 for the fiscal year in which such legislation is enacted and for the preceding fiscal year."

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.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6289) to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital may receive therein as a boarder and patient any adult person who appears to the Superintendent to be in need of mental care and treatment in a mental hospital, and who makes written application therefor and who is determined by the Superintendent to be mentally competent to make such application; and any person, under the age of 21 years, who appears to the Superintendent to be in need of mental care and treatment in a mental hospital, and whose parent, legal guardian, or other legal representative makes written application on behalf of such minor: *Provided*, That no such person shall be received as a boarder and patient in St. Elizabeths Hospital under authority of this act unless the certification provided for in subsection (b) of this section shall have been made with respect to him: *Provided further*, That no person shall be permitted to remain in such hospital as boarder and patient after the need for his treatment at a mental hospital has ceased: *And provided further*, That no person shall be permitted to remain in such hospital as a boarder and patient after the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital or his authorized representative has been notified that the certification provided for in subsection (b) has been revoked.

(b) Upon request therefor by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, the

Board of Public Welfare, if it finds that any person with respect to whom the application described in subsection (a) has been made was a resident of and domiciled within the District of Columbia for 1 year next preceding the time of such application, shall certify to the Superintendent that it will reimburse St. Elizabeths Hospital the cost of caring for such person as provided in section 3 of this act; except that if the Board finds that such person, or any other person legally responsible for his care, is able to pay all or any part of the cost of such care, the Board shall not be required to make a certification unless it has, pursuant to section 3, made an agreement satisfactory to it for payment to the District of Columbia of the cost of such care or such part of such cost.

SEC. 2. Any person received at St. Elizabeths Hospital for mental care and treatment under section 1 of this act shall not be detained there more than 3 days after having given written notice to the Superintendent thereof requesting his release, or, in the case of any such person who is under the age of 21 years, more than 3 days after he or his parent, legal guardian, or other legal representative gives such notice: *Provided*, That (a) if within such 3-day period there shall be filed in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia a petition with respect to such person, as provided by the act entitled "An Act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939, or (b) if an authorized representative of the Board of Public Welfare, upon receipt of a notice signed by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital or his authorized representative stating that in his opinion said person is of unsound mind and should not be allowed to remain at liberty or go unrestrained, shall within such 3-day period file a verified petition for a writ de lunatico inquirendo, or for an order of commitment, accompanied by the aforesaid notice, in the said District Court, alleging upon information and belief that such person is of unsound mind and should not be allowed to remain at liberty or go unrestrained, such person shall be detained by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital until a final judgment is entered by the court upon any such petition and any petition filed in accordance with clause (b) of this proviso, accompanied by the aforesaid notice, shall forthwith be referred by the court to the Commission on Mental Health, which said petition and notice shall be sufficient to initiate proceedings before said Commission. Pending the hearing upon the petition, such person need not be sent to Gallinger Hospital for observation and treatment, but shall be detained in St. Elizabeths Hospital for observation and treatment.

SEC. 3. The cost of board, medical care, and treatment furnished under this act shall be a charge upon the District of Columbia and shall be paid by the District of Columbia to St. Elizabeths Hospital. The District of Columbia is authorized to make such agreement as it deems necessary with any patient seeking board, medical care, and treatment under this act, or any other person or persons legally responsible therefor, for payment to the District of Columbia of the cost of such board, medical care, and treatment, or for the payment of a part of such cost; and is further authorized to take appropriate steps by legal action or otherwise to enforce such agreement or, in the absence of an agreement, to recover such cost of board, medical care, and treatment, or any part thereof, from the patient or from any person or persons legally liable therefor. The District of Columbia shall not be charged with the cost of board, medical care, and treatment furnished for any boarder and patient with respect to whom the certification required under section 1 of this act shall have been revoked by the Board of Public Welfare, and the said Board is authorized to order revocation of

any such certification: (a) When any person fails to make any payment under any agreement entered into under this act for the cost of board, medical care, and treatment; or (b) when, after a boarder and patient has been admitted to such hospital under a certification, without any agreement having been entered into for his care and treatment, the said Board determines, upon evidence satisfactory to it, that such boarder and patient is able, or other persons legally liable for his care are financially able, to bear all or part of such cost; or (c) when such certification has been made erroneously: *Provided*, That revocation of such certification shall not take effect until a copy of the order of revocation shall have been served upon the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital or his authorized representative.

SEC. 4. The Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he shall deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act relating to the hospital.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to prescribe such regulations as they shall deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act relating to the Board of Public Welfare and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 6. This act shall become effective 60 days after enactment.

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.

CANADIAN FISHING VESSELS AT ALASKAN PORTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6110) to permit the landing of halibut by Canadian fishing vessels to Alaskan ports, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 4311 of the Revised Statutes (46 U. S. C. 251), Canadian fishing vessels engaged in the North Pacific halibut fishery only shall be permitted to land their catches of halibut and sable fish (black cod) in ports of entry in Alaska, upon compliance with applicable customs laws, during any period prior to January 1, 1950, in which the Secretary of State finds and so notifies the Secretary of the Treasury that United States fishing vessels engaged in the North Pacific halibut fishery only are granted comparable privileges in ports of British Columbia.

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.

DONATING SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES BY ARMED SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5832) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force are hereby authorized in their discretion to donate for educational purposes in the States, Territories, and possessions without cost, except for costs of packing, transportation, and delivery, such facilities, equipment, materials, books, and other supplies as may be obsolete or no longer needed by the Army, Navy, or Air

Force and which the United States Commissioner of Education, Federal Security Agency, may consider usable for educational purposes.

SEC. 2. All property which the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, or Secretary of the Air Force may so donate, shall be allocated on the basis of needs and utilization of the United States Commissioner of Education for transfer by the owning agency directly to schools, colleges, or universities or to State departments of education, for distribution by the State to tax-supported schools, colleges, and universities and other nonprofit schools, colleges, and universities which have been held exempt from taxation under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code; except in any State where another agency is designated by State law for such purposes such transfer shall be made to said agency for such distribution within the State.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "which", insert the words "any such Secretary or."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "donate", insert a comma followed by the words "except that donated in accordance with section 3 hereof."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "of" before the word "the" and insert in lieu thereof the word "by."

Page 2, add the following new section to the bill:

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force may donate such of the property specified in section 1 hereof as they consider usable for educational purposes to those educational activities that are of special interest to the armed services, such as maritime academies or military, naval, air force, or coast guard preparatory schools."

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.

AMENDING STANDARD TIME ACT OF MARCH 19, 1918

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6318) to amend Section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States", approved March 19, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 15, sec. 264), which provides for placing a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone is hereby amended by adding the following: "*Provided*, That the Union Pacific Railroad Co. may use Pocatello as the point at which it changes from mountain time to Pacific time and vice versa, and may conduct all its operations on its main and branch lines west of Pocatello on Pacific time."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect at 2 o'clock antemeridian of the second Monday following the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "adding" and insert "striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

STUDY OF CLAMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1979) authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell and hard-shell clams.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to undertake, in cooperation with appropriate State and interstate agencies in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), comprehensive studies of the softshell clam, *Mya arenaria*, and the hard-shell clam, *Venus mercenaria*, with particular respect to the biology, propagation, and methods of cultivation of such clams. Such Service shall from time to time recommend appropriate measures for (1) arresting depletion in existing productive beds; (2) restoring to production beds formerly productive but now barren or unusable; (3) developing new areas which may be found suitable; (4) improving methods and techniques of digging, transplanting, and handling; and (5) otherwise increasing production and improving the quality of such clams for the benefit of both producers and consumers.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the 5-year period beginning July 1, 1948, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$250,000 to carry out the studies of the soft-shell clam and the sum of \$250,000 to carry out the studies of the hard-shell clam.

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.

EXEMPTION FROM ESTATE TAX OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6275) to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance in certain cases.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 811 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to determination of gross estate) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(m) Government life insurance: In determining the value of the gross estate of a decedent dying after December 6, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations, there shall not be included amounts receivable by the executor or any other beneficiary as national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance under policies upon the life of the decedent."

Sec. 2. Refunds: If the refund of any overpayment resulting from the application of the amendment made by section 1 of this act is prevented on the date of the enactment of this act, or within 1 year from such date, by the operation of any law or rule of law (other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to compromises), such refund may, nevertheless, be made if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act.

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.

COURSES OF INSTRUCTION AT UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY AND UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1723) to amend the acts authorizing the courses of instruction at the United States Naval Academy and the United States Military Academy to be given to a limited number of persons from the American Republics so as to permit such courses of instruction to be given to Canadians.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the first and second sentences of the act of July 14, 1941 (Public Law 168, 77th Cong., 1st sess.; 55 Stat. 589), is amended by inserting in the first sentence after the phrase "(other than the United)" the words "and Canada" and by inserting in the second sentence after the words "of such Republics" the words "and Canada" so that the first and second sentences as so amended will read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to permit, upon designation of the President of the United States, not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics (other than the United States) and Canada to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md. Not more than three persons from any of such Republics and Canada shall receive instruction under authority of this act at the same time."

Sec. 2. The first and second sentences of section 1 of the act of June 26, 1946 (Public Law 447, 79th Cong., 2d sess.; 60 Stat. 311), is amended by inserting in the first sentence after the phrase "(other than the United States)" the words "and Canada" and by inserting in the second sentence after the words "of such republics" the words "and Canada" so that the first and second sentences as so amended will read as follows:

"That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to permit, upon designation of the President of the United States, not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics (other than the United States) and Canada to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. Not more than three persons from any one of such republics and Canada shall receive instruction under authority of this act at the same time."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 20, strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

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.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1571) to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the eighth paragraph following the caption "Pay, miscellaneous" in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 930; U. S. C., title 49, sec. 241), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

"(a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (hereinafter referred to as the 'Committee') to be composed of not more than 17 members appointed by the President. Members shall serve as such without compensation, and shall include two representatives of the Department of the Air Force; two representatives of the Department of the Navy, from the office in charge of naval aeronautics; two representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Authority; one representative of the Smithsonian Institution; one representative of the United States Weather Bureau; one representative of the National Bureau of Standards; the chairman of the Research and Development Board of the National Military Establishment; and not more than seven other members selected from persons acquainted with the needs of aeronautical science, either civil or military, or skilled in aeronautical engineering or its allied sciences. Unless otherwise provided by law, each member not representing a Government department or agency shall be appointed for a term of 5 years from the date of the expiration of the term of the member whom he succeeds, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of a term shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds.

"(b) Under such rules and regulations as shall be formulated by the committee, with the approval of the President for the conduct of its work, it shall be the duty of the committee (1) to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution, (2) to determine the problems which should be experimentally attacked, and to discuss their solution and their application to practical questions, and (3) to direct and conduct research and experiment in aeronautics in the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, the Flight Propulsion Research Laboratory, and in such other laboratory or laboratories as may, in whole or in part, be placed under the direction of the committee.

"(c) An annual report to the Congress shall be submitted by the committee through the President, including an itemized statement of expenditures."

SEC. 2. Each member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics not representing a Government department or agency who may be appointed initially to fill any vacancy created by the increase in the membership of the committee authorized by the amendment made by the first section of this act shall serve under such appointment for a term expiring December 1, 1950.

SEC. 3. The following parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) That portion of the ninth paragraph following the caption "Pay, miscellaneous," in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 930; U. S. C., title 49, sec. 243), which reads as follows: "Provided, That an annual report to the Congress shall be submitted through the President, including an itemized statement of expenditures."

(b) That portion of the paragraph following the caption "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 650; U. S. C., title 49, sec. 242), which reads as follows: "Provided, That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to furnish office space to the National Advisory

Committee for Aeronautics in governmental buildings occupied by the Signal Corps."

(c) That portion of the first paragraph following the caption "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes," approved April 22, 1926 (44 Stat. 314; U. S. C., title 49, sec. 244), which reads as follows: ", hereafter to be known as the Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory."

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the bills eligible for call on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 540 (H. R. 5886), to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] objected. He now advises me he has studied the bill further and has no objection to the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]?

There was no objection.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1154; 8 U. S. C. 732), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 332. (a) An applicant for naturalization shall, not less than two nor more than 7 years after such declaration of intention has been made, make and file in the office of the clerk of a naturalization court, in duplicate, a sworn petition in writing, signed by the applicant in the applicant's own handwriting if physically able to write, and duly verified by witnesses, which petition shall contain substantially the following averments by such applicant."

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

AMENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House return to Calendar No. 611, H. R. 4032, to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] asked that this bill go over without prejudice. I understand he is now satisfied.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when I objected a few moments ago, I asked for

an explanation of the bill, but it was not forthcoming. Since then there has been an explanation of the bill. The question that I had raised relative to retired admirals and generals having personnel assigned to them I understand is being worked out in the Armed Services Committee. I will await with a great deal of interest their report and what they have been able to accomplish.

This bill does not go to that provision of the Executive which assigns military personnel to retired generals or admirals.

I ask that my original objection be removed.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the following acts or parts of acts are hereby amended by striking out the word "President," wherever it appears, and substituting in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Navy":

(a) Section 1443, Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 381);

(b) Section 1453, Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 417);

(c) Section 1454, Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 418);

(d) The last sentence of the second proviso of the second paragraph under the heading "Pay of the Navy" of the act of May 13, 1908, as it appears on page 128, volume 35, of the Statutes at Large (34 U. S. C. 383).

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1270; 34 U. S. C. 1017), is hereby amended by changing the final period to a colon and adding the following: "Provided further, That all authority hereby vested in the President shall hereafter be exercised by the Secretary of the Navy with respect to commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 8 of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 946), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1174; 34 U. S. C. 294 (a)), is hereby further amended by striking out the following: ", as directed by the President."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 13, strike out lines 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DISPOSITION OF THE RENTALS AND ROYALTIES FROM LEASES ISSUED OR RENEWED

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 555, providing for the consideration of 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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."

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.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an editorial on the Colorado River.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and to include a statement in each one and a resolution in one instance.

NEW STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. BUCHANAN. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to publicly thank the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, for his decisive and immediate action in recognition of the new State of Israel.

It marks an abrupt reversal of previous policy, but it was a logical and necessary answer to the circumstances at the dramatic moment it was made. Thus, in the end and after many fumbings and back-steppings, it marked the middle chapter of the story, our Government has returned to the same premises which motivated its strong support of the resolution for partition which was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations last November 29. Partition is now a reality.

My sincere hopes are now for the adoption of House Joint Resolution No. 362, which I introduced on March 31, 1948, to provide for the exportation of arms, munitions, and implements of war from the United States to Palestine. Certainly they are entitled to the wherewithal with which to defend themselves. The die is cast; there is no turning back now. We must recognize the present realities and meet them as they arise.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and attach thereto a list of veteran's bills passed by the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the mayor of Detroit on the housing situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and Mr. DINGELL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Would Make Segregation Constitutional."

Mr. CHADWICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] at exercises held yesterday at the University of Pennsylvania.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the calendar.

GEORGE HAMPTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3984) for the relief of George Hampton.

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

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SYLVIA M. MISETICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 744) for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, 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, to Sylvia M. Misetich, of Portland, Oreg., the sum of \$7,500, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of infection from a vaccination for smallpox administered to her pursuant to orders of her supervisor at the Portland subport of embarkation, Portland, Oreg., on January 10, 1944: *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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLIVER to the committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was 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.

WILLIAM NALLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4566) for the relief of William Nally.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay to William Nally, New York City, the proceeds of National Service Life Insurance Policy No. 10,171,649 issued to Ferdinand Ley, late private, Company A, Three Hundred and Nineteenth Medical Detachment, United States Army, who was killed in action in Luxemburg, on February 21, 1945. Although the said William Nally was designated by the insured as beneficiary of such policy, his claim for payment thereunder was disallowed by the Veterans' Administration on the ground that he did not stand in loco parentis to the insured within the meaning of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, because such relationship did not have its inception during the minority of the insured.

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.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN SHOSHONE RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1771) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Powell Townsite, Wyo., Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming, to the James S. McDonald Post 5054, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Powell, Wyo.

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

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JAMES P. LOVE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5151) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James P. Love a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue to James P. Love, a patent in fee to the following-described land, to wit: Lot 10, section 26, township 16 north, range 1 west, Choctaw meridian, Holmes County, Miss., containing 72½ acres more or less; *Provided, however,* That the issuance of such patent shall operate only as a conveyance of all the right, title, and interest of

the United States in and to the land described herein, but shall not affect any valid adverse rights of third parties should any such rights exist.

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.

TRANSFERS OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN COUNTY OF KAUAI, T. H., FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6252) to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii with the consent of the Governor of said Territory of Hawaii be authorized to issue a land patent to the Roman Catholic bishop of Honolulu, a corporation sole, covering the following described lands: Lots 118, 119, 120, and 122, Kekaha House lots, Waimea, county of Kauai, T. H.; said lands to be used for school purposes.

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.

MRS. HARRY A. LIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4587) for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey), the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

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.

LOWE WAY YUEN AND DANG CHEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1365) for the relief of Lowe Way Yuen and Dang Chee.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Lowe Way Yuen and Dang Chee (also known as Ellen Ding), who were admitted into the United States on October 12, 1939, for a temporary stay and who are the mother and sister, respectively, of Hon. W. Dang, a citizen and honorably discharged veteran of the armed forces of the United States, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of October 12, 1939.

Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available Chinese immigration quota.

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.

GUY CHENG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1483) for the relief of Guy Cheng.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Guy Cheng, of Charlotte, Vt., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of China.

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.

GUDRUN M. ERICSSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1729) for the relief of Gudrun M. Ericsson.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

EASEMENT OVER CERTAIN LANDS ADJACENT TO THE FORT MYERS AIRFIELD (FLA.)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5836) to authorize the Secretary of the Army or his duly authorized representative to quitclaim a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Fla.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army, or his duly authorized representative, be, and is hereby authorized and empowered under such terms as he may deem advisable, to quitclaim to the Inter-County Telephone & Telegraph Co., its successors and assigns, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a certain perpetual right-of-way and easement acquired by the United States in four and forty-two one-hundredths acres of land, more or less, for the location, construction, operation, maintenance, and patrol of a telephone line and telephone facilities, and for the construction and maintenance of a road necessary for the patrol of the telephone line and facilities, in, over, and across lands in the vicinity of the Fort Myers Army Airfield, Florida.

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.

PATRICIA SCHWARTZ AND BESSIE SCHWARTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5716) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any exclusion proceedings and to cancel the outstanding warrants of deportation

issued in the cases of Patricia Schwartz and Bessie Schwartz. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the aforementioned aliens shall not again be subject to exclusion by reason of the same facts upon which such exclusion proceedings were commenced or such orders of deportation have issued.

Sec. 2. In the administration of the immigration laws, the aforesaid aliens shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of May 9, 1947, the date of their arrival into the United States, upon the payment of the required head taxes.

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.

ALEX BAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6220) for the relief of Alex Bail.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of Alex Bail, and is directed not to issue any further warrants or orders in the case of the alien based upon such alien's membership in the Communist Party prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

DIONISIO R. TREVINO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 188) for the relief of Dionisio R. Trevino.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of Dionisio R. Trevino, and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Dionisio R. Trevino, who arrived at Brooklyn, N. Y., on or about April 25, 1934, as a seaman on the steamship *Mave Mar*, which he deserted on or about April 25, 1934, shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at such place and on such date. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota of the first year that such quota becomes available.

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.

FRANCISCO GAMBOA GIOCOECHEA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 511) for the relief of Francisco Gamboa Giocochea.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel the outstanding warrant and order of deportation, and bond, if any, issued pursuant to sections 13 and 14, of the Immigration Act of May 24, 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 213 and 214, in the case of Francisco Gamboa Gio-

cochea of Cascade, Idaho, any provision of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Francisco Gamboa Giocochea shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such warrant and order have issued.

Sec. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Francisco Gamboa Giocochea, of Cascade, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 6, 1927, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

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.

PERFECTO M. BIASON AND JOAN BIASON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1451) for the relief of Perfecto M. Biason and Joan Biason.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Perfecto M. Biason and his daughter, Joan Biason, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the Philippine quota of the first year that openings are available in such quota.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, and bond, which may have been issued, in the case of Perfecto M. Biason and Joan Biason.

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.

LEO HAMERMANN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1637) for the relief of Leo Hamermann.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Leo Hamermann. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The 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.

OMNIBUS PRIVATE CLAIMS BILL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first omnibus bill on the Private Calendar.

FIRST OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5055) for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc.,

Title I—(H. R. 354. For the relief of Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.) By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Dixie Margarine Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Tennessee, the sum of \$87,412, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for refund of capital illegally exacted by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, under the guise of taxes and licenses, for the period from March 1923 to November 28, 1925, the statutory period for refund of said illegally collected moneys having expired prior to the date of a decision of the United States Supreme Court that said moneys had been illegally collected as taxes on the product manufactured, and it also having been held by both the United States Court of Claims and the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals that relief must be from the Congress and not from the courts:

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, after the word "courts", insert the following: "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."

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, is this the proper time in discussion of the bill when a motion should be offered to strike out this title?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. First we will dispose of the committee amendment.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Potts moves to strike out title I of the bill.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple case, but I think it is important because what we do on this particular title is going to set a precedent for many of the other titles that we are going to consider today, and which will involve many hundreds of thousands of dollars, so that I think we ought to give this particular title a little consideration.

In and of itself, after the committee amendment is adopted, this title will allot some seventy-odd thousand dollars to a taxpayer. The facts of the case are not difficult and they are not hard to understand. This particular title provides for the repayment to a taxpayer of the sum of \$70,000 and, as I tried to point out, the same principle is involved in a number of the other titles in this bill so that

actually many hundreds of thousands of dollars are going to be disposed of on what you decide here today on this one title.

The facts of the case are very simple. An oleomargarine manufacturer paid some taxes away back in 1932, and he thought that he was right in paying those taxes. After a while he got a different opinion. He brought suit in the court to collect those taxes and he lost out all the way on this proposition on the principle that the statute of limitation had run against his claim. Now, there is not a lawyer in the House who will not tell you that the statute of limitation, as it applies in the law to claims between individuals, or as to crimes, is a very laudible provision of law. The statute of limitations has for its effect the settling of claims that have been in existence for a long time. These people decided that they did not want to do anything about it, and everything was all right until it got to the point where they decided, for extraneous reasons, or any reason at all after a long period of time, that they wanted to prosecute.

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

Mr. POTTS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the gentleman's kindness in yielding. This case arises from the city of Memphis, not in the district which I have the honor to represent. But, my recollection is that this company was required to pay these taxes, and later the Supreme Court held that the tax was invalid and did not apply, and then the statute of limitations had run, and they were unable to recover in a suit to get their money back because the statute of limitations had run, although the court had held that they did not owe the money. It looks to me like a matter of merit.

Mr. POTTS. It is not quite as simple as that. Cases have been tried where similar taxes had been ruled invalid, but not in this particular case. This case came up after those other cases were disposed of and after the statute had run here, and the particular case was decided by the court on the statute of limitations alone.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is my recollection and understanding that only by reason of the application of the statute of limitations were those people deprived of the money that the court said they were entitled to.

Mr. POTTS. No. The court never ruled on the merits of this case.

Mr. COOPER. And the fact that they were not able to get their money back caused this company to go broke.

Mr. POTTS. That is not quite so, because that particular point was not litigated in this case. The court merely said that the statute of limitations had run. We all know that in some cases the Government has benefited by the statute of limitations, and in other cases it has lost. It equalizes itself out, and the same applies to individuals.

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

Mr. POTTS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it not true that in this case and in other similar cases the claimant was derelict in bringing his suit in order to recover the tax which was wrongfully paid?

Mr. POTTS. He was happy about paying the tax until he found out that somebody else decided that perhaps a refund could be obtained.

Mr. DOLLIVER. He is trying to gain from the Congress what he could not gain from the courts.

Mr. POTTS. That is exactly it.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the bill seeks the refund of \$87,412 which the United States Supreme Court has said in a test case the Commissioner of Internal Revenue collected arbitrarily, capriciously, and without warrant and was an exaction in the guise of a tax. The Government has disputed tax claims against the Dixie Margarine Co. in the sum of \$16,775.60. It has been agreed these should be offset, leaving a net amount sought hereby of \$70,636.40.

After the test case above referred to, the Commission voluntarily refunded to the Dixie Margarine Co. in 1932 the sum of \$241,819.64, but refused to refund the \$87,412 paid in the period of time which was more than 4 years prior to the refund.

Suit was instituted in the Court of Claims, and that court in 1935 held:

The facts show that the plaintiff has paid, beyond the statutory period for refunds, amounts it should not have paid but this court has no jurisdiction to entertain a suit for the recovery of these amounts. Any relief to which the plaintiff may be entitled must come from the Congress.

In 1939 a bill was introduced, being H. R. 7426, Seventy-sixth Congress, First Session, and S. 2917. The Committee on Claims refused to hold hearings on matters which the President had a policy of vetoing and then the war came along. Suit was filed by the Dixie Margarine Co. against the deputy collector of internal revenue in the District Court, and sought equitable relief even though the legal remedy was barred by the statute of limitations. In 1943 the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals held that the courts were bound by the limitation and said "as pointed out in the decision of the Court of Claims, relief must be had from the Congress and not from the courts." In the intervening years bills similar to the 1939 bill were introduced in this Congress but were never brought out for debate. The bill introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress was approved by the Committee on Claims but was never enacted into law.

Thus, it clearly appears that this company has not slept upon its rights but it has been striving in the courts and in Congress to get that which belongs to it.

The present bill when introduced was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and by it to a subcommittee. This was done because of the reorganization of Congress abolishing the Committee on Claims but this claim is not one of those

contemplated by the reorganization since it far antedates that action by this body.

The Supreme Court of the United States, the Court of Claims, and the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals have all held that this money should be refunded to the Dixie Margarine Co.; the courts have held that it was an illegal exaction in the guise of a tax and that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in exacting the money was arbitrary, capricious, and oppressive. The Court of Claims and the court of appeals have both held that they would order a return of the money but for the fact that the Congress of the United States raised a bar of 4 years beyond which the taxpayer cannot go, and both of said courts have invited the Dixie Margarine Co. to come to Congress for relief. The courts are powerless to grant relief. Congress raised the bar of the 4-year limitation on the right to recover this money.

In this connection it should be noted that the 4-year bar applies to taxes and the courts have held this claim to be in the nature of a claim for taxes. There is a very definite distinction. The Supreme Court has held that the money collected from the Dixie Margarine Co. was not taxes but was "an exaction in the guise of a tax." Congress raised the bar to the remedy which now prevents the enforcement of the right belonging to the Dixie Margarine Co. as it has been construed by the courts, and Congress has the legal power to remove this bar to the enforcement of the right. Aside from the legal power to do so, on every tenet and precept of equity and fair dealing this Congress owes the duty to the taxpayer to right the wrong done by an official of the United States Government in regard to his illegal acts under a law passed by this Congress. It is the legal and equitable correct function of Congress to grant the relief sought.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PORTTS) there were—ayes 23, noes 41.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 127, nays 221, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—127

Allen, Ill.	Brehm	Dawson, Utah
Andersen,	Brophy	Dolliver
H. Carl	Buck	Dondero
Andresen,	Buffett	Ellis
August H.	Burke	Elston
Arends	Busbey	Engel, Mich.
Arnold	Butler	Foote
Barrett	Case, S. Dak.	Fuller
Bates, Mass.	Chipherfield	Gamble
Bender	Church	Gearhart
Bennett, Mich.	Clason	Gillette
Bennett, Mo.	Clevenger	Goff
Bishop	Cole, N. Y.	Goodwin
Blackney	Cotton	Grant, Ind.
Bradley	Davis, Wis.	Griffiths

Gross	Lemke	Robertson
Gwinn, N. Y.	Lodge	Rogers, Mass.
Hagen	Love	Ross
Hall	McCowen	Russell
Edwin Arthur	McCulloch	St. George
Halleck	McDonough	Schwabe, Mo.
Hand	McDowell	Schwabe, Okla.
Harness, Ind.	McMahon	Scrivner
Harvey	McMillen, Ill.	Seely-Brown
Herter	Mack	Simpson, Ill.
Hill	Macy	Smith, Kans.
Hoeven	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Ohio
Holmes	Mason	Smith, Wis.
Horan	Miller, Md.	Snyder
Hull	Miller, Nebr.	Stefan
Jackson, Calif.	Murray, Wis.	Stevenson
Jenison	Nixon	Sundstrom
Jenkins, Ohio	Nodar	Taber
Jensen	Norblad	Talle
Johnson, Ill.	O'Konski	Taylor
Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Calif.	Twyman
Jones, Wash.	Plumley	Vail
Jonkman	Potter	Vorys
Kean	Potts	Weichel
Kersten, Wis.	Poulson	Wigglesworth
Kilburn	Reed, N. Y.	Wolcott
Kunkel	Rees	Woodruff
Landis	Rich	
LeCompte	Riehlman	

NAYS—221

Abernethy	Gathings	Morton
Albert	Gavin	Muhlenberg
Allen, La.	Gordon	Multer
Andrews, Ala.	Gore	Murdock
Andrews, N. Y.	Gorski	Murray, Tenn.
Angell	Gossett	Nicholson
Auchincloss	Graham	Norton
Bakewell	Grant, Ala.	O'Brien
Banta	Gregory	Owens
Barden	Gwynne, Iowa	Pace
Bates, Ky.	Hale	Patman
Battle	Hall	Peden
Beckworth	Leonard W.	Peterson
Bland	Hardy	Philbin
Blatnik	Harless, Ariz.	Phillips, Tenn.
Boggs, Del.	Harris	Pickett
Bolton	Harrison	Poage
Bonner	Havener	Powell
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Preston
Brown, Ohio	Hedrick	Price, Fla.
Bryson	Heslton	Price, Ill.
Buchanan	Hess	Priest
Buckley	Hinshaw	Rains
Burleson	Hobbs	Ramey
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffield	Rankin
Camp	Hope	Rayburn
Canfield	Huber	Redden
Cannon	Isacson	Reed, Ill.
Carson	Javits	Reeves
Case, N. J.	Jenkins, Pa.	Regan
Celler	Jennings	Richards
Chadwick	Johnson, Calif.	Rivers
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Rizley
Chenoweth	Jones, N. C.	Rockwell
Cole, Kans.	Judd	Rogers, Fla.
Cole, Mo.	Karsten, Mo.	Rohrbough
Colmer	Keating	Rooney
Combs	Kee	Sadowski
Cooley	Kelley	Sanborn
Cooper	Kerr	Sarbacher
Corbett	Kilday	Sasscer
Courtney	Klein	Scott, Hardie
Cox	Lanham	Scott,
Cravens	Larcade	Hugh D., Jr.
Crawford	Lea	Shafer
Crosser	LeFevre	Sikes
Crow	Lesinski	Smathers
Cunningham	Lewis, Ky.	Smith, Va.
Curtis	Lewis, Ohio	Somers
Dague	Lucas	Spence
Davis, Ga.	Lusk	Stanley
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Stratton
Deane	Lynch	Teague
Delaney	McConnell	Thomas, Tex.
Devitt	McCormack	Tibbott
Dingell	McGarvey	Tollefson
Domengeaux	McGregor	Trimble
Donohue	MacKinnon	Van Zandt
Douglas	Madden	Vinson
Durham	Mahon	Vursell
Eaton	Maloney	Wadsworth
Eberharter	Manasco	Welch
Elliott	Mansfield	Wheeler
Ellsworth	Marcantonio	Whitten
Elsaesser	Mathews	Whittington
Evins	Meade, Ky.	Williams
Fallon	Meade, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Merrrow	Wilson, Tex.
Fenton	Meyer	Winstead
Fernandez	Michener	Wolverton
Fannagan	Miller, Conn.	Wood
Fogarty	Mills	Worley
Forand	Morgan	Youngblood
Garmatz	Morris	
Gary	Morrison	

NOT VOTING—83

Abbitt	Fulton	Miller, Calif.
Allen, Calif.	Gallagher	Mitchell
Anderson, Calif.	Gillie	Monroney
Beall	Granger	Mundt
Bell	Hart	Norrell
Bloom	Hartley	O'Hara
Boggs, La.	Hébert	O'Toole
Boykin	Heffernan	Passman
Bramblett	Hendricks	Patterson
Brooks	Hoffman	Pfeifer
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Wash.	Ploeser
Byrne, N. Y.	Jarman	Riley
Carroll	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Sadlak
Clark	Kearney	Scoblick
Clippinger	Kearns	Sheppard
Coffin	Keefe	Short
Coudert	Kefauver	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
D'Ewart	Keogh	Stigler
Dirksen	King	Stockman
Dorn	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Doughton	Knutson	Thompson
Engle, Calif.	Lane	Towe
Fellows	Latham	Walter
Fisher	Lichtenwalter	West
Fletcher	Ludlow	Whitaker
Folger	McMillan, S. C.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Towe with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Jackson of Washington.
 Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Hébert.
 Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Folger.
 Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Hart.
 Mr. Bramblett with Mr. Passman.
 Mr. Kearns with Mr. Carroll.
 Mr. Mundt with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.
 Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Kennedy.
 Mr. Short with Mr. Kefauver.
 Mr. Patterson with Mr. Walter.
 Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Riley.
 Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Latham with Mr. Chapman.
 Mr. Kearney with Mr. King.
 Mr. Knutson with Mr. Engel of California.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title II—(H. R. 385. For the relief of Reginald Mitchell.) By Mr. HINSHAW

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Reginald Mitchell, of North Hollywood, Calif., the sum of \$106.85, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when a United States Army vehicle collided with another automobile and pushed it into the rear of the automobile which he was driving, at the intersection of East Seventh Street and Maple Street, in Los Angeles, Calif., on November 10, 1944: *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.

Title III—(H. R. 813. For the relief of J. Don Alexander.) By Mr. CHENOWETH

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Don Alexander, of Colorado Springs, Colo., the sum of \$16,720.41, in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said J. Don Alexander on account of an erroneous payment of

income tax for the year 1929 in the above amount covering the capital net gain from the sale of 9,000 shares of stock in the Alexander Industries, Inc., which stock was later, in the case of Alexander against Theleman in the United States circuit court of appeals (69 F. (2d), p. 610), held to be the property of the corporation and not of the said J. Don Alexander: *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.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOLLIVER moves to strike out all of title III.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vote that has just been taken by roll call, perhaps anything I shall say now is utterly futile. But I for one am not going to stand by and see the statute of limitations eliminated by the House of Representatives by a roll call vote without the House knowing what it is doing. You have just voted \$87,000, less about \$16,000 to a bankrupt margarine corporation in the State of Tennessee.

Now, this bill is to repay \$16,000 to an individual in the State of Colorado.

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

Mr. DOLLIVER. No, I do not yield. You will have your time.

It seems to me that we ought to know where we are going in ignoring and flouting the statute of limitations which we ourselves have put upon the statute books of this country. The result will be, we are going to be swamped with a flood of this kind of legislation.

Now, about the facts in this case: The bill provides for the payment of over \$16,000 to the claimant as a tax on net gain on 9,000 shares of stock which the claimant is supposed to have owned and claimed that he did own at the time the tax was paid. It was subsequently determined that he did not own the stock at all when the transaction was made, and it was found, and correctly so, that therefore, as an original matter, no tax was due. However, before he got around to claiming the tax refund or perhaps before he could claim the tax refund, the statute of limitations had expired and he was barred from refund of those taxes. Now he is here asking the Congress to appropriate this money to refund that tax to him.

The Treasury Department opposes the bill because it says it grants special relief in the case of taxes erroneously collected, the refund of which is not claimed in the time and in the manner required by law, and thus constitutes a discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated, and would create a bad precedent which might encourage other taxpayers to seek relief in the same manner.

Now, it is your responsibility to vote up or down this amendment. If you wish to refund this tax to this individual, that is your responsibility. As far as I am concerned, I propose to vote for the amendment, to see to it that we abide by some rational method of refunding taxes.

As I said a moment ago, in view of the vote just taken for the margarine company in Tennessee, it may be that you will vote to give the gentleman from Colorado Springs the money as well. It looks as though first we look after the Democrats and then the Republicans.

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

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. Is it a fact that the taxpayers could not or just did not bring his suit in time?

Mr. DOLLIVER. As I understand it, he did not.

Mr. MATHEWS. Then, why is this bill here?

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is what I would like to know.

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am sure the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] wants to be entirely fair in this matter. He referred to the claimant in this matter as being a bankrupt individual. I hasten to correct that impression. Mr. J. Don Alexander is a highly respected and substantial citizen of Colorado Springs. He is president of one of the largest industries in that area.

In this case the issue is very simple. The United States Government has erroneously collected from Mr. Alexander the sum of \$16,720.41 on an income-tax payment. The only defense for retaining this money is that Mr. Alexander failed to make application for a refund in time. The House Judiciary Committee found that Mr. Alexander was entitled to a refund of this money, which is the amount of income taxes Mr. Alexander paid to the United States Government as a capital gains tax on certain stock which he thought he owned, but which the court later decided belonged to the corporation.

The stock involved was in the Alexander Industries, Inc., a Colorado corporation, with its principal office and place of business in Colorado Springs. In the year 1929 a sale of 9,000 shares of stock in this corporation was made. The sale price was \$135,257. The Government found that the cost of these shares to Alexander was .1637 cents per share, and after deducting the \$1,493.76 was the original cost arrived at a capital net gain of \$133,763.24, on which Mr. Alexander paid a tax of \$16,720.41.

This corporation became involved in bankruptcy proceedings and Mr. Alexander filed a claim for the amount due him arising through a loan of the proceeds of the sale of his stock. The referee in bankruptcy refused to allow this claim, and ruled that there was no indebtedness, in that the stock sold was unissued stock of the corporation. The trial court approved the findings of the referee and the case was appealed to the circuit court of appeals. This court

found in the case of *Alexander v. Theleman* (69 F. (2d) p. 610), that this stock, upon which Mr. Alexander had paid personal income tax, was not his personal stock, but had been loaned to him by the company, and that he was to have been repaid in stock. This case was decided on March 26, 1934, and a petition for rehearing denied on April 30, 1934. Mr. Alexander attempted to take the case to the Supreme Court of the United States, but a petition for writ of certiorari was denied on October 8, 1934.

Prior to this decision of the circuit court of appeals, Mr. Alexander had assumed that the determination of his 1929 income tax had been correct, and that for income-tax purposes he had realized a capital net gain from the sale of this stock. The court held that Mr. Alexander was to have received shares of stock from the corporation in exchange for the 9,000 shares which he sold. Consequently, there was no gain or loss in the transaction and the tax was erroneously assessed and paid. As a result of this decision Mr. Alexander had neither his stock nor the money. He is now seeking to obtain a refund of \$16,720.41, which is the amount he paid by mistake.

This explains why Mr. Alexander did not make application for a refund in time to comply with the statute of limitations. His case was not finally determined until 1934, which was a couple of years after the 2-year statutory period. Had the court found in his favor he would have owed the tax in question.

In other words, the United States Government, through the Collector of Internal Revenue, does not deny that the Government erroneously collected this money. They admit that Mr. Alexander did not owe the Government this tax. However, they say Mr. Alexander did not make claim for a refund within the 2-year period as provided by the statute of limitations, and therefore contend they have no authority whatever to make this refund. I fully agree with the position taken by the Collector of Internal Revenue that under the existing statute they are not authorized to pay this money back to Mr. Alexander. The only recourse he has is to appeal to the Congress of the United States through the bill that is before us. It is conceded that the money would have been returned to him had he filed his application in time to comply with the statute. He did file his claim as soon as he learned that the court had decided the stock did not belong to him, and that he had paid these taxes by mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that we must have statutes of limitation, but I also feel that equity should be done in these cases. I submit that the United States Government has no right to withhold this money from Mr. Alexander, which was paid in good faith, but by mistake, as admitted by all.

This case was not decided in the circuit court of appeals until 1934. This tax was paid for the year 1929. Up to the time the final decision was rendered in the circuit court of appeals this taxpayer thought he was the owner of the stock, and on that assumption he paid

the capital gains tax on the same. Finally the circuit court of appeals held that he did not own the stock, but that it belonged to the corporation. As a result he paid a capital gains tax on stock that he did not own.

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

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. So this taxpayer had no ground upon which to base a claim for relief until the statute of limitations had run.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. And is it not a principle of law that if a man is discharged in bankruptcy and relieved from the payment of a debt, that if he subsequently promises to pay the debt, a moral obligation will sustain a suit upon that barred claim? In other words, I am getting to the equities of the thing. If a man has a moral obligation to pay a debt, even though its payment may be barred by the statute of limitation, or even though he may be discharged in bankruptcy, his moral obligation will sustain his new promise to pay, and you can make him pay it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the observations of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I may say that I had the pleasure and honor of serving with him for a period of 6 years on the Committee on Claims. I consider him one of the best-informed Members of the House on private claims and the theory of such legislation.

Mr. JENNINGS. If the gentleman will permit another statement, an honest man's debt is never barred by the statute of limitations, is it?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I agree with the gentleman. I submit that the United States Government owes Mr. Alexander this money and that it should be paid to him. I hope the amendment will be rejected, so that this bill may pass.

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

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to strike out title III.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOLLIVER) there were—ayes 24, noes 76.

So the motion to strike out title III was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title IV—(H. R. 2696. For the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship and Engine Building Co.) By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship and Engine Building Co., the sum of \$103,821.56, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the difference between the actual cost of the construction of three torpedo-boat destroyers and the amount paid by the United States under the contract entered into for the building of said boats, as found by the Court of Claims on January 8, 1940, and reported in Senate Document No. 161, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent 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.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to strike out this title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOLLIVER moves to strike out all of title IV.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that this is not a refund-tax case, because I know how the membership is going to vote on that. This is something else, and entirely different.

Mr. Speaker, this is a claim that originated during the Spanish-American War in 1898 and is the claim of a receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co. for loss alleged to have been sustained on three contracts entered into on October 1, 1898, for the construction of three torpedo-boat destroyers.

A Senate resolution in 1910 referred this matter to the Court of Claims. According to the memorandum I have, finally, in 1940, the Court of Claims handed down a decision that the company suffered this loss through no fault of its own.

In reporting this bill the Committee on the Judiciary emphasizes that some other companies had reimbursement. Well, again, I can only refer to my own sense of responsibility in reference to this kind of a claim. It is 50 years old. Whoever had charge of it certainly has slept on his rights. If there was a claim in 1898 it certainly should have been settled by 1908. Now, 50 years later, they come to this Congress and ask for \$103,000-plus which arose out of this transaction of over 50 years ago. There is not a court I know of but what would call that kind of a claim stale and outlawed and would not consider it.

Accordingly, it seems quite unreasonable to me to believe that the Congress ought to pay \$103,821.56 of the taxpayers' money to a receiver of a bankrupt corporation for a loss alleged to have been sustained in 1898.

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

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

Mr. POTTS. Is this not another case where the funds are being paid to a bankrupt estate and that the taxpayer himself is not interested, but, rather, those who will get the funds for the bankrupt estate?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does the gentleman from Iowa believe that the statute of limitations runs while a case is pending in court?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understood the gentleman to say that the case was in court from 1910 to 1940.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The decision was rendered in 1940, and it was referred to the Court of Claims in 1910.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman does not contend that the claimant was lax in pursuing this claim while it was pending in the courts, does he?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes; I would say that he was lax in pursuing his claim when he had a claim in court 30 years.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Will not the gentleman agree that it is a fact that this money will be paid to the receiver for the benefit of subcontractors and materialmen whose rights to the money are not denied? They performed the work and are entitled to the money, but it has been held up in the courts for 30 years.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have no information on that score. I do not know what becomes of the money. I only know where it is coming from. If you vote for the amendment to strike out this title, you are going to save the taxpayers \$103,000. If you vote against it, why you are going to take \$103,000 out of the taxpayers' pockets which we, on the objectors committee, have tried to save for the taxpayers, and pay it to the receiver of a bankrupt corporation.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion and I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES], a member of the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I am entirely in sympathy with the purpose of the gentleman from Iowa to save money for the taxpayers. But I hardly think that most Members of this House are so intent on doing so that they would consciously reject a meritorious claim against the United States.

Rejection of this claim by passage of the pending motion to strike out title IV would result in a substantial and unconscionable injustice. The Claims Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, on which I am privileged to serve, conducted a hearing on the matter and gave thorough consideration to the merits of the case.

The claim is for actual "out of pocket" cash losses incurred by the Neafie & Levy Co. in the construction of three torpedo-boat destroyers for the Navy Department. These vessels were the first torpedo-boat destroyers designed and constructed by the United States Government and were experimental in a large measure. The losses and increased costs to the company were due to, first, delay in obtaining the deliveries of steel, resulting in wage and price increases; second, substantial changes by the Navy in the designs and displacement of the vessels; and, third, the unprecedented and unpredictable number of trial runs required by the Navy.

As the committee's report shows, several shipbuilding companies entered into contracts with the Navy Department at the same time for the construction of vessels of the same type, and all the companies

suffered losses similar to those of this claimant. All the companies, including the Neafie & Levy Co., appealed at once to the Navy Department for settlement, but the Navy referred them to Congress for relief. The Congress finally, in 1910, referred all of the claims to the Court of Claims, not for judgments, but to make findings of fact in each case and report the same back to the Congress.

In the Neafie & Levy case, the court delayed its decision for 30 years and in 1940 reported to the Congress that the actual losses of the company, exclusive of any item of profit, were \$103,821.56 and that such losses had been occasioned by the changes required by the Navy Department and other causes which neither the company nor the Navy Department could have anticipated at the time of making the contract. The court further found that compensation to which plaintiff might be entitled rests entirely in the discretion of the Congress.

The other two companies which suffered similar losses in the construction of torpedo-boat destroyers under the same Navy program were reimbursed for their losses by private acts of Congress, after the Court of Claims reported such losses to Congress.

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

Mr. REEVES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I ask the gentleman if my recollection is correct, that the facts involved in this bill are the same as were involved in the Lawley bill that I introduced, which passed this House and passed the other body and became a law in 1936?

Mr. REEVES. They are exactly the same.

Mr. McCORMACK. One other company, as I remember, the Fall River Co., was also involved, and that bill went through in 1926, or thereabouts.

Mr. REEVES. That is exactly correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I introduced a bill in behalf of one of them, and after a complete investigation I was satisfied as to the equities. It seems to me that this bill is based upon the same set of facts, and it ought to receive the same justice by this House as was given in connection with the other two companies.

Mr. REEVES. In 1926 the Fore River Ship & Engine Building Co. was reimbursed \$106,521.12 for losses in building two torpedo-boat destroyers.

In 1936 the George Lawley & Son Corp. was reimbursed \$92,781 for losses in building two torpedo-boat destroyers.

The pending claim of Neafie & Levy, which was not reported to the Congress by the Court of Claims until March 11, 1940, is for \$103,821.56 for losses in building three torpedo-boat destroyers.

Enactment of the present bill, therefore, will accord to this claimant the same equitable treatment as has been granted to the other two companies. It will also conform to the fairly well-defined policy of the Congress to reimburse Government contractors who have performed work and furnished materials, of which the Government has received the use and benefit, but who nevertheless, due to conditions beyond their control and which could not have been antici-

pated, have suffered losses in the performance of their contracts.

It is conceded that the claim is not a legal claim in a juridical sense. If it were, claimant could have secured a judgment in the Court of Claims and would not now be before the Congress asking for relief.

The Navy Department decided it was not possible under the law to make adjustments in any of these three cases, even though the Department conceded that such adjustments should be made. There was no recourse, therefore, except for the companies to come to Congress for relief. It is because these were not legal claims that Congress referred them to the Court of Claims for investigation and directed the court not to render judgment but to find the facts and determine the amount of the losses and report the same to the Congress. The Court of Claims had no power to render judgments for the claimants, but could only report the facts and find the amounts of the losses, and this title of the omnibus bill is based directly on its findings.

The objection that the company and its receiver are guilty of laches is entirely unfounded, because, as already stated, claim was promptly filed with the Navy Department. The fact is that while all these claims were referred by the Congress to the Court of Claims in 1910, the court did not report back its findings to Congress in this case until 1940. In other words, the court disposed of the other claims first, and as they were consecutively reported to Congress they were paid. Since the findings of the Court of Claims were filed in 1940, this claimant has been altogether diligent in its efforts to secure relief from the Congress.

The objection of laches was made against the Fore River and Lawley claims at the times they were before the House. This body considered these objections unfounded and with the concurrence of the other body authorized payment of those claims.

To state the case very simply, the three contractors were all in precisely the same position. Two of them have been fully compensated for their losses, and it is my conviction that the House has an obligation to insure that the third sole remaining contractor shall be equally treated and fairly compensated. The Government has received the use and benefit of these vessels, and this claimant should be paid in full just as the other companies have been paid. No interest is included in the amount of the proposed award.

I therefore urge that the motion to strike title IV from the bill be defeated.

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

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

Mr. REDDEN. May I ask the gentleman what caused all the delay? I have not heard any explanation of that.

Mr. REEVES. Congress held up the matter from 1900 to 1910. It was not quite sure how to handle it. Bills were introduced in successive Congresses during that period. Then it was referred to the Court of Claims for findings, and the Court of Claims delayed its findings for

30 years. It came up in 1940 with findings which support in every respect the facts which are set up in this bill and the award which is proposed to be made. There is obvious equity in the claim, and there has been no laches.

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

Mr. REEVES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. May I ask the gentleman if he thinks the House is justified in making another mistake, having made two mistakes on the same set of facts?

Mr. REEVES. I think it is the gentleman from Iowa who has made the mistake. There is no doubt about the merit of the bill and the House will make no mistake by voting down his amendment.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Does not the gentleman think the equities in this case are on the part of the receiver, when he remembers that the taxpayers of this country had the benefit of the use of those two destroyers throughout two wars, the Spanish-American War and the First World War, and the subcontractors and the material men still have not been paid?

Mr. REEVES. The gentleman is eminently correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOLLIVER) there were—ayes 30, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title V—(H. R. 1296. For the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.) By Mr. Coudert

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$19,030.20, in full settlement of all claims against the Government growing out of contracts Nos. 1325, 1645, 2299, 3220, and 4519N, and contracts supplementary thereto, for the manufacture during 1917 and 1918 of overcoats and uniforms for the United States Army.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 22, after "Army" insert a colon and the following: "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 committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. JOHN C. BUTLER.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

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

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some newspaper articles.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BILL, 1948

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5852) to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 5852, with Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on last Friday, general debate having been concluded, the first section was read for amendment.

THE MUNTZ BILL IS A WEAPON OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

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

Mr. Chairman, about 10 years ago, the House of Representatives established the Committee on Un-American Activities, first as a special committee and—since 1945—as a permanent committee.

Its purpose is to inquire into and investigate the activities and machinations of subversive elements in the United States. It is the only agency of our Government to which a Member of Congress can turn for information regarding individuals and groups whose loyalty to our Nation is questioned.

This is in no way to be construed as a reflection upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation or its work in this field. It is one of the most efficient agencies of its kind in the world; but, under the law creating the FBI, it is not at liberty to divulge all information and is subject to the Department of Justice, under which it operates.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has done most excellent work, and every loyal American owes it a debt of gratitude. It has been the target for much abuse, criticism, and persecution. The strongest reason for its continued existence is the enemies it has made.

Every Communist or other enemy of our country wants this committee destroyed.

The membership of the Committee on Un-American Activities is composed of outstanding, loyal Americans. They and their predecessors are men who do not flinch from subtle and cruel slander. They are steadfast in their duty to their country. I pay deserved tribute to each and every member of the committee for

the service they have rendered the cause of freedom throughout the world and especially here at home.

After a decade of painstaking effort and diligence, the committee has presented to the House a bill, H. R. 5852, to protect our freedom and way of life. No right-thinking, sane American can shut his eyes any longer to the danger of communism within our gates.

What is communism? "It is an evil and malignant way of life," says J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI. It is based on brute force, fear and terror. Communists have infiltrated every activity of American life. They are traitors to our country and wolves in sheep's clothing.

Nearly 20 years ago Russia gave notice, and I quote:

The world-wide nature of our program is not mere talk but an all-embracing and blood-soaked reality. Our ultimate aim is world-wide communism.

When a neighbor gives you notice that he intends to destroy you, your home and family, your religious belief, and your Government, and do it with force and bloodshed, you are an exception if you do not take measures to resist that threat, even unto death. You have no choice.

The bill before us is one of those measures. It ought to have the enthusiastic support of every Member of Congress. The Communist opposition to it is the best argument for it.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has found that the Communist movement in the United States is foreign-controlled and that its activities are carried on by secret and conspiratorial methods. They claim that they are a political party; we know they are not. Political parties in the United States are not controlled by foreign governments.

We have a right under our Constitution to protect ourselves. The Communists say this bill would nullify the Bill of Rights. What is the Bill of Rights? It is freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion. They propose to destroy every one of such freedoms. They propose to destroy our Constitution; yet they vociferously oppose this legislation on the ground that we are destroying such freedoms. Such nonsense would be humorous if it were not so tragic. They know, and we all know, that the freedoms guaranteed under our Bill of Rights do not exist under the atheistic creed of communism.

On April 3, 1947, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2948, the purpose of which is to safeguard the sovereignty and welfare of the people of the United States. It contains a provision requiring any agency, political or otherwise, whose origin is directly or indirectly of foreign inspiration and whose object is the overthrow of the Government of the United States, to register with the Secretary of State. I am gratified that the Committee on Un-American Activities has embodied that principle in the pending measure known as the Mundt bill.

I said at the beginning that Communists and other subversive elements had infiltrated into every activity of America. Not even the churches and schools have

been immune from their attack. The Federal Government here in Washington has been especially fertile soil for planting their seed. Their presence in key positions and influential posts has been particularly galling to loyal citizens everywhere. Members of Congress have protested with some effect.

For a number of years, I have exerted every effort to turn the spotlight on these termites and remove them from the Government. My efforts have been rewarded with some success.

The extent to which Communists and Communist sympathizers got into the very heart of our Nation is evidenced by the fact that they were able not only to obtain secret and highly confidential information from the records of our Government in time of war but were able to actually steal the records and transport them to a distant city.

The story of the Russian spy ring as it operated in Canada during the war and at a time when Canada was the friend and ally of Russia is undisputed evidence of the treachery of the Moscow Government. It demonstrates the ruthlessness of godless and unprincipled communism.

So clever are some of these agents of the Kremlin that they have been able to hoodwink and deceive loyalty boards and the Civil Service Commission into giving them a clean bill of health for employment within our Government. I can give cases and names.

A recent case is that of George Shaw Wheeler, whose record I exposed in a speech before the House of Representatives last July. As a result of my efforts, this man was compelled to resign from his position with our American military government in Germany. Where is he now? He was received with open arms and a warm welcome by the Communist-dominated government of Czechoslovakia and made an instructor in the technical high school in Prague, in that country.

The world is dividing into two camps: freedom versus communism; Christian civilization versus paganism; righteousness and justice versus force and violence.

That "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" may be a trite saying; but, not since the founding of our Republic, has liberty been so seriously threatened as it is today. Its light has been going out all over the world. Here in our land alone does the lamp of freedom still shine as a beacon light of hope to a distressed and saddened world.

Communism is the greatest menace and the worst threat to Christian civilization the world has ever seen. It has, thus far, blocked all efforts to world peace. Its purpose is to enslave the earth.

I shall vote for the Mundt bill as a weapon of national defense and that we Americans may continue to sing, "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty."

The Clerk read as follows:

NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The system of government known as totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by

the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial rather than a democratic basis, and by an identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists, such identity being so close that the party and the government itself are for all practical purposes indistinguishable.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the destruction of free democratic institutions, the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a democratic or representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary political movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a single world-wide Communist political organization.

(4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(5) The Communist dictatorship of such foreign country, in exercising such direction and control and in furthering the purposes of the world Communist movement, establishes or causes the establishment of, and utilizes, in various countries, political organizations which are acknowledged by such Communist dictatorship as being constituent elements of the world Communist movement; and such political organizations are not free and independent organizations, but are mere sections of a single world-wide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country.

(6) The political organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship, and among the methods commonly used to accomplish this end in any particular country are (A) the disruption of trade and commerce, (B) the inciting of economic, social, and racial strife and conflict, (C) the dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine established government and institutions, and (D) corrupting officials of the government and securing the appointment of their agents and sympathizers to offices and positions in the government.

(7) In carrying on the activities referred to in paragraph (6), such political organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations, commonly known as "Communist fronts," which in most instances are created and maintained, or used, in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such political organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of, and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such "Communist fronts."

(8) Due to the nature and scope of the world Communist movement, with the existence of affiliated constituent elements working toward common objectives in various countries of the world, travel of members, representatives, and agents from country to country is essential for purposes of communication and for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the movement.

(9) In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement; and, in countries other than the United States, those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in such Communist movement similarly repudiate their allegiance to the countries of which they are nationals in favor of such foreign Communist country.

(10) In pursuance of communism's stated objectives the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the traditional Communist methods referred to above, and in accordance with carefully conceived plans, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries, against the will of the people of those countries, of ruthless Communist totalitarian dictatorships, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

(11) The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions and make it necessary that Congress enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

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

Mr. Chairman, Mayor William O'Dwyer, a liberal Democrat and one of the greatest mayors the city of New York has ever had, recently issued a statement in opposition to this bill, for which he was criticized by the Catholic War Veterans, of which he is a member. I would like at this time to read to the House Mayor O'Dwyer's reply to that criticism. It is dated May 15, 1948, and reads as follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
May 15, 1948.

Mr. ANTHONY H. FORBES,
New York Athletic Club,
New York City.

MY DEAR SIR: Although your telegram criticizing my stand on the Subversive Control Act of 1948, H. R. 5852, assumes to speak on behalf of all the Catholic war veterans, I cannot believe that they would want to deny me the right to my opinion on a matter of public legislation, even when such opinion does not coincide with their views. However, I am glad to explain my opposition to the Mundt bill. In doing so, I prefer to reason rather than dispute with you.

To begin with, in approaching this bill, I do so as a citizen deeply interested in our American democracy, particularly at this time, when the democratic way of life is challenged as never before. Viewing it in that light, I am firmly convinced that the bill is destructive of our fundamental right to discuss and criticize, freely, and openly, all political questions and all political institutions—a right that is so clearly interwoven

with our other liberties that without it despotism or anarchy must result.

Our Supreme Court has expressed that right in these words: " * * * if there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess, by word or act, their faith therein."

We already have laws that punish treason and other criminal acts against the security or safety of the Government; laws against individual acts or conspiracies to overthrow the Government; and laws that require the registration of agents of foreign governments and of foreign principals. But this bill provides a dangerous short-cut to thought control and police-state regulation. It empowers a Government officer to interpret and censor people's thoughts and opinions and permits him to determine the subversiveness or disloyalty of any political, civic, or religious organization. Its terms are so broad, and yet so vague, as to subject innocent citizens to possible loss of citizenship and other heavy penalties, not for reason of any act on their part but for being members of an organization suspected of entertaining dangerous thoughts. It would thus establish the undemocratic and dangerous principal of guilt by mere association, without proof of actual guilt, and without the safeguard of a jury trial.

This is precisely the pattern of legislation set by the Nazis and police-state governments for accomplishing the destruction of the rights of the people.

The bill is dangerous and its dangers go far beyond its declared design of curbing communism. I am opposed to communism and to police-state regulation, but I am just as strongly opposed to adopting their methods. And that is precisely what the bill does.

The more I analyze the bill the clearer it becomes that, far from protecting, it will go a long way toward destroying the American way of life.

It is well for us to recall what Governor Smith said in 1923, when he signed the bill repealing the Lusk laws, similar in their provisions, but less drastic than the Mundt bill:

"I am satisfied that they should not remain upon the statute books of this State because they are repugnant to the fundamentals of American democracy. Under the laws repealed, teachers, in order to exercise their honorable calling, were, in effect, compelled to hold opinions as to governmental matters deemed by a State officer consistent with loyalty. * * * Freedom of opinion and freedom of speech were by those laws unduly shackled. * * * In signing these bills, I firmly believe that I am vindicating the principle that, within the limits of the penal law, every citizen may speak and teach what he believes."

On another occasion, a bill to bar from civil service persons accused of advocating the overthrow of Government by force and violence, came before Governor Lehman. He vetoed it and cautioned against that kind of legislation, saying:

"Were we of this great liberal State to approve this bill today, we might readily find tomorrow that we had opened floodgates of oppressive legislation in the Nation against religious, social, labor, and other minority groups."

These are some—by no means all—of the reasons why I am unalterably opposed to this bill and to this type of legislation.

A special word to my fellow war veterans of the Catholic faith: We are but a part of the millions of war veterans who merged themselves in the total struggle to preserve our American liberties. We, of all people, must remember the lessons taught us by incitement against minority groups. As Catholics, we must not forget the sufferings inflicted by the Know-Nothing Party, the Ku Klux

Klan. Nor can we forget the insidious anti-Catholic agitation directed against Al Smith in his presidential campaign. It is not impossible to imagine a situation where a Ku Klux administrator, in some local community that is hostile to a Catholic minority, might declare a Catholic organization subversive, disloyal, or subservient to a foreign domination. This may seem improbable, but the proposed bill opens the door, and opens it wide, to just such fantastic possibilities.

As a Catholic, as a war veteran, and as a citizen residing in the world's largest city, in which 8,000,000 people, of all races, colors, creeds, and shades of opinion, live in peace and harmony, in the spirit of American democracy, I am impelled to oppose the provisions and principles of the Mundt bill.

Truly yours,

WILLIAM O'DWYER,
Mayor.

This is a sober and intelligent analysis of the bill, devoid of the hysteria which unfortunately is so prevalent today. It should go a long way toward convincing those Members who sincerely desire to know what this bill is all about.

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

Mr. Chairman, of all men to make such a speech, the last one should be the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], who has just addressed the House.

Every time you mention the word "Jew" in this Chamber some of them whine to high Heaven. Yet he comes in here with a bill which is not only an insult to every white person in the District of Columbia but its passage would result in great injury to the Negroes of the District, it is an attempt to stir up race trouble here, by forcing Negroes into every white school in Washington.

That bill which was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] on May 10, is entitled "A bill to prohibit the segregation of persons in the public schools of the District of Columbia on account of race, color, creed, national origin or ancestry."

The people of the District of Columbia have put up with that sort of agitation for a long time. Nowhere in the world, I dare say, have the two races got along better together than they have in the District of Columbia under the circumstances. Yet here is a man who whines every time you mention the word "Jew," his own race, who comes in here and attempts to create race friction in the District of Columbia, by forcing Negroes into the white schools.

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

Mr. RANKIN. For what purpose?

Mr. KLEIN. For a question.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. What does the gentleman mean when he says I whine around here?

Mr. RANKIN. Every time the word "Jew" is mentioned some of you get up here and whine. Yet you come in here with this sort of a bill to stir up race trouble in the District of Columbia.

Every intelligent man knows it would bring about confusion, disturbance, race riots and probably mob violence.

The last man on earth who ought to be here talking pushing this kind of legislation is the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the foundation and the basis for this bill is that communism presents a clear and present danger to the security of the United States. I am satisfied beyond all peradventure of doubt that communism presents no such thing.

The record is that upon a check of the first 1,000,000 employees of the United States by the FBI it was discovered that there was one hundredth of 1 percent whose loyalty is questioned. Communism is not on the march. Communism is waning and has been for a long time, notwithstanding all of the propaganda we hear. We know what happened in Italy, we know that communism took an awful beating there. As reported in the press on April 26 this year the German Reds took a beating in the United States zone in voting the day before. Communism is on the wane there. Then on May 4 of this year the press reported 19 industrialists came over here from France and they unanimously reported that communism is on the wane in France and especially in labor organizations. Only a few days ago, on May 14, the Attorney General of the United States is reported in the press to have said that the Communist movement is on the wane in the United States and particularly in labor circles.

Yes; communism is on the wane and has been for a long time. I made that statement in substance in the debate on the Greek-Turkey aid matter, and some of you laughed at me. But, it was and is true. Communism is not on the march; it is on the wane. With all of this propaganda that we get—and you can scarcely pick up a paper but what you read several fear articles every day—and all that is said on the floor of the House and on the radio, about how dangerous to us communism is, no wonder the people are in jitters about it. No wonder we have all this hysteria. But, it is not so; it is not so that the danger is as great as pictured. Communism is not a good form of government and it will never take hold in the United States. Now, do not misunderstand me; I have said that communism is not on the march, that it is on the wane. Liberalism is on the march and it will ever be on the march, because the people are marching forward to a better order of the day; they are marching forward ever striving for greater liberties and a greater degree of justice, to better economic conditions; and liberalism will be forever on the march. Your good party over here, the Republican Party, is more liberal than it was in yesteryear. The good old Democratic Party is also more liberal than it was in days ago. Good old Jeffersonian democracy is on the march, and it will ever be. But, communism is not. You say it presents a clear and present danger, and I say it does not. The facts are against that argument. We are living in a state of hysteria superinduced by all of this scare talk and, my friends, it is causing us to do unseemly things. I repeat again, lest I be misunderstood, that there is not a man that lives or breathes that is more opposed to communism than I am; he

could not be. I could never be a Communist and could never have anything in common with the Communists. But, this is not the way to defeat communism. This is a good way to defeat Americanism. This is a good way to destroy our own liberties in this country, and I say if we keep on with these measures we are not going to be whipped by communism but we are going to whip ourselves. We are going to destroy our own liberties in this country if we are not careful, my friends.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the Communists in the United States call themselves a political party. In fact, they are no such thing. The Communist Party is not a political party in the American sense. The Communist Party is by self-admission a world-wide revolutionary conspiracy. Here in America we have merely one section of the Communist International, taking all its orders from Moscow.

It is completely illogical that a person can be a good Communist and remain a loyal American. For here is what communism stands for:

Hatred of God and all forms of religion.

Destruction of private property and inheritance.

Promotion of class hatred and violence.

Revolutionary propaganda to stir up Communist activities in foreign countries, in order to cause strikes, revolts, riots, sabotage, and industrial unrest.

Destruction of all forms of representative or democratic government, including civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, press, assembly, and trial by jury.

The promotion of class or civil war by force, violence, and bloodshed, and through world revolution to achieve the ultimate objective of a Russia-centered world dictatorship.

Communism as it is now propagandized in America is an un-American system that would destroy the fundamental freedoms upon which our Republic rests. Communists would destroy the very civil liberties they are now screaming about. The Communist Party and its satellite organizations constitute a literal enemy within our gates, and its members are quislings owing allegiance to the Soviet Union rather than to America.

On the basis of these undeniable facts, the only logical objection to the Mundt bill is that it does not go far enough. The Mundt bill is but a mild defense against the menace of communism. But it is a good beginning. Prompt legislative action is desperately needed to emasculate Communists in this country, economically and politically, by every means open to us within the framework of the American constitutional system. It is already later than we think. The security of our Nation demands that all Communists within our borders be rendered politically and economically impotent. Just as we have laws against criminal banditry, so we need effective legislation against the most dangerous gang of in-

ternational pirates ever organized. Just as we have laws requiring the labeling of poisonous chemicals for human consumption, so we need laws labeling poisonous ideas for what they are.

It is altogether possible that outlawing the Communist Party would achieve no practical purpose. It is a puerile argument, however, to say that such legislation would drive the Communists underground. The overwhelming majority of Communists are already underground. What we need is legislation that will bring them out of their hiding places, tear away their assorted masks, drag them out into the open, put the spotlight on every last one of them, to see who they are, where they are working, and what they are trying to do. The last thing that a Communist wants is public knowledge of his perfidy. The Communist Party is today the only party that persists in working in secrecy. The Mundt bill is designed merely to put the Communist Party on the same level as all legitimate American political parties. That is why there is so much wailing and gnashing of teeth among the Communists as they bring to bear all their underhanded pressure tactics to defeat the Mundt bill. The Communists know that as soon as they are brought out into the open they are doomed. They know that party members can never endure the public condemnation they will meet when they are known by name and threatened always by heavy fines and imprisonment if they choose to work in secrecy.

It is unnecessary to discuss in detail the manner in which these enemies within our gates are attempting to accomplish their nefarious objectives. They openly admit the use of any and all means, legal or illegal, or a combination of both, to bring about revolution. The efforts in this country are not confined to mere expression, or academic discussion. It is not a simple matter of freedom of speech and assembly. Overt efforts are being made in every conceivable way to create dissatisfaction and discontent, to capitalize on it wherever it exists, in order to produce emotional results that will aid them in furthering their cause. They employ the "boring-from-within" policy, a policy that Jefferson warned against when he stated that the greatest threat to American liberty would be from forces within rather than outside forces. The Communists employ the Trojan horse technique in labor, fraternal, and other organizations, in order to obtain a position of influence therein, or to obtain recognition so as to influence the policies of such organizations. They employ also the united-front policy, where they join with other organizations in the agitation or furtherance of some program. They are not interested in the program, except as a means of using the persons in their cause. They join with others, not because they believe in what others fight for, but to use the strength of other organizations for their own advantage. To them, anything in which they engage is simply a means to the end they seek—the overthrow of government, not through the Constitution, but by force and violence.

The other night while rereading Chief Justice Marshall's *Life of George Washington*, I came upon these words of admonition:

Let me conjure you, in the name of our common country, as you value your own honor, as you respect the rights of humanity, and as you regard the military and national character of America, to express your utmost horror and detestation of the man who wishes, under any specious pretences, to overturn the liberties of our country, and who wickedly attempts to open the floodgates of civil discord, and deluge our rising empire in blood.

The entire Communist program is disgusting and repulsive to all who believe in the things that America stands for. It is to our eternal shame that we have coddled and pampered these termites as long as we have. The legislation in question may very well be too little, too late. We must not believe that the Mundt bill is the final answer to the Communist problem. But it is a necessary beginning. We owe it to all innocent and loyal Americans to protect them from becoming unwitting dupes of the Communist Party and its multiple fronts. We may debate the wisdom of outlawing the Communist Party, but certainly there can be no debate over the question of exposing its members. Members of this House have no hesitancy in making their party affiliations known, why should the Communist?

The Mundt bill does not kill the Communist serpent, but it does draw its poisonous fangs. We owe at least this much to our people in the name of American liberty. We cannot wait until the Communist menace results in actual revolution. In the words of Justice Sanford:

If a State were compelled to wait until the apprehended danger became certain, then its right to protect itself would come into being simultaneously with the overthrow of the government, when there would be neither prosecuting officers nor courts for the enforcement of the law. (*Gitlow v. New York* (vol. 268 U. S. Reports, p. 667).)

The time to act is now. As we watch the onward sweep of communism in Europe and the Far East, and as we observe the devious doings of the Communists in America in their slavish subservience to Moscow, we cannot show too much haste in enacting legislation of this nature. The Mundt bill is practical, effective, and—if anything—altogether too soft. We must pass it now, and trust the common sense of the American people to do the rest.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for the Mundt bill is not apparent, and its value is doubtful. When two prominent Republican Presidential candidates cannot agree upon the interpretation of the bill—whether or not it outlaws communism—it is not clearly drawn. We have too much legislation written that way.

It is difficult to understand why this bill was introduced at all. We have plenty of laws to take care of sedition and treason. We have also on the books requirements for registration of subversive groups. Under the crime of treason, sedition is clearly defined, and it is a wonder to me, if the Communists are as bad as the Un-American Activities Committee maintains, that these agents advocating overthrow of our Government by force have not been prosecuted. Why have they not been brought to the courts, convicted and sentenced? If there is any flaw in the laws providing punishment for these people, the Un-American Activities Committee should see to it that the correction is made so that these traitors and seditionists are dealt with properly. Why attempt half-way measures? Why fool the American people into believing that something is being done to correct a dangerous situation, if it is a dangerous situation, when the proposed legislation will not cure it?

If the Mundt bill is enacted into law, it will be seen how far-reaching it is. Innocent people may be subject to persecution. It seems to me that under it a person expressing an opinion contrary to the accepted beliefs of the majority could be branded as revolutionary or subversive. As one of the Presidential candidates said, "Let us prosecute the act, not the idea." It is better that one guilty man escape than one innocent person be condemned. We have seemed to have lost that view lately in much of the legislation coming before us.

I have repeatedly said that I have no time for communism or for persons who would advocate the overthrow of this Government by revolutionary methods, but I cannot acquiesce in this legislation that would injure innocent people, and that would be its effect rather than the purpose its authors intended. It occurs to me that in our search for Communists we are drifting pretty far toward totalitarianism. That may be a common argument, but the approach to totalitarianism is so insidious that the American people may not realize it. All of the efforts being made to circumscribe the thoughts and actions of the decent American citizen are ample evidence of that trend. We have gone far along a dangerous road when we attempt to pass a measure of this kind.

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

Mr. Chairman, within the last half hour we have heard some remarks on the floor here which should give us cause for pause. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] made a few remarks in which he read a letter written by the eminent mayor of the greatest city in the world, a very democratic speech, showing that the mayor was a lover of liberty and believed in constitutional principles. Just a few minutes thereafter the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] made some remarks with respect to a measure which had previously been introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]. In those remarks the gentleman from Mississippi, in effect, accused the gentleman from New York of promoting racial strife and race riots and matters of that type.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to the fact that this measure practically makes it a crime for anybody whom the Attorney General can reasonably conclude belongs to an organization which takes a course of action which would incite economic, social, or racial, strife or conflict.

If the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] belonged to an organization at which speeches are made such as he has made in the past, or belonged to an organization that believes in nonsegregation of the white and the black, the Attorney General could find that that organization is a Communist-front organization. The members of that organization who are officers must needs be registered, and their names put on a blacklist. Under certain circumstances everybody that pays dues in that organization would have their names listed. It would contribute to the building up of a blacklist amounting to millions and millions of persons.

Mr. Chairman, it is all right to be against communism, but are we going to destroy the liberties of the American people by being afraid that communism is on the march? As the gentleman from Oklahoma very reasonably said, I think to the satisfaction of everybody, we know that communism is on the wane; we also know that democracy is on the march throughout the world; we in this country and in this Congress should not waste the time of the House of Representatives, practically two legislative days, in debating and passing a measure which all of us know almost as a matter of certainty will never become the law of this land. The other body will devote no time to ideas such as are proposed in the Mundt bill.

We spent over \$200,000 in a year to promote the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Next year I assume the committee will come in and ask for \$300,000, and then in order to justify that expenditure will make wild accusations, which they will not be able to prove, against the finest characters in America. The following year perhaps they will ask for half a million dollars, and come in with some other phony measure which will not do any good for the freedom-loving people of this country, and which is violative of the Constitution of the United States, under the bugaboo of suppressing communism. They are even beginning to accuse Members who oppose this bill of using communistic tactics. Every curtain that they can throw around the real meaning of the prohibitions contained in this bill, and every statement that is made in support of this measure, can by any thoughtful person be found to be unreasonable and without substance in fact.

I think all the legislation that should be passed by this Congress within the next 4 weeks, up to June 20, should be given consideration, instead of wasting time and stirring up hate and prejudice in this country. That is what this bill does. I do not know a single person in my congressional district that espouses communism, but I have in my district many organizations that believe in the FEPC, that believe in veterans' housing,

that believe in upholding freedom of speech and that right to express your opinion. I do not want those organizations labeled as Communist-front organizations, by the reasonable conclusion of one individual, some future attorney general, who may be swayed by prejudice, hysteria, or even personal or public political considerations.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the Committee on Un-American Activities for the fine work that it has done in the past and to encourage it to continue its good work—I also wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] for the splendid manner in which he has conducted the debate on this important subject.

Mr. Chairman, I have been raising my voice on this floor against Communists for more than 20 years. I shall vote for this bill, commonly known as the Mundt bill. It may not be what many Members might want, but it is a gigantic step in the right direction. Communism is a direct antithesis to Americanism. Likewise, it is a direct opposite to Christianity. Its purpose is to undermine America, and, consequently, we should not fail to condemn it at every opportunity. I hope we will reflect the sentiment of our people who are almost unanimously opposed to communism in all its ramifications. I may be compelled to be away tomorrow when the final vote on this bill comes up for vote. I have been called away on important public business relating to the experiments seeking to make oil and gas from coal and shale, and I may miss this vote, but I shall pair my vote if I can do so.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause of the bill H. R. 5852 be stricken out.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer this motion in all sincerity as the best way to postpone a decision on the questions raised in the Mundt bill. I feel very strongly that this bill needs further hearings and further study by the committee.

First we were presented with the original Mundt bill. We now have a substitute for the Mundt bill. During general debate the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] stated that the committee had indicated to him that they would accept possibly a dozen amendments that he proposes to offer to the bill, and I have heard it stated that the committee has numerous amendments that it intends to offer. All of which supports the position of those who oppose the bill as presented to us today. Undoubtedly many of these amendments will relate to the court review provision. I confess that I do not consider myself competent to hear an amendment read at the desk and then debated for 5 or possible 10 minutes, then be able to determine whether that amendment removes the objections that have been raised to the

bill. For that reason, I think the Committee should take all of the suggestions which have been brought out during general debate, objections that have been raised by Members of the House, as well as others, and give the bill further consideration.

Last evening I listened to the debate from Oregon on this question: Should the Communist Party be outlawed? We find two distinguished leaders of our country diametrically opposed to each other as to what the Mundt bill would do. One says that the Mundt bill outlaws the Communist Party. The other participant in the debate says that it does not do any such thing. He says that insofar as it provides for registration it is a good bill, but he intimated very plainly that in his opinion the balance of the bill was of doubtful constitutionality. Here we have the opinion of two able men who have studied the problem, and who undoubtedly have studied the bill. They have come to such diametrically opposed conclusions. Mr. Stassen says very definitely it will outlaw the party, and the committee report says it will not. I am sure of one thing. The bill will not drive the dangerous Communists under ground. This bill provides that after going through the procedure of having the Attorney General make a finding that the Communist Party of America is a Communist political organization, that each member of that party must register with the Attorney General. I assume some officer of the organization will be charged with registering their members. But what is going to constitute membership in the Communist Party of America? Will it be the paying of dues? If so, perhaps they will not have to collect any dues because they may be amply financed from Moscow and will not need any dues from American Communists. Will it be the attending of a Communist meeting or several Communist meetings? If a member goes to a Communist meeting in the city of Hartford in a public hall and expresses on the floor in that meeting his approval of certain matters that might be under discussion, will he be a Communist or will he have to attend six meetings of the Communist Party before he will be listed as a member of the Communist Party and have his name filed with the Attorney General?

I am not disturbed by the fellow who is interested or dissatisfied with things as they are and thinks that he would like to look at something else and read some Communist literature or who attends a Communist meeting. That sort of individual will be something else tomorrow. The man who is dangerous is the man who wants to conspire with others to overthrow this Government by force and violence. After this bill becomes law that man is not going to be enrolled anywhere as a member of the Communist Party. He will go underground and to that extent will be much more dangerous than he would be if he openly belonged to the Communist Party, incidentally, an organization, as I said on Friday, that is legally recognized in my own State of Connecticut as a political party, and is a party which under our law could elect a governor or President of the United

States if they could get enough votes to do it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I close with this thought, and offer in all sincerity the suggestion that the bill should go back to the committee for further study.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add one further thought. I asked a distinguished Member of the House over the week end, a Member who is an attorney, whether he thought the bill was unconstitutional. He said, "The bill is as unconstitutional as the hot place, but I am going to vote for it anyway because I want to drive the teeth down the throats of the damned Communists." Now you cannot legislate in that frame of mind.

If the committee would agree to support the motion I have offered to strike out the enacting clause, take the bill back to committee and in committee consider the various suggestions that were made during general debate last Friday, I believe they could bring a bill into the next session of Congress that would deal with the Communist problem without taking away from loyal Americans certain constitutional rights.

When such able criminal lawyers and such able prosecutors as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, state unequivocally that the laws now on our statute books are adequate to punish those who would overthrow our Government by force and violence, I for one am willing to accept their opinions.

The Attorney General could proceed at once to try a case under any one of the several statutes cited by Governor Dewey, and if in the trying of the case it developed that additional laws are necessary Congress could immediately provide the remedy.

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

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman states that this will drive the Communists underground. Does not the gentleman know that they already are underground and are working overtime?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The dangerous Communist is underground, and under this bill he will stay underground.

Mr. RANKIN. They are underground and they are working in every department of the Government.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. This bill will never bring them out in the open.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want by way of introduction to say that I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Connecticut and for his sincerity in offering this motion. I believe the gentleman after considering the measure has come to the conclusion that the motion should be offered. I believe that the House after careful consideration of this bill during the course of its reading today and tomorrow will come to the conclusion that the fears which the gentleman has expressed as a result of his study to date are for the most part completely unfounded.

This measure strikes, as it should, only at the subversive activities of Communists in the United States and not at

communism as an idea, as the gentleman has indicated he thinks it might.

I believe we should vote down the motion and consider the bill on its merits. I am confident that the House will overwhelmingly approve the bill after it has given it such consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

On page 16, line 25, strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Page 17, strike out lines 1 to 8, both inclusive.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, before speaking to the amendment, I want, as I did briefly during general debate, to pay my compliments to the committee, particularly to the subcommittee and its able chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] for the job they have done on this bill. The problem is not only difficult, but it also touches the very heart of our fundamental institutions. The problem is to find some way, without destroying our institutions, to prevent them from being destroyed by this movement, which without any question has that for its purpose.

The question is whether our system is strong enough and flexible enough to prevent its destruction by the use of the very freedoms which it alone provides. I believe it is. In its attempt to work out a measure that will accomplish this result, the committee, in my opinion, has done a great job. I for one intend to support the bill and support the committee in the work that it has done.

The particular amendment which I have offered would strike out lines 1 through 8 on page 17. Those lines appear not in the enacting clauses of the bill but in the section dealing with findings. The section dealing with findings sets forth in concise, clear, and accurate language the nature of the movement that we are endeavoring to deal with. In general, it is a fine statement. But, in this particular, it seems to me the language which I would strike out is unnecessary and somewhat weakens the findings themselves. It specifies certain methods which are commonly used by the Communist movement in carrying its objectives in various countries.

The trouble is, first, that by specifying certain methods you create an implication that there are not others, and these are only a few of the methods which the Communist movement uses.

A greater danger, it seems to me, is that there might be some possibility that in the interpretation of the enacting clauses of the bill these particular methods used by the Communists in furthering their ends might possibly be held, in themselves, to be illegal, though employed by persons with quite innocent intent. That is not the intent of the committee, I know, and it is not the intent of the House. We do not want in any way by this bill to prevent anyone

from advocating any good cause, or to make him fearful that his advocacy of it would lead him into a violation of this law. By omitting this language we would strengthen the finding section and would eliminate any possibility of the danger that some people have been concerned about.

I hope the committee will accept this amendment.

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

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. I have had occasion, as the gentleman knows, to have submitted this amendment to a majority of the members of the committee. They have approved the amendment for the very good reasons that the gentleman has indicated. I would like to say, as the gentleman has pointed out, this amendment does not weaken the findings. In effect, I believe, it strengthens the findings, because the findings and the necessity of the legislation as they are presently written are written so they apply generally and this brings in specific application of particular acts which I do not think are not consistent with the findings. I believe the amendment is in the nature of a perfecting amendment which will improve the findings and will strengthen the bill and will accomplish the aims which the gentleman so well points out. For that reason, speaking for myself and for a majority of the members of the committee, we will not oppose the amendment as presented by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to ask my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. NIXON] certain questions which are being propounded to me by many sincere and thoughtful constituents of mine who are disturbed over certain of the implications of this particular legislation. I shall ask the three questions and then hope that I shall be able to get an answer in the time which is allotted me. The first question is this:

Is this legislation aimed at destroying the third party?

I ask this question because some of my friends feel that if the Attorney General determines that the third party is a Communist political organization, then every one of the possibly millions of persons who are or may become members of that party will be liable to criminal prosecution.

The second question is: Does the gentleman see any possibility that the effect of this legislation, if it becomes law, may be to drive the Communists underground or to have them change their tactics once more in order to avoid being ensnared by existing law or proposed new laws?

The third question is: Many of my friends have questioned me as to the constitutionality of this legislation on

the ground that it establishes guilt by association.

I would appreciate it if the gentleman could take the time to answer these three questions.

Mr. NIXON. I appreciate the action of the gentleman from Connecticut in presenting these three questions because I realize they are of concern to him as a result of the concern of some of his constituents. I realize also that they are of general interest to other Members of the House.

Answering the first question: Is this legislation aimed at destroying the third party? The answer is emphatically, "No." The charge has been made falsely that under this legislation the third party could be classified as a Communist front organization. All you have to do is to read the bill and you will find that the third party is expressly excluded from the definition of Communist front organizations. We wrote that definition with that in mind. The definition states that a Communist front must be an organization other than an organization having the usual characteristics of a political party.

The question is also raised by the gentleman as to whether there is a possibility that the definition of a Communist political organization might refer to the third party. I will say in answer to that inquiry that the definition of a Communist organization as it is written—and if you will read carefully you will come to this conclusion—applies only to the Communist Party of the United States as it operates today and as it may operate in the future, provided it does not cut its foreign ties. It could not conceivably apply to the third party as the third party is now operating. And in this connection may I say, as far as the third party is concerned and as far as this piece of legislation being directed to the third party is concerned, that probably one of the best things that could happen to the third party or any other so-called liberal organization would be to have this legislation passed so we could spotlight the Communists and drive them into the open so that such organizations could get rid of them and do an honest job in the American fashion.

The last point raised by the gentleman is whether, if this legislation be passed, it may drive the Communists underground. In this connection the contention has been made that if this legislation is passed the Communists have threatened to disobey the law and refuse to comply with its provisions.

My answer is that the Communist Party, for the most part, at the present time, is already underground. So you are begging the question at the very beginning to indicate this will drive them underground. The only question is whether you are going to drive them further underground.

If the Congress of the United States sees an evil, I do not think it should refuse to enact legislation combating that evil merely because a certain organization or a certain group of individuals threatens to disobey the law if it goes on the books. That is one of the good reasons for enacting the law.

The third inquiry is whether or not this legislation might be unconstitutional on the ground it might involve guilt by association. In the minute I have left I cannot adequately discuss the question of the constitutionality of this legislation. I may say, however, that the committee gave this matter very thorough consideration. This bill is legislation in a new field. We have attempted to meet this problem in a constitutional manner, in a sane, moderate fashion.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is going to ask for time in the course of this debate to discuss the constitutional questions, and I trust all Members of the House will listen carefully to his discussion because he has a keen understanding of the problem. He is one of the able members of the Committee on the Judiciary, and he is thoroughly convinced that the measure is constitutional.

I believe that answers all of the questions of the gentleman.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would like to deal at this time with the first question the gentleman asks. It is significant that the gentleman from California in answering changed the question. The gentleman answered the question as though it were put in the following language: "Does this bill apply to the third party?" That is not the question that the gentleman from Connecticut asked.

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

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NIXON. I would like to read the question: "Is this legislation aimed at destroying the third party?"

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The question asked was, "Can the Attorney General use this legislation against the third party?" Am I correct in that?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I will repeat the question. It is a question that has been asked me by many of my constituents. The question that I asked follows: "Is this legislation aimed at destroying the third party?"

Then I went on to say that I asked this question because some of my friends feel that if the Attorney General determines that the third party is a Communist political organization then possibly millions of persons who are or may become members of that party will be liable to criminal prosecution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. So that realistically the first part of the gentleman's question is embodied in the latter part. That is the power that this bill confers on the Attorney General and whether he can utilize that power against, specifically, the Wallace third party movement.

Let us deal with that a minute. The only way to answer that question is to look at the definitions in section 3, page 19. We must bear in mind, first of all, the charges that are made against the Wallace third-party movement. It has been repeated time and time and time again by its enemies that the Wallace third-party movement is in the interest of the Soviet Union, that its foreign policy is in accord with that of the Soviet Union. That is the charge that the enemies are making. Assuming that the Attorney General takes that charge and then he applies the loose test, which is one of the dangers of this bill; that is, the broad looseness of the language.

It says, first of all, page 19:

The term "Communist political organization" means any organizations in the United States having some, but not necessarily all, of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party, with respect to which, having regard to some or all of the following considerations.

What are the considerations? They are as broad as the world.

(A) The extent and nature of its activities, including the expression of views and policies.

Incidentally, think of that in connection with the first amendment to the Constitution.

(B) The extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out and its activities performed, pursuant to directives or to effectuate the policies of the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization in which is vested, or under the domination or control of which is exercised, the direction and control of the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this act.

(C) The extent to which its views and policies are the same as those of such foreign government or foreign organization.

Any one of these can be used as the test. Here is another test, and under this test you can take in everybody that advocates any form of public ownership, even the gentleman from Mississippi, who advocates public power.

(D) The extent to which it supports or advocates the basic principles and tactics of communism as expounded by Marx and Lenin.

And public power is a socialist enterprise expounded by Marx and Lenin and Rankin, so that I do not have to continue to read.

It is quite obvious that when an Attorney General, in a period of war hysteria, repeating what the Attorney General did in 1798 in a like period of hysteria, using the Alien and Sedition Act, which also contains practically the same language of this bill—and I have it here; I would like to read that particular section of the Sedition Act of 1798 which the American public found so repugnant that they repealed not only the Alien and Sedition Act but they also repealed the political party that put it in existence.

The Sedition Act of 1798 read in part as follows: "or to aid, encourage or abet any hostile designs of any foreign nation against the United States, and so forth."

Under this loose language the followers of Jefferson, who was establishing a new party based on a foreign policy of peace with Republican France, were thrown

into jail. So too, under the loose language of this bill Wallace's followers can be jailed because of their advocacy of peace with the Soviet Union.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close. We are discussing matters that have not been read, and there will be plenty of opportunity to speak under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, that motion is not debatable.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You try to close off debate and I will ask for the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill and you will not vote on it today, then.

Mr. RANKIN. We can vote on it tomorrow.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. I will withhold it if the gentleman has an amendment. But, I do not care to sit here and hear them discuss parts of the bill that have not been read.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OWENS:

Page 15, line 5, after the word "dictatorial" strike out the words "rather than a democratic."

Page 15, line 12, after the word "in" strike out the words "the destruction of free democratic institutions."

Page 15, line 16, after the letter "a" strike out the words "democratic or."

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, when I spoke in debate the other day I mentioned that I thought this particular section 2 and section 4 were the strong parts of this bill because in section 2, it described a dictatorial form of government under the control of a foreign nation, describing a world Communist movement, and then set forth in section 4, the fact that anyone who would attempt to establish such a type of government in this Nation would be subject to a penalty of 10 years in jail and a \$10,000 fine. It is my thought, in view of the seriousness of that section, that there should be some change, and one very good change was suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey, and the portion that I am changing is merely perfecting this part so that there will be no misunderstanding whatsoever as to what it means.

For instance, subparagraph (1) reads:

The system of government known as totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial rather than a democratic basis.

The words "rather than a democratic basis" add nothing to the sentence but confusion, because the balance of the paragraph is quite sufficient without the words which I recommend be stricken.

Before I finish my statement about that part, I shall read from paragraph 2, where it states:

The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the de-

struction of free democratic institutions, the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power.

We leave out the words "the destruction of free democratic institutions," and we have, "The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power."

Then it goes on to say:

The complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a democratic or representative form of government.

By leaving out the words "democratic or" we do not change it one bit; in fact, we improve it, because the words "which are characteristic of a representative form of government" are sufficient.

Section 4, article IV, of the Constitution guarantees to every State a republican form of government, which is a representative form of government. In making this statement I do not mean anything from a political standpoint. What I am pointing out is that the democratic form of government means one where every person has a voice in that which is taking place—where they can move as a body. It is social equality as compared with snobbery. Therefore, we do not have an absolute democracy here because the States give the persons the right to participate in the vote, with certain limitations, and it is the perfect right of the States to do that. Therefore, it is not the system that is pointed out in here. By the use of the words "representative form of government" and by the use of the words "dictatorship" and "the ruthless suppression of all opposition," we accomplish everything we desire to accomplish without adding those words which might cause a great deal of confusion when that section is later being interpreted by a court.

I spoke with the gentleman from California [Mr. Nixon] about this the other day and he indicated that they would be willing to accept the changes. I have not heard him say so today, but I think that it would help perfect this section very much. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, last Friday I spoke upon the floor of the House and I made the charges against this bill that it had key words and phrases which were vague and indefinite as to legal interpretation and as to administrative determination. I gave a list of these vague and indefinite phrases and words, which may be found on page 5873 of the May 14 issue of the RECORD. The vague and indefinite language in the bill will confuse and distract any attorney general who tries to enforce it. He must,

of necessity use his own judgment as to "reasonable conclusions," as to "degree of similarity" between an inspected organization and some Communist or Communist-front organization. In other words, we will force upon the Attorney General the use of judgment rather than the compliance or interpretation of clear and well-defined offenses. We substitute the variable judgment of one man for legal phraseology, which has been given substance and prestige through Supreme Court determination. One of the basic principles of law is that a crime shall be defined in language which is so clear that a common man may understand it, and thereby know when he is complying with the law or when he is in danger of violating the law. The Supreme Court has said in Connelly against The General Construction Co.:

That the terms of a penal statute creating a new offense must be sufficiently explicit to inform those who are subject to it what conduct on their part will render them liable to its penalties.

I charge that this bill does not comply with the Supreme Court requirement of clear and definite language when describing offenses against society.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that many of the Members of the House listened to the debate last night between Governor Dewey, of New York, and ex-Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, both Republican Presidential aspirants. Last night's debate was a demonstration for all the people of America as to the understanding and interpretation of the Mundt bill. Governor Stassen, who seeks to outlaw the Communist Party, and who is very frank and honest in his advocacy of this method of controlling communism, claims that the Mundt bill will outlaw the Communist Party. On the other hand, Governor Dewey, who believes that if you outlaw the Communist Party you will drive it underground and thereby cause it to propagate in secret, conspiratorial manner much faster than if it remains above ground where it is exposed to the pitiless glare of publicity and constant criticism, came out with the very strong statement that the Mundt bill does not outlaw the Communist Party. In my opinion, this was the most important development of the 1-hour debate, which was listened to by millions of American people. Here we have two of our most prominent American citizens, men with legal training, men with governmental administrative experience, men of keen minds and strong intellect, and yet they take a directly opposite position on the interpretation of the Mundt bill. In my opinion, this proves the statement, which I shall continue to make, that the terminology of the Mundt bill is so vague and indefinite that it will open the door to countless interpretations on the part of either congressional committees or upon the part of the enforcement official, the Attorney General of the United States.

Last night's radio debate was a demonstration which the whole American people heard last night. Two men who have been governors of States and who think of themselves as Presidential timber, could not agree upon whether the Mundt

bill outlawed the party or not. Regardless of the facts involved, I am sure of the division that exists in their minds if they are honest, and I do not doubt they are honest.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I think there can be no dispute on this point: The Mundt bill does not outlaw the Communist Party by name, and that is where Governor Dewey placed his emphasis. But it does outlaw the party in fact because it outlaws the kind of activities in which it is engaged. That is where Governor Stassen placed his emphasis. It does not outlaw the Communist Party in name, but, if passed, will outlaw the Communist Party in fact, because it declares illegal and therefore outlaws the sort of activities in which that party is engaged. There was no confusion, I think, except for the public, even as a jury may sometimes be confused by skillful placing of emphasis.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the gentleman's explanation of Mr. Stassen's and Mr. Dewey's stands, but I listened to the explanation of the gentlemen themselves last night, and it does not coincide with the gentleman's remarks. The fact remains that there is confusion and misunderstanding between two of the prominent Republican aspirants for the Presidency on what the Mundt bill does. If it does what the gentleman from Minnesota says, in other words, outlaws the Communist Party by indirection, then it is clearly unconstitutional because the Constitution of the United States, or rather some interpretations of the Constitution of the United States, says that you cannot do by indirection what you cannot do directly.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to have the RECORD state clearly that I did not even suggest that this is an attempt to outlaw the Communist Party by indirection. Very properly this bill does not mention any organization by name. It would, I suppose, be class legislation to outlaw a particular organization or group by name. What it outlaws or declares illegal is a certain type of behavior.

The Communist Party itself has announced by its own declarations through many years and by its demonstrations that it carries on or intends at the right moment to carry on that kind of behavior. Therefore, while it does not outlaw the Communist Party by name, the passage of this bill will make illegal the sort of activities which are the essential part of its work and thereby will in effect properly outlaw the Communist Party.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, what it does outlaw is a criminal conspiracy against the Government of the United States and against American institutions.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, Governor Dewey in his argument very shrewdly and skillfully quoted Congressman MUNDT and the committee report, for example, as saying that the bill does not outlaw the Com-

munist Party—and it does not outlaw it by name; but it does make illegal and therefore outlaws the activities in which it is engaged, which are designed to overthrow the Government of the United States of America and install one here that will be subservient to the Soviet Union.

Mr. RANKIN. And the conspiracy is directed by a foreign power or a foreign influence?

Mr. JUDD. The language specifically makes illegal such activities.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If that conspiracy does exist, as has been asserted by both gentlemen who have spoken, why do you not go into the courts of the United States under the conspiracy statutes and prove, as a matter of fact rather than as a legislative finding, that such conspiracy exists?

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman knows, as was pointed out last night, that there is no statute whereby you can so deal with an organization functioning in the guise of a political party—and the Communists are not as dumb as the German-American Bund was, which called itself a Bund instead of party and therefore could be so indicted and convicted. They call themselves a political party and are therefore able to claim all the legitimate rights and privileges of a political party; but the activities of that so-called political party here, as in every other country where it operates or has operated, are directed toward the overthrow of the governments that exist, and to destroy the people's freedoms.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has not answered my question, because I asked him if there was not a treasonable act or a conspiratorial act under the Constitution that he could prove it in court. The gentleman admits he is setting up different criteria here for conspiracy, because he is contending that the conspiracy provisions of the Constitution do not apply.

Mr. JUDD. While I am no lawyer, I think the ordinary conspiracy provisions are not adequate for such a case, because these folks are shrewd and clever enough to evade conspiratorial actions, and keep you at the point where you cannot move against them, until they actually blow up the Capitol; until they have actually committed the deed. But we know on the basis of their teachings, their "scriptures," and their secret orders and all sorts of actions already taken in other countries exactly what they are trying to do. It is nothing short of insanity to wait until they do blow up the Capitol before you move to end a situation which allows them to grow to such power with perfect legality and every appearance of propriety.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not quarreling with the gentleman's philosophy at all, but I am objecting to the way you approach the answer to the problem. I am just as anxious to get rid of communism as is the gentleman from Minnesota, but I want to do it in a constitutional way.

Mr. JUDD. I appreciate the gentleman's position. It was the gentleman

from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who brought up the question of conspiracy. If it could have been handled under the conspiracy laws, then why was that not done long ago? I am willing to stand by the carefully worked out language of the bill which describes exactly what kind of activities we are declaring illegal because they threaten the very existence of the United States of America.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think what the gentleman overlooks is this, that up to this time our entire judicial process has been based on the proposition of judicial determination of guilt. Here we are substituting for that judicial determination, legislative determination of guilt. That is a tremendous distinction to which I think the gentleman from Minnesota should give adequate thought.

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

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to say in answer to the gentleman that the reason why we must, in some degree, change that procedure in such a case is because nation after nation has gone down through trusting judicial procedure in individual incidents rather than legislative determination in advance of what are improper and illegal practices. In each of those countries where Communists could get into the cabinet by political means they took over the ministry of the interior, where they could control the police. Then they took over the ministry of justice whereafter they could easily get decisions which declared guilty those they were against and declared innocent those they were in favor of.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then the gentleman should amend the Constitution.

Mr. JUDD. They pose as a bona fide political party and pretend to operate as such until they get into power using the Constitution to destroy the Constitution. That is an intolerable situation. It involves the inherent right of self-defense. As Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "the right to free speech does not include the right to cry 'Fire' in a crowded theater." To grant them liberties which we know they intend to use to destroy the people's liberties is indefensible.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of what I think is the objective of this bill, to rid America of atheistic communism. I am against the method employed to reach that objective. It is far too dangerous. In our attempt to stamp out communism, we should stop, look, and listen before we adopt something which could be equally dangerous to the protection of our citizens. I do not be-

lieve that there is a Member here who really knows how far-reaching this bill is. I believe it is particularly dangerous to the workers of America. No person can read this bill and not realize that it is directed at labor. Not satisfied with the Taft-Hartley law, the enemies of labor would go a step further and, under the guise of anticommunism, attempt to wreak vengeance on all organized labor.

The great labor organizations of this country are not Communist-controlled. They are alert to the menace of communism and can be depended on to get rid of any communistic influence, whenever it is found within their ranks. They do not need this legislation.

I have very great faith in our democratic form of Government, and I believe my faith is shared by a great majority of our people, but, unfortunately, we spend very little time expressing our faith. We take it for granted that everybody should know we believe in democracy; but do they? Why do we not spend as much time praising our Government as we do denouncing communism? And why do we not do something about what causes the spread of communism? We know that communism flourishes in poverty, in suffering, in bad housing conditions, in hunger, in want. Destroy the cause, and communism will die.

Labor knows, and we should know, that the only time communism will gain strength in America will be when men have not the means to buy food and other necessities to which they are entitled. Let us be realistic about this. Force down the price of food, even if it is necessary to control prices. Report the housing bill which has been locked in committee, while decent men cannot find even a modest home for their families. Report the 75-cent minimum wage bill, the extension of social security, remove ever-present fear from our old people, and there won't be any necessity for controlling communism.

I have given a great deal of thought to this bill, and have discussed it with many of my colleagues. There seems to be some confusion about the Catholic viewpoint on this legislation. The Catholic Church, as we all know, is and has been the greatest force in the world against communism, but that does not mean that the Catholic Church endorses a bill of this kind. However, in order to get the viewpoint of an outstanding leader of Catholic philosophy, I wrote to the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, bishop of Grand Rapids, Mich., and a former dean of the School of Social Science of the Catholic University of America, for his opinion of this bill, and this morning I received this wire from him, which I shall read:

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., May 15, 1948.
 MRS. MARY T. NORTON,
 House of Representatives,
 Thirteenth District, New Jersey,
 Washington, D. C.:

In my judgment, H. R. 5852 is potentially destructive of the moral and civil rights of all Americans. As one who believes in the widest measure of individual freedom consistent with the public interest, I beg to register my emphatic opposition to this bill.

Moreover, the bill contradicts itself. While it professes to combat totalitarian dictator-

ship, it gives the Federal Government such arbitrary powers over personal freedom as to make the Government, in effect, a totalitarian dictatorship. It is hard to see how anyone who really believes in private enterprise—unless perhaps he is talking with his tongue in his cheek—can risk giving Government such wide discrimination over individual conduct as does this bill.

Communism is an evil to be removed, but it would be folly to destroy ourselves in removing it. The slower but surer methods of reason and Christian regard for others, rather than a bill such as H. R. 5852, are the instruments best suited to the task of stamping out communism.

MOST REV. FRANCIS J. HAAS,
 Bishop of Grand Rapids.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to propound a question or two to the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill. On page 19, under "Definitions" we read:

The term "Communist political organization" means any organization in the United States having some, but not necessarily all, of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party, with respect to which, having regard to some or all of following considerations.

Then under subdivision (D) we read further:

The extent to which it supports or advocates the basic principles and tactics of communism as expounded by Marx and Lenin.

Does that embrace the principles which Marx expounded in his philosophy?

Mr. NIXON. First, let me say that I urge that the entire definition be read carefully, having full consideration for all the elements involved. You will find that the requirements are that it be reasonable to conclude that the organization is under the control of such foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization. Only insofar as the support or advocacy of the principles and tactics of communism as expounded by Marx and Lenin bear upon the conclusion of foreign control do those principles and tactics have any bearing upon whether an organization can be classed as a Communist political organization.

In other words, if you will refer again to the definition you will find that the term "Communist political organization" means any organization in the United States with respect to which, having regard to some or all of the following considerations, it is reasonable to conclude that it is under the control of such foreign government or Communist political organization. In that connection the statement that has been made previously today to the effect that only one of these considerations would be enough to find an organization to be a Communist political organization, and mere coincidence of views between a political organization and the Soviet Union would classify it a Communist political organization, is not borne out at all by the definition because it is essential not simply that one of these elements appear but that sufficient elements appear to justify finding that the organization is under the control of a foreign government or a foreign governmental or political organization.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Now let us see where we are. Do the principles which

Marx embodied in his manifesto conflict with the American system of government?

Mr. NIXON. The gentleman's question, I must say first of all, does not relate to the definition. I may say that, as far as the economic system which Marx advocated is concerned, that economic system would be inconsistent with the American system of government as we know it. But I wish to emphasize again that for the purposes of this definition the principles and tactics of Marx and Lenin would have bearing only insofar as adherence to those principles bore upon the conclusion that a political organization in the United States is under the control of a foreign government.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is not what this law says. It says "some or all of the following considerations." It does not say they have to be under foreign control.

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

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Let me see if we cannot proceed methodically and get an answer to this question. Does this embrace the things which Marx advocated in his Communist manifesto?

Mr. NIXON. The answer is the same as I gave the gentleman before.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I see I cannot get an answer. Now, the Communist manifesto embodies progressive taxation. The United States adopted progressive taxation in 1913 by amending the Constitution and later making it effective by law. I would like to know how you are going to exclude the Democratic Party and the Republican Party from being classified as a Communist political organization under section 3 of this bill.

Mr. NIXON. Would the gentleman like to have me answer that question now?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes, I would like to have an answer.

Mr. NIXON. I am glad the gentleman put it exactly that way, because he has put his finger on the nub of the entire problem. Under this definition it is not enough to advocate the theories and principles of Marx and Lenin which relate, for instance, to progressive taxation or public housing or socialized medicine. It is not enough to do that, because this definition is not aimed at, and a reading of the definition will show clearly that it does not strike at, the ideology of communism as such, insofar as it is a domestic ideology without foreign government control. I realize that the gentleman is very sincere in propounding the question, but I must emphasize again that these standards in the definition of a Communist political organization can be taken into account only as they bear upon the conclusion that the organization is under the control of a foreign government or foreign political organization. Only for that purpose can those definitions be taken into account. There

would be no question that the mere fact that an organization advocated progressive taxation, for example, would have no bearing whatever upon the finding that it was under the control of a foreign political or governmental organization.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This provision does not include the part which the gentleman mentioned, that it must be under a foreign power. It says specifically: Having regard to some or all of the political considerations.

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

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Furthermore, in connection with the argument the gentleman is making, under this definition they set forth certain standards that are enumerated, beginning with section (A) on page 19 to (J) on page 21, and then they put in these words, "It is reasonable to conclude," "the Attorney General, if he finds that it is reasonable to conclude as a result of finding any one of these standards enumerated," "if he finds that it is reasonable to conclude as a result of any one of the standards enumerated that this party is one of the principal instrumentalities utilized by the world Communist movement in carrying out its objectives," and under that broad language, Doctor, you can take in even the physicians association, if the Attorney General wants to make that charge against them.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I am confused on several points in this bill. I am wondering whether the authors of this measure thought through all of its provisions and implications.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think somebody ought to protest the views expressed by the Catholic bishop quoted by the gentleman from New Jersey. I, of course, do not know the bishop, but I believe I know that the views expressed by him are not the views of the Catholic Church. It is inconceivable that a great religious order, headed by one of the great world figures—I think one of the three greatest of all the Popes—that has wrought so nobly in behalf of the preservation of freedom on this earth and that has contributed so much to stopping the spread of communism, would approve the views expressed by this divine.

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

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three subjects to which I want to refer.

A while ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] mentioned me in connection with Karl Marx because I have supported the development of the water power of this Nation and the extension of rural electrification. Karl Marx was dead and buried long before Edison developed the use of electricity. Therefore, I am sure he could not have had the TVA in mind when he issued his manifesto.

I also want to reply to some of the other statements that have been made here. I call your attention to the fact that before Germany attacked Russia

the Communists in this country were plotting the overthrow of this Government, and the Black Dragon Society of Japan was operating throughout certain sections of the country and lining up against this country every individual they could induce to join them.

The Black Dragon Society was rampant in the islands of Hawaii. They furnished the spies to direct the Japanese in attacking Pearl Harbor. They ran their cars against the tails of our planes and wrecked them so that the aviators could not leave the ground at a moment when our brave men were dying by the thousands.

That is the kind of element this bill is directed at. It would not have any more effect on Henry Wallace's party than that debate between Stassen and Dewey last night will have on the coming election. It absolutely has nothing to do with the American Labor Party, but it is directed at this foreign conspiracy.

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

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

Mr. CHELF. Any first-grader knows that the Republican Party would be the last party in the world to sponsor a bill that would outlaw the third party and the Wallaceites, because they know that the third party would take more skin off the backs of the Democrats than it would from them in the November election. They would be the last ones to do that. So all of this fear over the so-called third party being outlawed is unfounded.

Mr. RANKIN. The Democrats will be next to the last, because we know that the Wallaceites are hurting the Republican Party, if you want to get down on the low level of politics.

But that is not what is involved here. Let me call your attention to the fact that during the war Earl Browder was head of the Communist Party. He conceived the idea that since Russia was in the war of cooperating with the United States. When the war was over, Duclos, the head of the Communist International in Paris, sent a letter over here removing Earl Browder as head of the Communist Party in this country and put William Z. Foster in his place.

That is the kind of foreign direction that is being carried on by our enemies, not only of America and American institutions but of every Christian church in the world.

They would destroy or close every church on earth, especially every Christian church, and they would wreck free governments throughout the world. That is what they are trying to do in this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, "Congress cannot do by indirection what it is expressly forbidden to do by the Constitution"—Dewey.

"The Mundt bill attempts indirectly to outlaw the Communist Party. Congress cannot do this under the Constitution"—Stassen.

"Congress cannot outlaw any political party under the Constitution as now written. Existing law is adequate to fine, indict, and punish actual subver-

sion, conspiracy, and treason as defined by the Constitution"—Dewey.

The Mundt bill sets up new standards for treason.

The main body of the bill would substitute administrative decision for court decision.

The Mundt bill gives the Attorney General the power to stigmatize individuals and organizations without trial for what he thinks they think.

The Mundt bill gives the Attorney General power to declare guilt by association which is antagonistic to all our thinking.

We all know that the quintessence of Americanism is the right to boo the umpire.

The bill has been written to protect us and our way of life against the inroads of an ideology which is abhorrent but the bill is so loosely drawn that it could be interpreted and administered to rob us of the very rights it sets out to protect. It is a bill which threatens the freedom of speech and assembly of all those who would raise their voices in criticism or dissent.

Moreover, the bill will not succeed in its expressed purpose of curbing and stamping out Communism in America. On the contrary, it will make martyrs and heroes out of Communist leaders. For every Communist jailed a hundred will be bred to support him.

We must fight communism in the American way.

We must fight it openly, freely, democratically, at the grass roots.

You cannot jail an idea or hit an idea over the head with a club. Thoughts cannot be circumscribed. And it is dangerous business when the Government decides to prescribe what is safe or not safe for people to think.

Who is to decide? Congress and the Attorney General?

Do we now propose to attempt to invade the mind of the individual citizen?

The argument runs like this: "Extraordinary circumstances warrant extraordinary measures."

It is an old argument. I heard it effectively used in Germany. Its sequel contends: "People cannot govern themselves wisely. They need a leader—a superior being—to think for them and to tell them what they should and should not do."

Are we now, in the fear and hysteria that has been whipped up over communism, to appropriate methods which we despise?

In a democracy the people believe in themselves. They trust their own ability to think through their problems. In a democracy the people hold the power of government. In a vital democracy they will not be stampeded into yielding this power for any reason.

In all forms of totalitarian government the state holds the power. And, unless the people abide by the decisions of the state, they go to jail, or are liquidated.

This is the essential difference between democracy and communism.

The Mundt bill says over and over, I hate communism—I hate communism. I fail to find a balancing declaration in favor of democracy. It is not enough to hate and reject. We must love and be-

lieve. We will not lick communism by merely hating it but by our faith in democracy—in its resilience and its strength. We prove our faith by our daily works.

This bill is a long step toward the very state controls from which it seeks to protect us. The authors of the bill were undoubtedly sincere and earnest in their desire to curb communism in America, but, I repeat, hating alone is not enough.

I remember when I was a little girl our old family doctor said to me, in answer to an expression of hate on my part: "Be careful or your hate will take you over, my child."

Have we talked about Communists so much that we have begun to imitate them?

If we are to combat communism successfully we must believe in democracy enough to live up to its high principles. This often means sacrifice and self-discipline, and a real sense of responsibility to our fellow man with a high regard for his rights at all times, even if we despise what he stands for and what he says.

The Committee on Un-American Activities finds that there is a clear and present danger from Communist activities in this country. I do not believe that our Government is in danger of being taken over by 60,000 American members of the Communist Party. Does anyone in this House seriously believe that we are in such imminent danger?

I do believe that we are in clear and present danger of going broke unless this Congress acts to check inflation which has swallowed up the savings of the American people.

I do believe that this Congress is itself in clear and present danger of spreading communism by failure to act realistically to protect the incomes, the jobs, and the family life of the American people.

The Mundt bill is no substitute for long overdue housing legislation and for desperately needed price controls.

If the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee would bring to the floor of this House the housing bill which is now locked up in his committee he would make a real contribution to the strengthening of democracy. A house to live in is a better defense against communism than any attempt to rule by terror, such as is contained in this bill.

A liberal program for America is the only logical and realistic weapon in the fight against communism. I am fearful that the Mundt bill would destroy all those truly American liberal forces in this country which provide the most effective bulwark against communism.

In this critical struggle of ideologies which is taking place throughout the world today there is great danger of losing our heads and relying upon destructive and negative tactics which would defeat the very purposes and destroy the very principles which liberals espouse. The Mundt bill is certainly not the answer. It gives weapons to those whom it would defeat.

Clearly and unequivocally the solution to the Communist problem lies in the development of economic and social and political policies which will provide prosperity and peace and freedom to America and the world.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, for the past 6 years I have supported every effort in an attempt to help hold back the spread of the dangerous and godless ideology of communism throughout this Nation. I rise today in support of H. R. 5852 because I believe it will help to retard the spread of communism and its enactment may enable the Government to stop the growth of communism by making it possible to convict and send to the penitentiary for a term of 10 years leaders of the Communist Party in this country who are, in fact, agents of the Kremlin conspiring to destroy our Government at behest and directions from Moscow.

For 10 years now the House of Representatives, through a standing committee, starting with the Dies committee and continuing up to the present time as an arm of this House, has been investigating and uncovering the Communists in this country whose purpose is to overthrow the Government. This committee, with the support of the Members of this House, has done everything within its power to retard the progress of communism in an effort to protect freedom and representative government here in America. We have met with considerable success. We have at last awakened the American people to the danger of communism.

Mr. Chairman, the great majority of the American people realizing the danger of communism to our form of government want us to step up the fight to destroy this red menace. They would like to have the Communist Party outlawed and barred as a political party from the election ballot. There are those who are opposed to such action in the belief that it is better to keep the known Communists and their activities out in the open rather than to drive them underground. Furthermore, it is difficult under our Constitution to pass such legislation as the facts disclose after a study of the entire problem by committees of Congress.

This bill, H. R. 5852, which we have before us now is thought to be the best approach that can be made to this problem at the present time. It is recommended by J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, who no doubt, is the best authority in America on how to best handle the Communist menace.

The bill provides that all Communists in the United States be compelled to register their names and addresses with the Department of Justice. Those who are members of the Communist Party should be compelled to register so that the Government will know who they are, that the people whom they seek to influence may know they are members of the Communist Party, and that, in fact, being members of the Communist Party here in the United States they are acting under the direction of the Russian Government with its headquarters in Moscow. All other political parties in the United States owe no allegiance to a foreign

country. Their activities and efforts are in what they believe to be in the interests of our own country. Republicans, Democrats, and Socialists all register before they vote. They are proud of the principles of their party. Why should we not compel all Communists to register so we can know who and where they are?

The bill further provides that literature sent out by the Communist Party must bear the name of the party. This is to prevent Communists from propagandizing through the mail under organization names like Youth for Democracy, the Abraham Lincoln League, and various other misleading names of organizations which appear to be thoroughly American, yet are used only as a front for the propagation of communistic ideas in the hope of influencing the people in that direction.

Mr. Chairman, this bill outlaws any conspiracy to overthrow the American form of government for the purpose of establishing herein a totalitarian regime dominated by a foreign power. If this bill finally becomes law, Communist leaders who engage in that kind of conspiracy will be subject to a 10-year sentence in the penitentiary and a \$10,000 fine.

This would apply to the German-American Bund, or any organization seeking to overthrow this Government and establish a totalitarian form of government here in America. This is exactly what the Communist Party has been seeking to do. It classifies the Communist leaders, in fact, in the category of treasonable action to this Government.

If this law is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, for the first time it will put our Government in a position to cope with the brazen Communist leaders who for the past number of years have delighted in trying to organize the people into a party which would destroy private enterprise, the freedom and liberty of the people, and subordinate this Government to the control of the parent communism of Russia.

The bill would prohibit any member of the Communist Party from holding a position of trust in the Federal Government, and that is as it should be. No man or woman is entitled to hold a position and draw a salary from the very Government it seeks to undermine and overthrow.

Furthermore, it requires Communist-fronted organizations to register the names of the organizations, their officers, and their financial statements with the Department of Justice. It compels them to keep in their own files the names and correct addresses of their members.

If the Communist Party in America operates as a strictly American organization, its members will not be penalized by law; but if they operate as a secret agent of a foreign power, they must suffer the consequences set up in this bill.

While this legislation does not outlaw the Communist Party as an organization, it does force them to operate in the open and it makes unlawful activities on the part of anybody who conspires for the purpose of overthrowing this Government or in an attempt to establish

here a totalitarian regime subservient to any foreign government.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I know there are many of my colleagues on this floor today who, like myself, hate communism and all it stands for but who are seriously concerned as to the results this bill may bring about.

I have studied the bill carefully since it has been available. I have read the hearings and the committee report thoroughly. I have refreshed my memory as to the principles and the court decisions so far as constitutional law is concerned. I have examined the brief and the cases cited which was prepared in the Federal Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service. I make no pretense of being a constitutional lawyer, but I have found portions of this bill which, in my honest judgment, unless they are eliminated or radically amended, will be found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, should it become law.

I do not have the time at this point to discuss all the phases of the bill which I think raise a question of constitutionality, but I would like to address myself briefly to one portion of the bill which I think, not only in terms of its constitutionality but in terms of its possible wisdom, is most important for us to consider carefully before we vote on this legislation. I refer to section 3, insofar as it attempts to set up a control over what are termed Communist-front organizations. Certainly, the committee itself has well recognized the distinction between the Communist Party and the Communist political organization, and all that they seek to accomplish in this country, and these other voluntary organizations of good American citizens who might be brought within the scope of the legislation under the definition of Communist-front organizations.

Because I was concerned, I took the liberty of getting in touch with some of the best constitutional lawyers in this country, people in whom I am sure you would have complete confidence.

Up to this moment each has advised me of their opinion that certain parts of the bill before us are unconstitutional.

I want to present to you portions of one of the replies I received. I do not have express permission to disclose the name of the person who has written to me, but I do guarantee to you that you would recognize him as one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers of this country. I wish very much that we might have the benefit of the opinions and recommendations of the many able constitutional authorities after their study of this specific bill, but since we are not to have those opinions and recommendations, it occurred to me that I might raise this question in the hope that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] who kindly consented to look at this

letter, might be willing to discuss it in the course of his remarks.

This gentleman writes to me:

It is my impression that the definition of a "Communist-front organization" in section 3 (4) is by itself too indefinite to be an acceptable basis for a criminal prosecution.

Under the Thornhill case, I think it is, acts which may constitutionally be made criminal under a sufficiently narrow, definite statutory statement may still be immune from punishment under a statute couched in such broad and vague terms that it includes within its net acts constitutionally immune from punishment. A statute may not so combine the good and the bad as to serve in terror to deter people from indulging in conduct in which they have a constitutional right to engage. Such an intermingling is not cured by any separability clause.

This brings us to the question whether this vice in the statutory definition, considered a part from other provisions, can be regarded as cured by the provisions with respect to registration. If no duty to register were imposed until after there had been a determination by the Attorney General under section 13, subject to the judicial review provided in section 14, it might be urged with some force that the fault of the indefiniteness in the statutory loose language would be condoned by the ultimate judicial determination that the organization comes within the statute. There would, however, remain the issue of whether the statute itself is sufficiently specific for the guidance of the Attorney General and the courts.

Of course, party members and fellow travelers will try to horn in on all possible organizations striving to improve the lot of the poor and the oppressed and other organizations of persons dissatisfied with things as they are and urging change; but this should by no means determine the character of the organization thus invaded.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. And finally with reference to another feature of the proposed legislation he writes:

I am by no means certain that no duty to register is imposed until the Attorney General takes the initiative and an order by him is affirmed by the court. It looks as though section 8 imposes the duty to register, etc., on organizations defined or ill-defined in section 3 (4) and that section 15 penalizes failure so to do by any organization later found in criminal proceeding to be such a one as is contemplated or adumbrated in section 3 (4). This, if correct, would in my judgment clearly render the nonspecificity of Communist-front organizations void for indefiniteness. Penalizing of nonaction differs from penalizing conduct. This provision smacks of compulsory confession by men who think that they are not guilty.

Those are the clear warnings I think we should all consider in arriving at the conclusion we must individually make on this legislation after it has been amended. I believe that some of the amendments already offered and adopted have distinctly improved the bill. It remains to be seen whether the other objections that have been forcibly ex-

pressed by competent constitutional authorities can be overcome. I have tried to devise a means of doing that but I have reached the conclusion again and again that the only method would be by striking out section 3 (4) and (5) and the portions of section 8 dealing with this subject. I understand others are working on the problem. Perhaps an alternative, eliminating any unconstitutional matter can be presented.

In any event, I hope that those who believe these particular provisions to be constitutional will give us the benefit of their reasoning. Before many hours each of us will be required to form our individual judgment to the best of our ability in the discharge of our grave responsibility to uphold and defend the Constitution. We are not confronted frequently with the problem of constitutionality. But, in this instance, the committee has raised and discussed it and, whatever opinion may be held, I think everyone will admit that it is involved and must be decided.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is because I do so intensely hate communism and any form of totalitarianism that I am concerned about the present bill, and concerned about some of the thoughts which have been advanced here today. For example, one of our colleagues, in speaking of the bill, said this bill does not prevent the advocacy of anything which is good. But I call to your attention a fact that we must all agree on, and that is the glory and the strength of our institutions in America is the protection of those who wish to advocate something which the majority thinks is bad. Americans have a constitutional right to be in the minority, and to advocate things which the majority does not approve. And who is to determine what is good and what is bad?

A gentleman said in discussing this bill that too many countries have fallen by the wayside because they have trusted in the judicial processes. It seems to me if we have come to the point where we are going to stop trusting the judicial processes, we are losing everything which we are trying by this bill to defend.

If liberty is to mean anything, if freedom of speech is to mean anything, it means freedom to disagree with the majority; the freedom of our opponents to speak for those things which you and I may think are evil.

I call attention to the fact that in this House the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], with whose philosophy very few of us agree, who is in a minority of 2 out of 435 Representatives, is, nevertheless, accorded every privilege. The glory, and strength of this House is that every right that any man in this House has, is freely and generously accorded to the gentleman from New York even though the rest of us violently disagree with what he says.

I hope we do not destroy what we are trying in this bill to defend. Incidentally, I think the committee has been very careful with this bill. It might have gone very much further than it did. But the bill still leaves many of us in

grave doubt and I trust further amendments may be adopted by the committee which will resolve some of those doubts in the course of this debate.

Let us all, throughout this debate, remember and keep remembering the deathless, immortal statement of that great Frenchman, Voltaire, who said in effect: "I disagree with everything you have to say but I will fight to the death for your right to say it."

Mr. Chairman, that is liberty; that is freedom; that is Americanism.

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

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the last gentleman who has addressed us, as I do numerous others of the Members on the Republican side of the aisle who refuse to be swept off their feet, as it were, because of the mass Red hysteria that seems to be besetting the Nation. I listened intently to the debate last night over the radio between two distinguished citizens of the United States, one of them having served as governor of a great State and one still governor of a great State, and I could not help but come to the conclusion that these men, reasonable creatures indeed, men of rare intelligence, could not even understand what the terms of this current bill were. One gentleman said that the bill outlawed the Communist Party; the other gentleman said that the bill does not outlaw the Communist Party. If two important contenders for the Republican Presidential nomination cannot agree as to the bill's terms there must be something drastically wrong with it. This bill struck consternation, confusion, and conflict in the minds not only of Governors Stassen and Dewey, but of the American people. Surely if they could not agree as to what the terms meant, what can you expect from us poor mortals in this House? Certainly we cannot agree as to what the terms mean either. The words may seem quite innocent, and as you read section 3, pages 19, 20, and following, you might get the impression that those words are effective and constitutional; but the application of those words can be mightily dangerous and unconstitutional and the repercussions most severe and Draconian. Examine them carefully, and you will see how fraught with evil they may be in their application. The organization under attack need have one or more of the criteria mentioned in section 3. One of the criteria is as follows, and this is found on lines 22 and 23 on page 19:

(A) The extent and nature of its activities, including the expression of views and policies.

Then turning over to page 20:

(C) The extent to which its views and policies are the same as those of such foreign government or foreign organization.

Now, you may have a group of well-intentioned, well-meaning men and women who might call themselves the adherents to the doctrines expounded by Emerson, Thoreau, and Hawthorne. Those revered gentlemen believed in economic communes. Or you might have a group of well-intentioned, well-meaning men and women who believe in the na-

tionalization of our basic industries, and they might call themselves the American sympathizers of the British Labor Party. Mind you, they are thoroughgoing Americans. Yet, under these dangerous criteria, those innocent men and women might be charged with a violation of this act. The latter group might run afoul of this bill since their views are those expounded by a foreign government, the British Labor government.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman expresses doubt as to the provisions of this bill, or some of them. Do I understand from the gentleman's statement that he is against the attempt to do anything with this matter at this time?

Mr. CELLER. I am perfectly agreeable to do something that might contain or that might scotch communism, if you can do it, but it is mighty difficult, if not impossible, to do sans a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. I recognize that, and the gentleman is a good lawyer, and an able Member of this House, and I trust that he will not do as some who agree with the objectives, who say that something needs to be done but then resolutely oppose every attempt to do anything. I would appreciate it if the gentleman's position would be such that he would apply his great talents to our assistance in the enactment of effective and decent constitutional legislation.

Mr. CELLER. I will say to the gentleman that what he seeks to do just cannot be done without changing our basic constitutional fabric. It is not in the cards, because legislation of this character and stamp seeks to lay the entire Nation over a Procrustean bed of conformity—a conformity that unfortunately would be dictated in the narrow minds, the proscriptive minds, of the members of the Un-American Activities Committee.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Such conformity is contrary to the tenets of our Bill of Rights which provides for free speech and free expression of opinion, the erection of political parties, and so forth. This type of legislation, or any attempt that the gentleman has in mind, would be equivalent to setting up an iron curtain against ideas and the free current thereof, an iron curtain that would hamper if not prevent the formation and operation of political parties. Russia has iron curtains. You do not want iron curtains. We inveigh against Russia because it has erected an iron curtain, and we do not want that in a democracy.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I can only conclude from the gentleman's response that he is

against any effort to try to deal with this problem here at this time.

Mr. CELLER. Oh, no. The only way that you can deal with this problem adequately and properly, and the only way you can get an antidote against the virus of communism, aside from a constitutional amendment, is not by repression or coercion or punishment of this character, but by better health, and housing, and higher standards of living; no slums, no rat-infested rookeries, either in Tobacco Road or in congested areas; no second-class citizens, no harsh and violent discrimination on religious or racial grounds in employment, in education, or in economic opportunity; no poll taxes, no lynchings, no inflationary prices for food, shelter, and clothing; no fear of the havoc of war. That is how to remove the causes of discontent. That is how to destroy communism. It may be a slow process, but it is a sure process. This type of legislation makes for martyrs and makes the victims of the bill heroes. You dramatize the importance of Communists far beyond what they are entitled to, and you make subjects of the law's cruelty and the ideology that they enhance far too attractive; attractive to the youth, unfortunately, of this land. If you go into the campuses of the Nation you find so many young ladies and young men who are adherents to neocommunist. These youths are attracted to communism and neocommunist because the Un-American Activities Committee places a halo in effect around Communists and fellow travelers.

This bill's proponents argue that they do not wish to deny Communists and fellow travelers and members of front organizations political freedom. All they do they say is punish them by denying the exercise of their political freedom. They are to be deprived of passports, threatened with loss of citizenship, forced to suffer contumely and humiliation by being blacklisted, endangered in their attempts at earning a living.

These threats of sanctions will not lessen communism. Communists and their sympathizers will simply do covertly what they dare not do overtly. They presently act in semisecrecy. They will scatter themselves and seek the shadows.

To the members of the Un-American Activities Committee their silhouettes outlined in semidarkness will seem more menacing. More and more panic will possess these members.

In certain benighted lands one is made guilty by association. Such guilt is foreign to us.

The bill says willy-nilly, communism is directed by the Kremlin. That's that. There is no gainsaying it. Therefore, those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the Communist movement must be punished.

Some Communist leaders may take orders from Moscow. I cannot say. But many do not. Many followers of the Red Party have no liaison with Moscow. They may be sincere believers in the ideology of communism, with no connection with Communist leaders. Yet they are in the movement. The bill would by just such slight association penalize

thousands. There are many Utopian Communists—theoretical Communists, who detect the Russian perversion of their ideals. Yet they run afoul of this bill.

I loathe communism as much as any Member in this House, but I lack the fear complexes that seem to possess some of the Members.

As far as I can recall, Communists never polled more than 50,000 votes. If that number were doubled or tripled what would that mean in a Nation of 144 million? Do we so lack faith in our democratic institutions that we fear the presence of a comparatively few Communists could destroy that democracy? I have far greater faith in our democracy than do the proponents of this bill.

Go through the vast reams of testimony. I have yet to find a single overt act that threatened the destruction of our Government.

Overshadowing all these arguments, however, is the danger that the Un-American Activities Committee and the proponents of this bill would force our citizens to think and act as they want and dictate.

The Supreme Court has stated in the case of the *Board of Education v. Barnette* (319 U. S. 624, 642):

If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein. If there are any circumstances which permit an exception they do not now occur to us.

Cast your eye backward along the pages of our history and you will see that most of our men whom we deemed great refused to conform to the status quo. To men like those who now constitute the Un-American Activities Committee, Jefferson, Emerson, Thoreau, Jackson, Cleveland, and F. D. Roosevelt would have been rebels if not un-American. They were constantly protesting against that which was deemed orthodox. By these words, I do not mean I support communism. I fight for liberalism and the right to criticize and examine, a right which this bill infringes.

Finally, the Attorney General, by this bill, can set the time and place of a hearing to determine whether there is guilt by endeavor or association. There is no trial in the real sense of the word. The hearing, being administrative, is without jury, the ordinary rules of evidence do not apply. The investigation, prosecution, and judgment are all combined in the office of the Attorney General. There is no rule of establishing guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as is the case in all criminal procedure. The Attorney General's findings can be appealed to the court of appeals for the District of Columbia, but that review is on the record made before the Attorney General. The findings of fact in the record are conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. In weighing the evidence the court must give great weight to the conclusions and inferences of the Attorney General. The presumption of guilt prevails in the appellate court once the Attorney General determines it is so.

There is no trial on the merits in a court before a jury. This is drastic and novel procedure, especially when one considers that penalties are \$10,000 fine, imprisonment for 10 years, or both.

Finally the bill is as sadly mistaken as the infamous Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. Mr. Justice Holmes denounced the underlying purpose of those acts—as he would express abhorrence at the pending bill were he alive today—in his classic opinion in the Abrams case, as follows:

Persecution for the expression of opinions seems to me perfectly logical. If you have no doubt of your premises or your power and want a certain result with all your heart you naturally express your wishes in law and sweep away all opposition. To allow opposition by speech seems to indicate * * * that you doubt either your power or your premises.

But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe * * * that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas, * * * the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market. * * * That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on the floor of the House regarding this bill. I listened last night to the debate that has been referred to here so many times today. I have leaned favorably toward this bill, but I always like to analyze legislation further and listen to this very able House thrash it around a little before I make a final decision.

However, I have received today numerous telegrams from my district from certain labor leaders. I believe they have helped me make up my mind on this bill. I have here a telegram signed by Albert J. Eberhard, president of Local 813, UE-CIO, in Evansville, Ind. He states:

I am instructed by the Local, 813, UE-CIO, to register its protest against Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, and to demand you to take action to stop its passage. Purportedly against totalitarianism, this bill would give to one man power to break strikes. Deny freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religious worship, and to jail any person with whom he disagreed. Such Fascist legislation has no place in a democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I know this fellow, Albert J. Eberhard. He was rammed down the throats of the members of local 813 by Bill Sentner, of St. Louis, who is an avowed Communist. He was rammed down to follow his boy Charlie Wright. They are both "pinkos" from way back. Mr. Eberhard has the guts to tell me in a telegram "I am instructed by the membership," but I will give you 8 to 5 that not 5 percent of the membership instructed him to do anything; 95 percent want him to get out or sign the anti-Communist waiver that is provided for in the Taft-Hartley Act so that they, the good American members of this union, will have proper representation before the National Labor Relations Board. The leadership have not signed it because they are Communists; 99 percent of the members of local 813 in Evansville, Ind., are good, honest, patriotic, God-fearing citizens who have had this man shoved

down their throats. He should resign for the good of Local 813, UE-CIO.

I am glad Mr. Eberhard has helped me make up my mind. My answer to him is that he can go to hell. I am going to vote for this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, some entirely sincere people, as well as large numbers from insincere and improper motives, contend that we should not try to deal with the Communist menace in this country by legislation because of the grave constitutional issues involved. Admittedly, it is not easy to frame a measure which will have meaning and be effective and still not violate constitutional guaranties. I share emphatically the view that we must not adopt totalitarian methods of those that condemn to gain a short cut to even a laudable objective. I am also, however, completely convinced that the Constitution of the United States does not prohibit us from passing a law to protect our Nation against those who would use the liberties guaranteed by our Constitution to destroy it.

It is not enough for the opponents of this measure to cry in generalities, "It is unconstitutional—it violates the Bill of Rights." They must point to the precise provisions of the Constitution which they claim to be violated by its terms. If pinned down—a position which is always particularly distasteful to those who prefer loudness to logic—the proponents of legislative inaction on this subject, so far as I am aware, refer solely to the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution as a basis for argument against the passage of this bill. Let us examine these claims separately.

First, it is contended freedom of speech and of the press guaranteed by the first amendment is restricted by this measure.

No doubt, its effect will be to curtail both, insofar as, by words or writings, attempt is made to establish in this country a totalitarian dictatorship subject to the domination of a foreign power. It is, however, well recognized in a long line of decisions that freedom of speech and of the press does not mean unbridled license to preach or publish any doctrine or contention, no matter how vicious, harmful, or subversive. These freedoms can and frequently have been held properly to be curtailed where there is "a clear and present danger" which the Government seeks to meet.

Thus, Mr. Justice Holmes said in *Schenck against United States*:

We admit that in many places and in ordinary times the defendants in saying all that was said in the circular would have been within their constitutional rights. But the character of every act depends upon the circumstances in which it is done. The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theater and causing a panic. The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent.

In *Okamoto v. U. S.* ((C. C. A. 10, 1945) 152 F. 905) a decision by the Circuit Court of Appeals sitting in the city from which hails the gentleman from

New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who spearheads the opposition to this measure, the court had this to say:

Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly guaranteed by the first amendment are fundamental rights. But, though fundamental, they are not in their nature absolute. These rights are not unbridled license to speak, publish, or assemble without any responsibility whatever. Their exercise is subject to reasonable restriction required in order to protect the Government from destruction or serious injury. The delicate and difficult question usually presented is whether speech, press, and assembly are of such nature as would produce, or are calculated to produce, a clear, present, and imminent danger of a substantial evil which Congress has the constitutional power to prevent.

There is no doubt in my mind that the measure before us sets out the facts and circumstances indicating the seriousness and immediacy of the danger sought to be repelled.

Abundant evidence has been produced to support the findings in this bill. One need go no farther than to read the testimony of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, which appears at pages 35, 36, and 43 of the House hearings on H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122, Eightieth Congress, first session, 1947, to realize the extent to which our country faces a "clear and present danger."

This widely respected and admired public servant testified, out of the abundance of his experience and breadth of his knowledge, that the Communist Party in the United States is dedicated to force and violence, if necessary, for the overthrow of the United States Government; that the party maintains as a fundamental principle support of Soviet Russia, as is daily evidenced by the mouthings of its adherents; and that the "Communist Party of the United States is a fifth column if there ever was one" and is "far better organized than were the Nazis in occupied countries prior to their capitulation."

This is no time for complacency. This is no time to minimize the danger which faces our Nation and everything we hold most dear. It was only a short time ago that our neighbor on the north, the Dominion of Canada went through an experience, happily without too serious consequences, which should serve as a lesson to us that a danger does exist, that we must remain on the alert.

Even more recently we have witnessed on the European continent one country after another engulfed not by force of arms but through the subversive tactics of a tiny minority operating under the direction of a shrewd, ruthless, totalitarian dictatorship probably unequaled in resourcefulness and unprincipled cunning in all recorded history.

In my study of this problem I asked the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives to inform me regarding the number of actual Communist Party members in the various European countries and the percentage which they bore to the total population. These figures are extremely revealing. In Italy, for instance, where the recent elections reveal that nearly one-third of the people voted for a totalitarian regime, the actual Communist Party members are

said to be 2,000,000 or about 4 percent of the population. In Poland, where the lights of freedom have been extinguished, only 2 percent are said to be actual members of the party. In Rumania, 3 percent; in Hungary, 7 percent; in Yugoslavia, 11 percent; in Czechoslovakia, 11 percent; in Bulgaria, 12 percent; and in the Soviet Union it is only 3 percent or 6,000,000 souls.

In the face of the overwhelming testimony presented in public hearings and in the light of the experience of other countries which have at times scoffed at the seriousness of the communistic threat, only to wake up too late, the existence of a "clear and present danger," amply sufficient to sustain this legislation, appears to me to be established beyond reasonable opposition.

Prof. Zachariah Chaffee, Jr., of Harvard Law School, a well-known liberal, recognizes in his Free Speech in the United States, 1941, at page 31, that despite the first amendment, there are purposes of government, such as order and protection against aggression, which must be balanced against the right of unlimited discussion interfering with these functions.

As was said in *United Public Workers v. Mitchell* (1947) 330 U. S. 75-95:

The essential rights of the first amendment in some instances are subject to the elemental need for order without which the guaranties of civil rights to others would be a mockery.

The argument that a bill such as this invades the private or personal rights of anyone is well answered by the statement of the Court in *U. S. v. Josephson*—a name well known in this body—((C. C. A. 2d) (1947), 165 Fed. (2d) 82, certiorari denied (1948) 16 L. W. 3253), where it was said:

If * * * propaganda takes the form of, for example, advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by violence, it is rightfully called "Un-American" and a sensible regard for the self-preservation of the Nation may well require its investigation, with a view to the enactment of whatever remedial legislation may be needed or to the amendment thereof. One need only recall the activities of the so-called fifth columns in various countries both before and during the late war to realize that the United States should be alert to discover and deal with the seeds of revolution within itself. And if there be any doubts on the score of the power and duty of the Government and Congress to do so, they may be resolved when it is remembered that one of the very purposes of the Constitution itself was to protect the country against danger from within as well as from without. See *The Federalist*, Nos. II-X. Surely, matters which potentially affect the very survival of our Government are by no means the purely personal concern of anyone.

It is also contended that this measure does violence to the fifth amendment, providing that no one shall be deprived of his liberty without due process of law. It is well settled that a criminal statute, such as the one before us can in part be properly described, must define the offense with such definiteness that it is not necessary to indulge in speculation to determine whether the acts committed by an accused constitute the crime under prosecution. Otherwise the

statute is subject to successful constitutional challenge under the fifth amendment.

Offenses in this bill to which criminal penalties attach fall into two general categories. First are the directly prohibited acts set forth in section 4, all having to do with attempting or participating or conspiring to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship, the direction and control of which is under the domination of a foreign government, organization, or individual. I have heard no objection to this section on the ground that it did not clearly state the acts which would constitute the offense.

Then there are other penal provisions relating to failure to register, application for passport, or application for Federal employment, which fall in a separate category. The Communist political organization, its officers and members must register as to the "Communist-front organization," only registration of the organization itself and its officers is required. The members are not subject to the provisions of this law. In each case, viz.: The employment provision—section 6—the passport provision—section 7—and the registration provision—section 10—a necessary element of the illegal action is that one, in order to run afoul of the law, must be a member of a Communist political organization, not a front, "knowing or believing or having reasonable grounds for knowing or believing that the organization is a Communist political organization."

I am reliably informed that the committee will offer an amendment to all three of these sections to strike out the words "or believing, or having reasonable grounds for knowing or believing," the effect of which will be to provide that conviction can only follow if one becomes or remains a member of a Communist political organization with actual knowledge that it is such. This amendment will, in my judgment, greatly improve these sections and provide beyond peradventure of a doubt that no injustice may result to an innocent party.

It is then contended, however, that the definition of a Communist political organization contained in subsection (3) of section 3, beginning at page 19 of the bill, is not sufficiently definite to permit one to know whether or not a particular political organization is or is not Communist in character. Much has been made of the fact that various political parties might fall within one or more of the provisions lettered (A) to (J) inclusive, appearing on pages 19 to 21. Although, so far as I know, no single one of those considerations applies to any party in this country except the one which calls itself the Communist Party, it is important to note that all of these paragraphs are but introductory to the single test, the ultimate determination: Is the conclusion reasonable that the organization is under the control or domination of a foreign government or foreign political organization?

Here again this legislation has been immeasurably improved by the willingness of the committee to accept an amendment to strike out on page 21 the

alternative provision which would permit a determination that a political organization was Communist to be based upon a finding that it was one of the principal instrumentalities utilized by the world Communist movement in carrying out its objectives. This might be subject to abuse in that it is conceivable, although admittedly unlikely, that a political body might be a pawn in the hands of the world Communist movement without its actual knowledge or consent. By the elimination of this second ultimate test, however, the issue is clarified and there should be no difficulty by reason of indefiniteness in proving whether the organization is "under the control of a foreign government." When the smoke and fog are cleared away that is the sole question.

It is here that communism as a political, economic, and social theory parts company with communism as a part of a worldwide conspiracy to subject this country to the domination of a foreign power. It is only the latter inhibited by this law.

The proposed statute is not open to the challenge that it uses indefinite terms such as the word "gang," criticized in one decision, about the meaning of which a person is required to speculate. The meaning of the phrase "Communist political organization" is here defined with clarity and, I believe, accuracy.

Since the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibits a State not only from depriving a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, but also denying to any person the equal protection of the laws, it has been held that a denial of the equal protection of the laws by a Federal statute would be inhibited by the fifth amendment. In other words, although not expressly prohibited, it is to be considered implied. Therefore, the contention has been advanced that requirement of registration and the filing of annual reports by Communist organizations does violence to the due-process clause contained in the fifth amendment in that it is such an unreasonable discrimination as is condemned by the equal-protection doctrine.

This same argument was raised against the New York statute which required the Ku Klux Klan to register in that State. A prosecution was brought against one who remained a member of that group, knowing that it had failed to comply with the registration requirements. The registration provisions of the measure before us follow closely the language of those set forth in the Supreme Court opinion in the Ku Klux Klan case known as *Bryant v. Zimmerman* (278 U. S. 60). Just as the Communists argue here that they should not be singled out for discriminatory treatment any more than the Democrats, the Republicans, or the Wallaceites, so in this case the defendant argued that the statute discriminated against the acts of the Ku Klux Klan when it should equally apply to labor unions, the Masonic fraternity, the Odd Fellows, the Grand Army of the Republic, and the Knights of Columbus. The Court, however, had little difficulty in reaching the conclusion that the classification was justified by radical differences between the Ku Klux Klan on the

one hand and the other classes of associations on the other hand. No greater difficulty will be encountered in distinguishing between that party, on the one hand, which seeks to serve a foreign master and those others which, however they may differ among themselves, yield their allegiance solely to the United States of America.

One case advanced by the opponents of this measure is *Thomas v. Collins* ((1944) 323 U. S. 516). It is true that the Supreme Court said in this case with respect to a speech by a union organizer, that one who is "required to register as a condition of his right to make a public speech to enlist support for a lawful order" is deprived of his rights under the first amendment. The Court, however, expressly based its decision on the premise that "lawful public assemblies, involving no element of grave and immediate danger which an existing state is entitled to protect, are not instruments of harm which require previous identification of the speakers."

In other words, the very basis of the decision was the absence of a "clear and present danger." In this case the Court referred to Bryant against Zimmerman, distinguished it, but did not overrule it or question its authority as a sound expression of the Court's present view of the law on this subject.

Perhaps a word should be added regarding section 5 relating to loss of United States citizenship. Citizenship is a political status which may be defined and its privileges limited by Congress. A person has the right to expatriate himself voluntarily. Likewise Congress has the power to say what acts shall expatriate a citizen. Citizenship acquired either by birth or naturalization may be lost by expatriation.

In *McKenzie v. Hare* ((1915), 239 U. S. 299), the argument was made that Congress could not by legislation provide that certain acts by a natural born citizen amounted to expatriation, in this case marriage to a foreigner. The Supreme Court denied this contention, pointing out that the United States as a sovereign may impose conditions for the maintenance of citizenship and provide that certain situations voluntarily entered into, with notice of the consequences, may deprive one of such citizenship.

In conclusion, therefore, although I recognize the constitutional as well as the practical difficulties which have been encountered by the framers of this legislation, I feel confident that it is the most sensible and rational approach as yet suggested to deal with an extremely serious problem which affects the liberty and security of every man, woman, and child in the country.

Great care, I know, has been taken by the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Nixon] and by his advisers, in the drafting of this legislation, to insure that no constitutional guaranty of any citizen is infringed. In my opinion success has been achieved in keeping within the four walls of the Constitution. In my judgment this legislation will be still further improved by the amendments which, I understand, are acceptable to the commit-

tee. When perfected, the bill should meet every constitutional test.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. I have listened to the gentleman's exposition of the cases with some interest. I would like to ask the gentleman if he agrees that by virtue of the provisions of section 4 it would become a criminal act if any one of us at a public meeting, or with two people before us, should propose a constitutional amendment, and to publish that fact in the press—an amendment for the purpose of carrying out the prohibition contained in section 4 of the act.

Mr. KEATING. The proposal of a constitutional amendment would not be an act, in my judgment, which is prohibited by this section.

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEATING. I yield briefly.

Mr. COUDERT. In the first paragraph of section 4 the prohibition is against "in any manner." "Any manner" includes legitimate, constitutional methods of operation. So that a constitutional amendment is an "in any manner" act. So that the bill would prohibit any citizen from proposing, if he were then fool enough to do so, the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship by constitutional amendment, with the reporters in the room, aboveboard and frankly. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. KEATING. I will say to the gentleman that I have not given thought to that precise question. If there is a remote possibility that this section might be construed in the way suggested, which I doubt, perhaps it should be clarified by an appropriate amendment. It strikes me that if anyone sought to bring about the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship here under the domination and control of a foreign government through the medium of an amendment to the Constitution, he would surely not be prosecuted criminally, but committed to a mental institution.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On page 19, line 1, after the article "a" strike out the words "clear and present" and insert the word "potential."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman has just spoken on the clear and present danger provision and had ten additional minutes, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes over the 5 on the same subject.

Mr. NIXON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I shall not object to the request of the gentleman from California, but due to the fact that we are not making very fast progress on the bill I will have to object to future requests for additional time.

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

California that he may proceed for three additional minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly at this point?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield very briefly, but that is all.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes. I just wanted to reply to the observation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] by saying that the clear and present danger must be a judicial determination. Here they make it a legislative determination, which is prohibited by the Constitution.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I intend to talk at length on that subject and I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] will listen.

Mr. Chairman, I have three main objections to this bill.

First. The authors of this bill are attempting to get around the Bill of Rights, and do by indirection that which they recognize by their report, they could not do by direction. They have been forced to use the type of language which has been designated upon previous occasions by the Supreme Court as "vague and indefinite." In numerous places in this bill this vague and indefinite language opens the door to fuzzy and dangerous interpretation. It places the questionable judgment of a man above the clear and specific meaning of tested legal language.

Second. This bill purports to control Communist and Communist-front organizations. The language used in this bill to set up the standards by which the Attorney General makes his determination regarding the status of many economic, political, and religious groups in our Nation, is so vague and indefinite that it is not only unworkable, but actually dangerous. The Attorney General is given unparalleled power, heretofore reserved to the courts and the judiciary, to proscribe and prosecute suspected groups, organizations, and individuals. A vicious or even a stupid Attorney General could do tremendous violence to our civil, economic, and political liberties. The language of this bill is so broad and general in its scope that it throws a "Red blanket" over thousands of organizations and millions of citizens who hate communism, but who believe in working for certain social, economic, and political reforms through constitutional American methods.

The third objection I have to this bill is that I firmly believe that it is unconstitutional. The bill rests basically on the conclusion of its authors that there is a clear and present danger—that is, that the Communists are about to overthrow the United States by force and violence. Now, unless the sponsors of this bill can prove this clear and present danger, as defined by Justice Holmes in his Supreme Court decision, the whole foundation or reason for the bill is destroyed. I say that the committee has failed to prove that the Communist Party of the United States, or of any

Communist-front organization in the United States, presents a clear and present danger, which attempts to overthrow our Government by force and violence. They have made a legislative finding to that effect, but I deny the validity of that finding. The minimum proof which any board of the land would accept would have to demonstrate at least these two points: First, that the American Communist Party is so strong numerically and politically that they would be effective in a military sense; second, that they are conspiring to overthrow the Government by force and violence, and this would necessarily mean that evidence would have to be produced showing military organization, caches of arms, and revolutionary plans for a military coup. No proof has been produced to prove the existence of such factors or danger. I therefore deny that the committee has established adequate grounds to prove in any court in the United States that there is a clear and present danger to our institutions.

Statistically speaking, there are less than 100,000 Communists in our population of over 145,000,000. That is a ratio of 1 Communist to every 1,450 persons. They are without military arms or equipment and it is ridiculous to see this Congress cowering in fear before such a fact. If our pioneer forefathers faced the dangers of the new land against the hordes of Indians and the hazards of the wilderness, I believe that 1,450 loyal Americans can handle 1 Communist.

I say again, there is no clear and present danger.

The committee has not brought forward proof to show that there has been one abortive attempt to use force and violence in the United States to overthrow the Government. And if such force and violence were attempted by any part, or all, of these 100,000 Communists I want to bring to your attention the fact that we are strong enough in the United States to take care of any such attempted military coup. We have several hundred thousand Regulars in our armed forces available. We have fifteen or twenty million ex-GI's. We have the greatest civilian police force in the world. And we have several million more loyal Americans with shotguns and deer rifles in their closets, and I have confidence that we could take care of any potential Communist coup in the United States. No, there is no clear and present danger, regardless of the hysteria of the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities. We are fighting an ideological war. We are fighting a war of ideas. We are fighting communism on the political and economic plane. And that is where we should keep the fight. To fight it on the political plane you have to make democracy work. You have to take care of political inequalities in our democracy for all American citizens to preserve the privileges and rights which they are given inherently in our Constitution. To fight communism on the economic plane you have to correct the economic maladjustments of our society. You have to see that the people are fed and clothed and housed adequately. You have to eliminate monopoly control of great economic sections of our Nation.

You have to make free enterprise work in the sense that a small-business man shall not be ground into bankruptcy under the heel of monopolistic and great financial power.

If we fight communism on the political and economic plane, we correct the maladjustments of our society. We need have no fear of the growth of communism, but if we fail to correct these maladjustments by adopting totalitarian police-state methods by allowing continued growth of monopoly, the continued elimination of the small-business man, then we will be in danger from within. And the ranks of communism will swell by millions of American citizens who will be with them because of their economic desperation, because of hunger and sickness, and because of no place to live.

Economic chaos will bring on unemployment, hunger, and desperation. These are the fertile grounds in which communism will grow. If we lose our political democracy through fear and failure to protect the Bill of Rights, then we lay the foundation for dictatorship, and it may be of the Communist left, or it may be of the Communist right. In either case, it is the totalitarian dictatorship which we hope to preserve our Nation from.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. I have listened to the gentleman's statement with much interest and I have concluded he does not think there is any necessity for enacting any anti-Communist legislation at this time. Is that the gentleman's position?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No. I have an amendment on the desk which I expect to offer that will attack this problem in what I think is a constitutional way and at the proper time when section 3 is read I expect to offer the amendment.

The amendment, very briefly, seeks to do this: It asks the Attorney General to prepare a report to the Congress on the 27 laws which we already have on the books and the need for an amendment of those laws and for any additional legislation, if it is needed, and also to give us a draft of such legislation. If the Attorney General will do that, of course, it will then be up to the wisdom of the Congress as to whether to accept his draft or not. I say that the Attorney General has a better idea of what is needed because of the responsibility of enforcing laws against subversives than possibly the bill before us.

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

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

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

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would like to issue this challenge to the majority leader, to submit the pending bill to the Attorney General and let us have his opinion on the constitutionality of this bill. He can get that opinion much faster than those of us on the minority can. He is majority leader.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. May I say that as a Member of Congress I have always held it to be my responsibility to determine for myself as best I could the constitutionality of measures coming before us. I am doing that on this measure, and I have followed that practice all along. There may be disagreement among us about what is constitutional and what is not constitutional, but I know we are dealing here with a problem that needs to be met and, as far as I am concerned, I am going to meet it as best I can on my own responsibility.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Even though it violates the Constitution.

Mr. HALLECK. I did not say anything of the sort. No one has been more consistently devoted to the Constitution than I. I disagreed with the statement we had one time asking the Congress to enact legislation without regard to doubt as to its constitutionality however reasonable.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the question was raised by the gentleman from California who just preceded me with reference to a showing of a clear and present danger to the security of the United States, and referred particularly to the statement made with reference to that danger. I want to first call attention to the fact, to answer in part the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], that the committee had before it the Attorney General of the United States, and questioned him with reference to the weakness of a good many of our laws, and the number of existing laws. In addition to that it was testified clearly before the committee by the Director of the Bureau of Investigation that the active Communists in this country today were a larger percentage than it was in Russia at the time the Communists took over the Government of Russia. Today there are in this country thousands of active, well-trained and schooled men. They know their places at the time when the orders come to take part, to seize strategic positions, to infiltrate into strategic organizations, and place themselves in strategic places. So, it is not a question of numbers alone. Witness after witness more or less reiterated those particular facts.

The membership of this House has for a long period of time asked the members of the committee this question: Why do you not bring out legislation to meet this situation? That was at the particular time when we were investigating it. It was hard sledding. It is not easy to serve on this committee. This committee has had many problems facing it, but each time it has come before the House with a request the House held up the hands of this committee, because it recognized it has a hard job to do and is trying to do a patriotic duty. But, they said: Why do you not bring out legislation? The committee, in its desire to bring out fair, constitutional legislation, has taken time and has considered the testimony of many people who have appeared before it. In general debate the other day I quoted a telegram received from the

chairman of the Bill of Rights Committee of the American Bar Association, an attorney eminent in his own right, who is highly respected in this Nation I had submitted to him the entire draft as we had finally reported it out. I asked him point blank his advice with reference to it, and you will find it incorporated in the general debate. I extended it at that time in my remarks. He said that there was need for his legislation; that this legislation was carefully drawn, and in his opinion it was constitutional.

There is no effort to try and abridge freedom of speech. The question was asked a few minutes ago with reference to the proposal of a constitutional amendment. When you make an analysis of the definitions under this bill you will find each time it is tied into the dictatorship of a foreign government; the establishment of a totalitarian form of government and then subservient to a foreign government. That is part and parcel the sum of the various definitions as set forth.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to pay tribute to the Committee on Un-American Activities for the splendid job it has done over a long period of years. I wish to pay special tribute to the subcommittee that handled this bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT], and particularly the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON], who, in my opinion, and I know many Members of this House concur in it, from the record he is making in his first term in this body, is one of the most outstanding men that has been sent to the House of Representatives.

The bill carries the name of one of our colleagues the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. Those of us who have been rather close to this committee know that he has been a very valuable member, but we also know that the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] has carried a large part of the load on this particular bill.

We have heard a great deal of discussion today regarding constitutionality. Ever since there has been a House of Representatives hardly a week has passed but that some bill has been brought to the floor of the House and we have heard Members argue against its constitutionality. That is nothing new. The opponents of any bill always argue about its constitutionality.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, I do not happen to be a lawyer, but I do not think it is in the wisdom of anyone in this House or even the Attorney General to set himself up as the final authority on the constitutionality of any bill. We have a Supreme Court to determine the constitutionality. After this bill is passed, if there is someone who thinks there are some provisions that are unconstitutional, no doubt the matter will be taken to the Supreme Court. If the Court declares any of the provisions un-

constitutional, then it is up to the Congress of the United States to rewrite those provisions in line with the decision of the Supreme Court.

Just out of curiosity I analyzed the vote against the appropriation bill which was before the House not so long ago for the Committee on Un-American Activities. I also analyzed the vote against the Condon resolution, I also analyzed the vote against the rule that brought this bill to the floor of the House. There were not more than 40 votes cast against any of the three measures. I have every confidence that this bill will pass the House by an overwhelming vote, and I doubt if there will be more than 40 to 50 votes against its final passage.

I have been flooded with telegrams and communications from various organizations in opposition to this bill, and when we go back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent to make these telegrams a part of the record at this point. However, they are all of about the same tenor, and I do not hesitate to say for the benefit of my colleague from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL], who spoke about the telegram he received from some of the CIO in his district, that in nearly every instance the telegrams are from the CIO.

Mr. Chairman, the people of our country are overwhelmingly demanding that the Congress of the United States do something about the spreading menace of communism. The Mundt bill is certainly a step in this direction. It is a bill that every true, patriotic American should be willing to support wholeheartedly. It is high time that we stand up and not be afraid to be counted on the side of Americanism.

In order that the people will know who is in opposition to this bill, and for posterity, I am inserting the following telegrams and letters which I have received:

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington D. C.:

The omnibus bill H. R. 5852 represents real threat to American democracy. Urge you to fight its enactment in any form.

ANDY ANDRASKA,
B. A. Locals 55D and 68E USWA-CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 6, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington D. C.:

On behalf of 2,800 members of local 1154, many of whom are your constituents, we urge you to vote against and fight against the so-called subversive-activities act. This legislation would destroy the basic rights of all Americans.

JOHN KELLIHER,
President, Executive Board, Local
1154, UE-CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 7, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington D. C.:

United Office and Professional Workers of America, Local 24, representing thousands of Chicago white-collar and professional workers alarmed at Fascist repressive legislation called Mundt Subversive Activities Control Act being considered by Congress this week. This bill will destroy our American way of life by following the Nazi pattern. We love America. We refuse to have our democratically elected Congressmen make our beloved

country a police state and destroy civil rights. Do not help blot the fair traditions of our American heritage. We appeal to you to oppose in every way possible the passage of this vicious un-American bill. Confirm.

HARRIET PIPER,
President, Local 24, UOPWA.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 11, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Members of our organization, many residing in your district, fully realize Mundt un-American bill designed to turn our beloved country into a Nazilike state. Confident you have same understanding. Strongly urge you fight against this diabolical legislation. By your deeds you shall be judged.

JOHN T. BERNARD,
Director, Chicago UE Political Action
Committee.

NATIONAL MARITIME UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., May 14, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUSBEY: We urgently request that you vote against the Mundt-Nixon bill (H. R. 5852), described as the Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948.

The membership of the National Maritime Union is strongly opposed to this bill, both because it seriously threatens the existence of bona fide labor unions and because it sweeps aside civil rights guaranteed to every American by the Constitution.

We have always believed that the House Un-American Activities Committee, which is sponsoring this bill, is in itself unconstitutional.

We are sure that you will agree that the Mundt-Nixon bill contains serious dangers to the American system. We urge that you cast your vote against the bill.

We would appreciate an answer to this letter.

Yours very truly,
SAM MOONBLATT,
Chairman, Committee Against Mundt-Nixon Bill.

RESOLUTION ON THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES ACT

Whereas the Un-American Committee has prepared a blueprint to end democracy in our country and substitute for it a Fascist-style police state. This conspiracy against our traditional liberties and constitutional rights is known as the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948;

Whereas under the guise of fighting so-called subversives, the police-state act is really aimed at smashing the labor unions, the Wallace movement, and any progressive movement that fights for the workers, the people, and for the rights of minorities, especially the Negro and Jewish peoples; and

Whereas the police-state act is designed to silence the voices of all progressives so that the Wall Street program of union busting and war can be pushed without opposition; and

Whereas this is an amplification of the Taft-Hartley "slave" Labor Act to deliver the final smashing blow to destroy organized labor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this quarterly membership meeting of Amalgamated Local 453, UAW-CIO, goes on record as condemning the police-state bill as a threat to our democratic rights and trade-unions; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive board and joint council are instructed to carry out an all-out campaign for the defeat of this vicious bill; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the National CIO; the International Union UAW-CIO; regional office, UAW-CIO; Senators SCOTT LUCAS and WAYLAND

BROOKS; and to the Congressmen from the Chicago area.

Passed this 25th day of April 1948.
AMALGAMATED LOCAL 453, UAW-CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 11, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Chicago Teachers' Union, representing 7,200 public-school teachers in Chicago, affiliated with the American Illinois and Chicago Federations of Labor, respectfully, requests that you oppose the Mundt bill. The teachers' union believes this bill is un-American and dangerous to the liberties of loyal American citizens.

JOHN M. FEWKES,
President.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 11, 1948.

Congressman FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the membership of Local 107, UFEMWA, CIO, we demand your unqualified opposition to the Subversive Activities Control Act 1948, when same appears for House action. This legislative monstrosity would by its discretionary powers make the Attorney General more powerful than the Congress of the United States.

EXECUTIVE BOARD OF LOCAL 107.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 11, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to vote against Mundt bill, H. R. 5852. Measure is dangerous and unconstitutional. It will not serve its stated purpose against communism. Bill a dangerous threat against basic civil liberties of Americans.

MICHAEL MANN,
Secretary, Chicago Industrial
Union Council, CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, is most reactionary union-busting piece of proposed legislation ever to appear before Halls of Congress. I urge you to fight this bill in all forms as real threat to civil liberties.

T. A. GRIMM,
Legislative Director, USWA-CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Provisions of Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, contain all that is necessary to bring fascism to America. Represents threat to American labor movement, civil liberties, democracy. Urge you to fight this bill with all your power.

JULIUS CRANE,
Executive Director, USWA-CIO.

SMASH MUNDT-NIXON POLICE-STATE BILL (Statement by the resident board of the American Slav Congress)

The resident board of the National Committee of the American Slav Congress, meeting in New York May 7, 1948, condemns the Mundt-Nixon Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948 (H. R. 5852) as a monstrous attempt on the part of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to destroy the basic constitutional rights and liberties of the American people and introduce police-state methods, thus going a long way toward establishing in these United States exactly what this bill ostensibly aims to prevent, namely, a totalitarian dictatorship.

We agree with Henry Wallace that this bill is a legislative device by which "we are being plunged on the road to fascism," behind the smoke screen of the Red menace, and that this is a measure "which would, in effect, make any advocate of peaceful understanding in the world an international conspirator."

In this sense, the Mundt-Nixon bill holds a special danger for all Slavic Americans who dare express their admiration for the rapid industrial, political, and cultural advancement of the peoples of their native lands in eastern Europe.

Following the familiar Nazi pattern of exposing and destroying communism and communistic-front organizations, the bill states, without supplying any proof, that there exists a world-wide Communist conspiracy, directed by a foreign totalitarian power, which aims to destroy free American institutions and establish a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States under the domination of a foreign power. The authors of this bill propose to destroy this imaginary conspiracy by the enactment of a law that provides 10 years' imprisonment and \$10,000 fine for anyone who in any way helps or abates this conspiracy.

Any Slavic American or Slavic American organization that criticizes the American foreign policy, advocates friendship with Slavic countries, opposes ERP, condemns the United States position on Palestine, or protests against the enactment of the draft and UMT could, under this law, be charged with facilitating the establishment of a dictatorship by weakening our country through the dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine its institutions.

Every individual and organization that protests against armament appropriations and advocates better social security, Federal housing and price control would be open to a similar charge.

Every trade-union leader who calls a strike for the betterment of working conditions and higher wages could be charged with "facilitating or aiding in bringing about the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship." Every official of that union could be charged with active participation in the management of a "movement to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment of such a dictatorship."

Every individual or organization which fights against racial discrimination, refuses to obey segregation laws and ordinances, calls or participates in mass meetings or other forms of activity to put pressure on the Congress to enact the FEPC, antilynch and anti-poll-tax laws, would be open to the charge of aiding in bringing about the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship by inciting social and racial strife.

In brief, this bill would set up the machinery for a full-blown police state, American style. It is directed primarily against the Wallace movement and confirms Wallace's statement that the main menace to our freedom comes not from abroad but from "home-grown fascism."

The Mundt bill sweeps away the Bill of Rights and substitutes the police state. It is not sufficient to call this proposed law unconstitutional. It is more than that. The bill, if passed, will replace our democratic institutions with a state where freedom to think or to speak freely will be completely lost.

If this measure becomes law, constitutional democracy will disappear. Instead, a horde of FBI men will be prying into your homes, your meeting places, your organizations in order to determine whether you are a member of a "Communist political organization" or a "Communist-front organization." And the language of the bill is so broad, so vast in purpose, that it encompasses everybody who has any desire to better himself or his family in any manner or make this world a better place to live in.

This bill, if enacted into law, would make a mockery of the democratic traditions of our country and would bring shame upon the name of America before all freedom-loving peoples of the world.

The New York Post was absolutely right when it wrote editorially that "no decent citizen could come near it—the bill—without protecting his nose with a clothespin."

Even Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, certainly no "fellow traveler" has declared that: "This bill is thought control borrowed from the Japanese war leadership and is an attempt to beat down ideas with a club. It is a surrender of everything we believe in."

Justice William C. Douglas stated at the Altgeld centennial on December 30, 1947: "A people indifferent to their civil liberties do not deserve to keep them, and in this revolutionary age may not be expected to keep them long. A people who proclaim their civil liberties, but extend them only to preferred groups, start down the path to totalitarianism."

It goes without saying that the defeat of this bill should be the major task of every Slavic-American organization, of every American of Slav descent, as well as of all other Americans who believe in democracy.

We, therefore, call upon our State and city committees, affiliated organizations, and upon the millions of progressive Slavic Americans to immediately wire or write their Congressmen and Senators urging them to vote down this un-American bill.

LEO KRZYCKI,

President.

ZLATKO BALOKOVIC,

Chairman, Resident Board.

GEORGE PIRINSKY,

Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD,
Chicago, Ill., May 11, 1948.

The Chicago Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild issued a statement today condemning the Mundt-Nixon antisubversive bill on the ground that it violates every fundamental precept of American constitutional law.

In issuing the statement, George L. Siegel, president of the chapter, said: "The purpose of this bill is to regiment American social and political thinking."

The Chicago Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild represents lawyers of many different political opinions but who are one in their devotion to the Constitution and in their desire to retain unimpaired the freedoms safeguarded by the Bill of Rights. Consciousness of this obligation impels the Chicago Guild to speak out firmly against the invasions of fundamental constitutional liberties which the bill authorizes.

We believe the bill, in the breadth of its scope and in the vagueness of its terminology, to be violative of due process requirements. We believe that the bill, by its registration and so-called "exposure" provisions, imposes prior restraints on freedom of political thought, expression, and action contrary to the first amendment. We believe further that the first amendment is violated by the criminal penalties against peaceful speech and action and by the ban on freedom of association. We believe that the bill, by leveling its sights and imposing its sanctions on a specifically designated section of American citizenry, recreates what was anathema to the framers of the Constitution and what was specifically outlawed by that document—the Bill of Attainder.

The Chicago Guild believes with the United States Supreme Court and with most Americans that freedom of thought and action is of the essence of democracy, that when such freedom is denied any individual or group in our country, democracy is maimed and imperiled. The Mundt-Nixon bill, if passed, will pave the way for the suppression of independent thinking and the imposition of a

hateful system of thought-control. Coerced orthodoxy cannot fail but to lead, as the Supreme Court has stated, to the "unanimity of the grave."

The executive board of the Chicago Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild has given careful consideration to the Mundt-Nixon Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948, recently reported out favorably by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The executive board is firmly persuaded that the bill is inimical to the spirit and letter of the Bill of Rights and represents an alarming intrusion upon the freedom of political thought and action which is so deeply rooted in the American way of life.

The bill alleges that there is a world Communist movement controlled by a foreign country, that there are Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations in many countries which do the bidding of that country and that the "recent successes of Communist methods in other countries" present a "clear and present danger" to the security of the United States and require legislation to ward off that danger.

The bill attempts to safeguard the security of America by a requirement that all Communist political and front organizations—as such terms are broadly but nonetheless vaguely defined—register with the Attorney General of the United States and file annual registration statements which are to be kept open for public inspection. Communist political organizations must register the names of their officers and members and give a detailed accounting of the sources and uses of their funds. Front organizations are subject to the same requirements except that they need not register the names of their members. The Attorney General is given broad powers to investigate and determine whether any group is a Communist political or front organization, and if he finds affirmatively, to require the organization to register. The Attorney General's findings, "if supported by substantial evidence," are made conclusive on the courts in case judicial review is sought.

The bill creates a whole new series of crimes, many of them based on a concept hitherto unknown to the American system of law. The bill makes it a criminal offense:

1. "To attempt in any manner" to establish in the United States a "totalitarian dictatorship," a phrase left undefined in the bill.

2. For a member of a Communist political organization, if he knows or has reason to believe that the organization is of such character, to seek or accept employment under the United States unless he first reveals his membership in the organization; or, whether or not he reveals his membership, to continue to hold any nonelective employment under the United States;

3. For a member of a Communist political organization, if he knows or has reason to believe that the organization is of such character, to apply for a passport or to make use of one previously issued to him;

4. To become or remain a member of a Communist political organization if the organization fails to register as required;

5. For a Communist political or front organization to disseminate matter through the mails or over the radio unless the publication or broadcast is identified as coming from a Communist organization.

The penalties provided by the bill are severe including fines up to \$10,000 or imprisonment up to 10 years, or both, and a minimum penalty of 2 years imprisonment and/or \$5,000 fine for violation of certain sections.

The Chicago chapter of the National Lawyers Guild represents lawyers of many different political opinions but who are one in their devotion to the Constitution and in their desire to retain unimpaired the freedoms safeguarded by the Bill of Rights. Consciousness of this obligation impels the Chi-

ago Guild to speak out firmly against the invasions of fundamental constitutional liberties which the bill authorizes.

We believe the bill, in the breadth of its scope and in the vagueness of its terminology, to be violative of due process requirements. We believe that the bill, by its registration and so-called exposure provisions, imposes prior restraints on freedom of political thought, expression, and action contrary to the first amendment. We believe further that the first amendment is violated by the criminal penalties against peaceful speech and action and by the ban on freedom of association. We believe that the bill, by leveling its sights and imposing its sanctions on a specifically designated section of American citizenry, recreates what was anathema to the framers of the Constitution and what was specifically outlawed by that document—the bill of attainder.

Finally, we believe that the bill is unconstitutional in making acts criminal solely because they are performed by adherents of a particular political faith or by members of a particular organization. Basic to American law is the concept that the criminality of an act depends on the nature of the act, not on the political orientation of the one who commits it; that the commission of the proscribed act constitutes the offense, without regard to whether the offender be rich or poor, Republican or Democrat or Communist. The bill violates these fundamental principles. Application for or use of a passport is lawful for everyone except members of a defined political group and is made unlawful for the latter solely because of their political faith. The seeking of Federal employment without revelation of political belief, lawful to everyone else, is unlawful to members of that group for the same reason. The Bill of Rights protects all citizens, including those who entertain minority political beliefs.

The Chicago Guild believes, with the United States Supreme Court and with most Americans, that freedom of thought and action is of the essence of democracy, that when such freedom is denied any individual or group in our country democracy is maimed and imperiled. The Mundt-Nixon bill, if passed, will pave the way for the suppression of independent thinking and the imposition of a hateful system of thought control. Coerced orthodoxy cannot fail but to lead, as the Supreme Court has stated to the "unanimity of the grave."

The secretary is directed to send copies of this statement to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, members of the Illinois delegation in the Congress, and representatives of the Chicago press.

LOCAL 1154, UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., May 10, 1948.

Representative FRED E. BUSEBY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed resolution was passed unanimously at a membership meeting of local 1154 UE. This local represents 2,800 workers in the Stewart-Warner plant, many of whom are your constituents.

Very truly yours,

JOHN S. KELLIHER,
President.

RESOLUTION ON MUNDT BILL PASSED BY LOCAL 1154, UERMWA-CIO

The House Un-American Activities Committee, under the pretext of only combating communism, throughout its 10-year history has consistently badgered the progressive forces of the United States. Its smear-and-run program has cost a great number of Americans their means of livelihood. Because of its actions, it has been condemned by the CIO and the UE in convention.

This form of attack on leaders of trade-unions and any liberal-minded Americans has now been developed to the legislative stage where the Un-American Activities Committee plans to have passed a bill, the Subversive Activities Control Act, which would restrict Americans in their political and economic thinking to the narrow terms acceptable to the Un-American Activities Committee, thereby destroying the sinews of democracy in America.

Using the Communist issue as a front, the Un-American Activities Committee calls for the virtual outlawing of trade-unions through the clause providing imprisonment of any American "who conspires to disrupt the trade, commerce, or Government of the United States with the intent to further the objectives of the world Communist movement."

The bill calls for the Communist Party or any "front" organization to register the names and addresses of every member and list their sources of funds and expenditures. All publications and envelopes sent through the mails would have to be marked "disseminated by _____, a Communist-front organization." Any organization that differs in its political or social views from this Un-American Activities Committee has been and will continue to be labeled a "front" group.

Because this bill will definitely tear into shreds our Bill of Rights, will end the cherished American rights of freedom of speech, thought, and assembly, we members of local 1154 UE-CIO here assembled in regular meeting therefore:

Resolved, That our Congressmen work against and vote against this Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948 to see that it is defeated; and be it further

Resolved, That our Congressmen work for the passage of the Sabbath resolution that calls for the abolition of the notorious House Un-American Activities Committee.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of over 7,000 workers employed in 31 Chicago machine shops who are represented by UE-CIO, Local 1114, we, the undersigned officers of the local, wish to make clear to you, our Representatives, that we are unalterably opposed to the un-American Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, which seeks to impose upon the American people a Hitlerite Fascist dictatorship. This bill violates the first, fifth, thirteenth, and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution, under the pretext of fighting against a so-called world Communist conspiracy. Just as Hitler and Mussolini used the big lie to first enslave the German and Italian people and then attempted to conquer and enslave the world, the Mundt bill would first outlaw the Communist Party and every trade union and progressive organization and individual in America which fought for higher wages, better working conditions, social security, housing, civil rights, democracy, and peace. If you wanted these things and the Communists wanted the same things, you and your organization would be called subversive and subject to fines and imprisonment. We call upon you to do everything within your power to defeat this despicable police-state bill.

Pasko Soso, President; William Conway, First Vice President; Austin Sullivan, Second Vice President; Louis Abbate, Third Vice President; James Butler, Recording Secretary; Charles Jeske, Financial Secretary; Edward Dalley, Treasurer; Louis Torre, Business Manager; Fred Anderson, Trustee; Clarence Coleman, Trustee; Paul Dublinski, Trustee; Richard Keith, Trustee; James Small, Trustee; Thomas Skinner, Sergeant-at-Arms.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On the part of 5,500 Chicago shoe workers I implore you to do all in your power to defeat the omnibus bill H. R. 5852. This bill is first step in curbing civil liberties, crushing trade unions, and is opening wedge toward totalitarianism in America.

GENE BARILE,
Secretary Joint Council No. 25, USWA-CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Mundt bill H. R. 5852 is a definite threat to the American labor movement, civil liberties, and American democratic ideals. Urge you to fight this Fascist bill.

CLELL TADE,
B. A. Locals 51B and 52C USWA-CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Most serious threat to civil liberties, trade unions, and democracy is contained in Mundt bill H. R. 5852. Urge you and your colleagues to fight and defeat this bill.

TIM MANALE,
B. A. Local 49A, USWA-CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Mundt bill E. R. 5852 is first step toward fascism in America. Urge you to do all in your power to defeat this bill.

JAMES BRINGLE,
B. A. Locals 48 and 80, USWA-CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Local 194, Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers, CIO, representing 4,500 members and their families in the city of Chicago urges most strongly that you vote against the Mundt-Nixon subversive activities control bill. This bill would repeal the freedoms of speech, thought, and press guaranteed by the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution and establish a police state here in America.

JOHN GALLAGHER,
President,
VERONICA KRYZAN,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Local 194, FTA, CIO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 3, 1948.

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY,
Washington, D. C.:

National Council of National Maritime Union in behalf of 90,000 members condemns Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, subversive activities control bill, as attack on constitutional rights of American people and attempt to smash trade unions. Urge you oppose this police thought-control measure.

FERDINAND C. SMITH,
National Secretary.

NEW YORK, N. Y., May 11, 1948.

Congressman BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Transport Workers Union of America, CIO, vigorously opposes the Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 5852, as an infamous piece of pro-Fascist legislation designed to enslave the American labor movement. We urge you to vote against it and use your influence to see that it is defeated.

MICHAEL J. QUILL,
International President,
DOUGLAS L. MCMAHON,
International Secretary-Treasurer,

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, must be defeated as this bill represents real threat to civil liberties, progressive thinking, and American democracy. Urge you to fight against its enactment.

JACK SPIEGEL,
B. A. Locals 69 and 81, USWA-CIO.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1948.

Representative FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to vote against the Mundt bill because it threatens a political freedom of all Americans and we urge you to work for the passage of the Sabbath resolution which would abolish the Un-American Activities Committee.

THE NINETEENTH WARD CLUB OF THE
PROGRESSIVE PARTY OF COOK
COUNTY.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York City, May 3, 1948.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: May we express our opposition to H. R. 5852 reported by the Un-American Activities Committee, a bill to control Communist activities.

We have no sympathy or associations with communism, but we are opposed to any such restrictions as are fixed in this bill.

Democracy is not to be defended by adopting antidemocratic methods. Mere opinions and associations should not be penalized. The bill does not only that, but denies basic rights to American citizens solely because of their opinions and associations.

In our judgment the bill is clearly unconstitutional. It is in fact a bill of attainder, usurping the function of the courts to determine offenses and punishments.

It is furthermore unwise public policy, for it would have the inevitable effect of driving the Communist movement underground where it would be much more difficult to combat.

May we earnestly urge your adverse vote against so unprecedented a proposal in clear conflict with our constitutional guaranties.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS,
General Counsel.

THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE,
Chicago, Ill., May 5, 1948.

Representative FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution on the Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948, passed by the Chicago Area Council, American Veterans Committee, at its regular meeting Friday, April 30, 1948.

Very truly yours,
SEYMOUR L. GALE,
Chairman, Chicago Area Council,
American Veterans Committee.

CHICAGO AREA COUNCIL,
AMERICANS VETERANS COMMITTEE,
Chicago, Ill.

Whereas on the 28th day of April 1948, the House Un-American Activities Committee reported out a so-called get-tough-with-Communists bill; and

Whereas the constitutional basis for the suppression proposed therein must be that the individuals and organizations named are engaged in seditious or treasonable acts; and

Whereas the measures proposed will constitute certain individuals and groups as unlawful not upon the basis of traditional American judicial methods, but rather by legislative determination; and

Whereas outlawing groups and individuals for professing political beliefs is repugnant

to the democratic principles of this country and probably violates the constitutional guaranty of the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas if the groups and individuals sought to be suppressed are actually engaging in seditious or treasonable acts, it is the duty of our Government to bring the law-breakers to trial so they can be punished for their misdeeds in accordance with established judicial procedure; and

Whereas we see in the legislation proposed the establishment by Congress of an evil that can be as great as that which it seeks to destroy, legislation that will undermine the traditional and time-proved safeguards of the civil liberties of our fellow citizens, substituting the totalitarian pattern of destroying all thought contrary to the majority view of the country's political leaders;

Now, therefore, we the members of the Chicago Area Council of the American Veterans Committee, an organization of over 4,000 veterans residing in the Chicago area, who have just fought a war for the purpose of safeguarding the democratic principles which this legislation serves to destroy and who have consistently forthrightly and militantly rejected Communist doctrine and leadership, call upon the Members of Congress to oppose and defeat with all the vigor that they possess, this un-American proposal.

THE STUDENT ASSEMBLY,
The University of Chicago.

RESOLUTION ON H. R. 5852

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress H. R. 5852, a bill to combat Un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist front organizations and for other purposes;

Whereas this bill required registration of, and prohibits Federal employment of and issuance of passports to, members of organizations very loosely defined and administratively determined as Communist front;

Whereas there exist at the University of Chicago, a Communist club and other organizations which the Attorney General would, without any doubt, require to register their membership;

Whereas such requirements do, in the present political atmosphere constitute an effort at intimidation and place these organizations at a legal disadvantage;

Whereas all student organizations which do not engage in unlawful pursuits have an unequivocal right to carry on their activities and propagate their views unhampered by such intimidation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the University of Chicago student assembly, on behalf of the student body, strongly protest the initiation of such legislation and oppose its enactment, and that the public relations committee is hereby authorized to give this resolution adequate publicity and that telegrams be sent to Congress tonight.

LOIS E. JACOBS, *President.*

Adopted May 5, 1948.

COMMITTEE OF ONE THOUSAND
TO ABOLISH THE HOUSE COMMITTEE
ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
New York, N. Y., May 5, 1948.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUSHEY: We are enclosing a statement released to the press and signed by 167 noted individuals, all sponsors of the Committee of One Thousand, urging the defeat of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948, and the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

We are eager for your comments on this legislation and we look forward to your reply.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL ZIPORKIS.

COMMITTEE OF ONE THOUSAND,
New York, N. Y., April 23, 1948.
STATEMENT ON PROPOSED SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES
CONTROL ACT OF 1948

We review with critical concern and apprehension the proposals for a Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948, to be recommended to Congress by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, because of this committee's history of almost complete disregard of the liberties which this legislation purports to defend.

The committee has been in existence for about 10 years. Its record was succinctly summarized on January 20, 1947, by the board of directors of the American Civil Liberties Union—an organization which the Dies committee itself publicly absolved of any Communist taint. Referring to the present committee and its predecessors, the board said:

"The principal effect of the committees' probes has been the unwarranted discrediting of genuine liberals who have been earnestly and sincerely seeking needed reforms, particularly in the field of labor, monopolies, and race relations. This has been accomplished by smear methods, innuendo, distortion, and other propagandistic devices reminiscent of Fascist techniques. Nothing in recent years has been as un-American as the conduct of the hearings of the Congressional Committee on Un-Americanism."

That Congress is to be asked by a committee whose conduct has been so described to safeguard the American way of life deserves serious thought.

The committee has announced that it will propose legislation which purports to do the following:

1. Make illegal the knowing and willful advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by any means for the purpose of subverting the interest of the United States to that of a foreign Communist power.

2. Require the registration of Communist-front organizations as proposed in the Mundt bill (H. R. 5852).

3. Deny Government employment to Communists.

4. Deny passports to Communist Party members.

The committee suggests additional legislation to—

1. Increase the penalty for contempt of Congress from 1 to 5 years, and from \$1,000 to \$5,000 fine.

2. Strengthen the espionage laws.

3. Require aliens to register annually.

We cannot be unmindful of the fact that for 10 years the House Committee on Un-American Activities not only has attacked Communists, but has stamped subversive all those whose opinions it found unpalatable. It has exhibited an unwillingness, as Prof. Walter Gellhorn said, "to tolerate those whose estimates of current problems do not match its own."

That this bill is primarily a request by the committee for legislative sanction to accelerate its drive to squeeze all opinion and activity into the channels of conformity is obvious from the following definitions contained in the Mundt bill and approved for incorporation:

"Sec. 3. * * * (2) the term 'Communist Party' means the political party now known as the Communist Party of the United States of America, regardless of any change hereafter made in such name; and such term includes, irrespective of its name, any organization carrying out the policies of, or engaged in the same character of activities as, the Communist Party of the United States as it now exists and operates;

"(3) the term 'Communist-front organization' means—

"(A) the Communist Party; or

"(B) any organization which engages in any activity intended, or which it is reason-

able to believe is intended, to further the objective of

"(i) bringing about replacement of the existing form of government of the United States with a Communist form of government, or

"(ii) bringing about replacement of free private enterprise in the United States with a Communist economic system, or

"(iii) bringing about acceptance, in the United States, of Communist ideology; or

"(C) any organization which is under the control or influence of the Communist Party."

We are aware of no legislative act that does greater violence to the principles which have guided our country to greatness—the encouragement of criticism and the toleration of dissent. If this bill is enacted, persons and organizations espousing such current controversial causes as the partition of Palestine, the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, civilian control of atomic energy, antilynch laws, and national health insurance may be subject, if not to criminal action, to abusive investigation and disparaging publicity. They become open to the charge of engaging in the same character of activities as the Communist Party of the United States, or being under its control or influence. "America," Prof. Henry Steele Commager said, "was born of revolt, flourished on dissent, became great through experimentation."

We condemn what seems to us to be an effort to utilize the unsettled state of international affairs and political discord both at home and abroad to impose upon Americans modern alien and seditious acts, the wisdom of which our history has long since disproved. On the basis of the record of the Committee on Un-American Activities, we believe we are justified in discounting this body's estimate of the dangers that face our country. We do not believe we can be charged with ingratitude for refusing their offer to protect our liberties. Instead we propose to Congress the alternative to a government by terror—the defeat of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948 and the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. By so doing we reaffirm our confidence in the strength and virtue of the Constitution of the United States and our faith in the American people.

Complete list of signers of the statement follows:

Rev. B. S. Abernethy, Rev. Dr. Charles B. Ackley, Prof. Comfort A. Adams, Rev. Frank D. Adams, Dr. James Luther Adams, Dr. James W. Alexander, Milton Avery, Rev. Lee H. Ball, Dr. Ruth Benedict, William R. Benet, Rev. Walter L. Bennett, Edward Biberman, George Biddle, Dr. A. F. Blakeslee, Rabbi Herbert I. Bloom, Ernst P. Boas, M. D., Prof. Campbell Bonner, Prof. Edwin G. Borling, Mrs. W. Russell Bowie, Van Wyck Brooks, Rev. J. George Butler, Henry Seidel Canby, Rev. Dr. J. Henry Carpenter.

Robert Carse, Ruthven S. Chalmers, Rev. Thaddeus Clapp, Robert M. Coates, Rev. Albert Buckner Coe, Charles H. Colvin, Aaron Copland, Dr. George W. Corner, John O. Crane, Charles P. Curtis, Jr., Prof. George Dahl, John Dewey, Prof. J. Frank Dobie, Olin Downes, W. E. B. DuBois, Rev. Hubert N. Dukes, Rev. Charles E. Dunn, Leslie C. Dunn, Philip Dunne, Rev. J. Edwin Elder, Aymar Embury II, Dr. Thomas I. Emerson, William Emerson, Rev. Thomas D. Ewing, Prof. John K. Fairbank, Rev. Ralph M. Felix.

Don Freeman, Prof. Joseph F. Fletcher, Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, Dean Christian Gauss, Rev. William H. Geron, J. W. Gitt, John C. Granbery, Prof. Walter Gropius, Ernest A. Grunsfeld, Jr., Rev. Armand Guerrero, Rev. Wm. D. Hammond, Prof. Georgia Harkness, Prof. Marion Hathway, Rev. Paul Silas Heath, Zoltan Hecht, Rev. Chester E. Hodgson, Prof. Leicester B. Holland, Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, M. A. DeWolfe Howe, Rev. Fleming James, Sr., Rev. John Paul Jones, Rev. Albert W. Kauffman, Rev. Allen Keedy.

Dean Hayward Keniston, Robert P. Knight, M. D., Dr. I. M. Koethoff, Rev. Virgin A. Kraft, Alfred Kreyborg, William F. Kruse, Stella M. Landis, Dr. Andrew C. Lawson, Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron, Philip E. Lillenthal, Prof. Ralph Linton, Rev. Herman F. Lion, Oliver S. Loud, Rev. Virgil E. Lowder, Prof. Robert H. Lowie, Elizabeth McCausland.

Carey McWilliams, Curtis D. MacDougall, Dr. Percy MacKaye, Charles A. Madison, Rev. H. P. Marley, Daniel Gregory Mason, Gregory Mason, Prof. Kirtley F. Mather, Rev. Robert Mayhew, Dr. S. A. Mitchell, Dr. Wesley C. Mitchell, Prof. Arthur B. Moehliman, Prof. M. F. Ashley Montagu, Marianne C. Moore, Dr. P. Morrison.

Lewis Mumford, Prof. Robert Hastings Nichols, Rev. Justin Wroe Nixon, Rev. Edward W. Ohrenstein, Frederick Law Olmsted, Rev. George L. Paine, Rev. Clay E. Palmer, Prof. Edwin Panofsky, Rev. Don Ivan Patch, Prof. Ernest M. Patterson, Will Payne, Rev. Leslie T. Pennington, Prof. Melba Phillips, Rosa Pringle, Rev. Karl Quimby, Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch, Anton Refregler, Anne Revere, Oscar K. Rice, Rev. Frank Ricker, Rev. B. C. Robeson, Prof. Margaret Schlauch, Arthur Schnabel, Rev. Walter A. Scholten, Rev. Robert W. Searle.

Mrs. Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch, The Rev. Dewees F. Singley, John Sloan, The Rev. Robert D. Smith, Rev. William B. Spofford, Jr., O. M. W. Sprague, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, Dr. Arthur G. Steinberg, Philip Stevenson, Rev. Howard L. Stimmel, Rex Stout, Prof. Richard M. Sutton, Prof. J. S. P. Tatlock, Prof. C. F. Taylor, Prof. Lloyd W. Taylor, Rev. L. F. Thornton, Jr., Rev. W. G. Towart, Louis Untermyer, Willard Uphaus.

Mark Van Doren, Willard Van Dyke, Prof. Oswald Veblen, Dr. Maurice B. Visscher, J. Raymond Walsh, Prof. Eda Lou Walton, Max Weber, Rev. W. A. Werth, Prof. F. W. Weymouth, Rev. Hugh V. White, Rev. Frank S. C. Wicks, Prof. Henry N. Wieman, Prof. Eugene P. Wigner, Rev. David Rhys Williams, Rev. Lynn A. Wood, Prof. Quincy Wright, Bishop R. R. Wright, Jr., Prof. Sewall Wright, Rev. James D. Wyker, Dr. Robert M. Yerkes, Leane Zugsmith.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the day we have heard the motives of one gentleman impugned because of his religion, and the motives of a gentlewoman impugned in presenting the views of an eminent cleric. I am not speaking for my co-religionists today. I will speak for those American citizens who live in my district, most of whom believe in their Bible, and when I say Bible, I mean both the Old and New Testaments. Two challenges have been thrown today to those who oppose this measure. One challenge asked that we point to specific provisions of the Constitution which may be violated by enactment of this legislation. There have been ample citation of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject. For those who want to read, I suggest they read article I, section 9; article III, section 2, and the first and sixth amendments of the Constitution.

The second challenge that has been hurled at those who oppose this measure has been in the nature of an inquiry: What do you want to do about this matter? What do you want to do by way of amendments? My answer to those inquiries is that we move to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to hold public hearings on the new matter in this bill, some 17 or 18 pages of printed matter, on which there were no public hearings. At such hearings we can then come in and be heard to urge our respective amendments, instead of trying to prepare a bill of this kind of so important a nature on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman told the House, I believe, on Friday that he had more Communists in his district than in any other congressional district?

Mr. MULTER. That is the fact.

Mr. McDOWELL. Would you want those Communists or any of their representatives to come here and tell the Committee on Un-American Activities how to write this bill?

Mr. MULTER. I am afraid you cannot help yourself as to that. Unless you repeal the first amendment of the Constitution, you would have to hear them. Much as I dislike what they say, and much as I think they would try to impede your work, we could nevertheless handle them and do a good job at your public hearings.

Mr. McDOWELL. May I tell the gentleman then that I believe we invited five of them down at various times. Four refused to come. One or two are on their way to jail because of their refusal to come. Another one came and spent 25 minutes insulting the committee. The Committee on Un-American Activities is in a difficult position and there are some things we do not want to take again.

Mr. MULTER. May I suggest then that you invite the respectable Members of the House to such a hearing so that you can sit down with us, the Members who are serious about this, and hear what we have to say, and permit us to urge proper amendments to this bill.

Mr. McDOWELL. May I suggest to the gentleman from New York that that is what we are doing here today. We are having a hearing on the bill today to do something about subversive activities in the United States.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The committee is not accepting any suggestions made by those in opposition to the bill. They wrote the bill and brought it in here, and now suggestions are being made, and they fight every amendment. So the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] falls. This is not a hearing.

Mr. McDOWELL. Two amendments have been accepted by the committee.

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

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think that we should also at this time nail the statement in the report which gives the impression that the Attorney General and others testified in favor of this particular legislation. I say that the hearings do not bear that out, and I say that the Attorney General himself will not support the contention.

Mr. MULTER. So far as I know, this is the first piece of legislation suggested by the Committee on Un-American Activities and its predecessor, both of which have been laboring for a period of about 10 years. There is no need for haste in enacting this bill. All of the arguments thus far very plainly indicate that there is no clear and present danger to the security of the United States that requires the immediate enactment of this bill. Any bill as far-reaching as this, obviously going contrary to American traditions of justice, should receive much more careful and thorough consideration than can be obtained by attempting to offer amendments under the 5-minute rule. Few, if any, amendments that must be offered to this bill can be explained within the 5 minutes allowed to the Member offering the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOFFFIELD] has offered an amendment to strike out the words "clear and present danger" and substitute the word "potential."

A war enforces an uneasy national unity, but when it is over, a lot of people are disposed to work off the grudges built up in wartime and say to themselves, "Now that we have licked the enemy outside, let us finish off those so-and-so's next door." The question of national unity, the question of a clear and present danger brings to my mind a recurrence of what followed after World War I. In 1918 and 1921 there were charges of disloyalty; deportations; the wrecking of the New York office of the Call; and "veterans" and "wobblies" clashing in the Northwest. Those were all episodes of the period following that war, in which the great Red scare was on.

Now, as we want no reoccurrence of those events today. Let us examine the differences between the two periods. The principal root of all movements is fear. Fear is usually mixed with prejudice, and heightened by hysteria. I want to point out, and I believe I can support my contention with observations of leading historians and sociologists, that national unity today, to a greater degree, is far better than it was during World War I and following World War I. If you will recall, then Debs was imprisoned and the Socialists were under suspicion, but today we find the leader of the Socialists, Norman Thomas, probably the best known outspoken exponent of opposition to communism and Communists. In this early period, of course, fear sprang chiefly from the evidences of disunity; signs of national disunity. Today, few

are troubled by ideas of domestic disruption. It is external rather than internal peril that takes first place in men's apprehensions. National unity, as the second World War shows, has grown steadily in recent years. Today, it is an external threat more so than an internal threat. A believer in Russian communism today cannot take shelter behind the Constitution. He is a believer in a police state of the most ruthless character, a system of secret arrests, a system of dictated convictions, of purges, and concentration camps. He believes in a system which has killed, imprisoned, or exiled many millions, whereas czarism has killed and jailed thousands.

Bear in mind one fundamental fact that majority rule will only be loyally accepted so long as it respects the basic rights of minorities.

Let us clarify the broad, sweeping assertions and loose statements in this proposed legislation. It is confusing at best.

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

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK] is recognized.

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly anxious to speak on this amendment, because it so sufficiently points to a question which has plagued me in respect to this bill, not merely since it was introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MURPHY] but many months and even years before that. I have given very serious consideration to the threat of communism as we find it abroad and at home, and I had reached the conclusion as long ago as October 1946—that we would finally find that we could not by legislative measures, short of a constitutional amendment, find any relief or remedy against this conspiratorial plague which is working upon our political and economic system like a cancer.

I approached this bill therefore, the hard way, with the preconceived notion that it was impractical to accomplish this purpose in any other way than by a constitutional amendment.

As a matter of fact I found time to appear before this committee while they were considering this very act and made a brief statement, in which I included a reference to the fact that I had reached such a conclusion, and had actually prepared such a constitutional amendment a long time ago. The only reason I have not presented it in this House is because I did not propose to be the first American to admit that any threat, internal or external, could so drive home the iron into our soul of the admission that our American system, with its very fundamental basis of free speech, would have to surrender part of its genius in order to meet such an attack.

But when I examined this bill, originally prepared by the gentleman from South Dakota, and now perfected by this committee, most ably and most conscientiously and most carefully, I reached the conclusion that they had found a touchstone that might solve the problem which presented itself to me.

As I read this bill, its basic concept is the prohibition of certain activities in

America which might well be legal if they were indigenous, if they were merely American radicalism in the American fashion, but which are so polluted by the influence and control of outside agencies that it becomes possible for the Congress in the first instance, and the courts in the second instance, to say that this is a matter which is within the reach of legislative remedy. Having reached that conclusion, I am satisfied in my own mind, my own conscience, that I can support this bill.

Let me point out, however, in connection with this present amendment, which the gentleman from California makes persuasive by his argument about the fewness of our Communist foes in America, that I think we erred earlier this afternoon when the committee decided to exclude a portion of the bill (from line 1 to line 8 on page 17); because I believe those words are essential, or at least very desirable to the understanding of the purpose of this bill. With your permission I am going to read those words, as a refutation of the argument of the proponent of this amendment so that we can count the number of card-bearing Communists and then relax:

And among the methods commonly used to accomplish this end in any particular country are (A) the disruption of trade and commerce; (B) the inciting of economic, social, and racial strife and conflict, (C) the dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine established Government institutions, and (D) corrupting officials of the Government and securing the appointment of their agents and sympathizers to offices and positions in the Government.

The havoc that a well-disciplined band of trained revolutionaries, and their fellow-travelers, can actually accomplish, if left to their own devices, is incalculable. We have much to fear.

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

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

Mr. OWENS. I see what the gentleman means, but the amendment was offered in order to strengthen the section.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I just do not believe that we should compliment the communistic movement by saying that it is a clear and present danger to the United States. Do we not by such statement bring weakness upon ourselves? Do we not thus say that in America we are so weak that a handful of people can destroy us? To my mind that is a psychology brought about by hysteria, and nothing else.

I brought to your attention a few moments ago from the daily press statements showing beyond the purview of doubt that communism is on the wane in Germany, in the American occupation zone, also, that it is on the wane in Italy and in France, and I told you of a statement by the Attorney General of the United States that it is on the wane in America. It is on the way out.

Now, I regard the majority leader very highly, but let me say to him that communism has already been stopped here in the good old United States of America. It is stopped in its tracks and it will get weaker if we do not pull a lot of bonehead plays and ruin our own American institutions. It will continue to be stopped; it has been stopped by the common sense of the American people. That is what stops it and that is what will keep it stopped.

You could let every one of them get up and make a speech every day, give them police protection, let no one bother them, assist them upon the platform, and thus help them make their speeches, and it would still never make America Communist. That is, as long as we keep our way American. But if we continue with these witch-hunt bills, such as I believe this one is, we might help bring it about in this country, not intentionally, of course. Your purpose is good. You have worked hard, and I admire you for that. I do not impugn your motives. They are good; the same as mine. I know my motives are good. They may be wrong but I know my motives are good intentioned. I love my country as you do. I do not want to see its liberties attacked.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is in my judgment unconstitutional. It is a bill of attainder. It attacks the right of freedom of speech and the right of freedom of the press, it attacks the right of the people to publicly assemble and petition their Government for a redress of grievances. There are many ways in which it is unconstitutional, I believe.

I call attention to the fact that I enlisted in the First World War when I was a kid. At that time the papers most every day were filled with statements that the Germans were committing atrocities of all kinds; they claimed they were cutting the arms off Belgian children, that they were crucifying Canadian soldiers, and that they were taking English soldiers who were killed and boiling their bodies and making soap out of them. There were affidavits in the papers to that effect. Go back and read those atrocity stories. All of those stories were there. My mind was inflamed as a kid, because I believed those stories. Most everybody else believed them. The Congress of the day evidently believed them. But they turned out to be untrue.

When I came back from that war I read a number of books on propaganda. I am telling you we are right now in the midst of one of the greatest propaganda campaigns that ever occurred in this great Nation of ours. They are scaring us to death. Russia is not so strong as to be able to do us any harm, but some people believe she is. Do you believe a little handful of radicals is going to overthrow the great United States? It is not true. It cannot be done. If there is any danger at all, it is not clear and present.

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

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

Mr. ISACSON. First, Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the shocking tirade in support of racial segregation, as well as the

derogatory remarks about the fight of the Jewish people for a national homeland, pass unchallenged. Those statements constitute a slander on the Negro people as well as on the Jewish people.

I know that these opinions expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] are not the opinions held by the majority of American people.

The American people abhor bias and bigotry and prejudice and discrimination and are anxious to enact legislation which will root out these evils from the dark places where they fester like spores and toadstools in the rot and decay of incipient fascism.

Second, I would like to read at this time a resolution which has been entrusted to me by the Jewish War Veterans of Bronx County. It reads:

Whereas the Jewish War Veterans of the United States are dedicated to the preservation of democracy; and

Whereas we believe the best defense of democracy is to defend the civil liberties of all groups; and

Whereas the Mundt bill under the guise of combating subversive elements is actually a long step in the direction of fascism and an unprecedented violation of freedom of speech; and

Whereas the bill would deny to American citizens solely because of their beliefs and associations, rights guaranteed to all by the Constitution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Jewish War Veterans of Bronx County at annual convention duly assembled oppose the passage of the Mundt bill and pledge to do all in our power to preserve civil liberties in America.

Third, to those who have expressed some scorn regarding the charge I have made that the Mundt bill is unconstitutional, I refer you to last night's debate between Mr. Dewey and Mr. Stassen as reported in the Herald Tribune this morning.

Mr. Dewey, after citing the 27 pieces of legislation which deal with all efforts to overthrow the Government by force and violence, indicated that he thought such existing legislation was sufficient.

Mr. Dewey said: "I have some doubts about its [the Mundt bill] constitutionality. It supplements the present legislation in a very small way."

Mr. Stassen, who is in favor of outlawing the Communist Party entirely, said that this legislation goes even further than he would go.

One last thing: The question has been raised as to the relevancy of this legislation as far as the Wallace third-party movement is concerned. I refer you again to section 3, subparagraph (C), which makes the test of a subversive organization:

The extent to which its views and policies are the same as those of such foreign government or foreign organization.

Under this subdivision, if a political party opposes the right of partition of Palestine, or opposes the armed intervention in Greece or China, it is expressing views and policies which may be considered the same as those of a foreign government or foreign organization and opposed to the foreign policies of our administration.

I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] whether under this subdivision (C) and applying this test, the

Mundt bill might not be used to falsely brand the Wallace party as subversive?

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the reasons this bill is before Congress is that several democracies in Europe have been taken over by the Soviet Government. It seems to me the United States should not become fearful that it will be taken over by the Soviet Government or its philosophies because some of the small countries over there have been taken over, if we would just take into consideration the fact that conditions in the countries that were taken over by the Soviet ideology were altogether different. I will admit there is some dissatisfaction in this country with social and economic conditions, and that there is a desire for a higher standard of living, but if you will just think of the conditions of the nations in Europe that are now under the control of the Soviet Union you will realize that those conditions have lasted for perhaps centuries, where the people have had no hope whatever of ever attaining a higher standard of living or even having any land reforms or ever being recognized on an equal social basis, or ever having any opportunity really to act as free men and women. It is in that kind of an area that socialism and communism gain a foothold. The ground here is not ripe for that. We have no reason to fear that the ideology of communism will take root here or flourish. Neither have we any reason to fear military might on the part of the Soviet Government. So I think those that are shuddering are unnecessarily afraid.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this bill is also tearing away at a fundamental institution of this country. It is taking away from the courts, from the judiciary of this country, the right to find a person guilty or not guilty. In this bill you allow one single individual, the Attorney General of the United States, to come to a reasonable conclusion. It does not have to be based on substantial evidence, all the bill states is a reasonable conclusion, so that you have a determination by an individual. That is contrary to our fundamental institutions and that is one of the first things that dictators in Europe did when they commenced to take hold of the countries there, dictators like Hitler and Mussolini, and that was the first thing they did in Russia. You have the right of appeal here. Tell me, do you have the right of trial by jury? There is nothing in this bill, as far as I have been able to see, which gives an accused organization or an accused individual the right of trial by 12 of his peers. So, in my judgment, that is an attack on or an undermining of the fundamental liberties and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I think this bill is a step toward dictatorship, because some of the guaranties we have been so thankful for since the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, the right of trial by jury, the determination in the first instance of guilt or innocence by a grand

jury, and by a court later, are taken away from us. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, unless the bill is radically amended, and because my honest belief is that this bill is completely repugnant to the principles that our founding fathers embodied in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States, I shall vote against the measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I will not condescend to even reply to the remarks of the Member from New York [Mr. ISACSON] in referring to my opposition to this communistic bill, which was introduced here by the Member from New York [Mr. KLEIN] and which the Communists continue to push in order to stir up race trouble, not only in Washington, but throughout the country, and especially throughout the Southern States.

We had this same opposition, virtually per man, and almost per woman, in this House when the Committee on Un-American Activities had its investigators chasing these Communist spies at Oak Ridge. If it had not been that one of them turned state's evidence after they got back to Canada, they would have had the secrets of the atomic bomb in the hands of the very power to which the opposition to this bill gives so much encouragement.

Mr. Chairman, I want every Member to go down and see this picture called The Iron Curtain and see what sacrifices that man made in order to save America from being blown to atoms by the enemies that are attempting in every possible way to destroy this country.

Why, they talk about Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dewey. They have said on the floor that Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dewey both said they favored outlawing the Communist Party. Neither one of them said that. I listened to both of them carefully and they both supported this bill. Every loyal American who believes in the form of government that our forefathers established with their blood and sacrifice will agree to this bill and support it when the time comes for the final vote on its passage.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] intimates that this measure would take away the right of trial by jury. Every loyal American knows there is not a scintilla of fact to support that utterance. Trial by jury remains. The freedom of speech remains. Freedom of the press remains. Freedom of assembly remains. But we do not propose to exempt the freedom of conspiracy. That is what we are driving at. We do not propose to allow freedom of conspiracy to destroy this country.

I have just pointed out the fact that one of the very elements that was busy destroying this Government was the Black Dragon Society of Japan. They ran their trucks up against the tails of our airplanes at Pearl Harbor and destroyed them at the very moment when our boys were dying by the thousands as a result of Japanese treachery. At that time every Communist in America was opposing the United States, because at

that time Russia had not yet entered the war on our side.

No, Mr. Chairman, this committee has gone through a great deal. I have taken all the slander from this group that I am going to take. I have just had about enough of it. But I can tell you now that the American people are behind this committee. It has taken abuse and vilification of this element that secretly in their hearts want to destroy American institutions and set up a communistic dictatorship. Mr. Bullitt said in answer to my question before the committee when he was testifying under oath that he never saw a Communist who was not well fed, well dressed, and well financed. Now they talk about poverty. No, it is a fifth column of well-dressed, well-fed, shrewd, keen, well-financed individuals who steal throughout the world wrecking nations, just as they wrecked Poland and Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia and just as they are trying to wreck the United States. But they are going to find that they have a different people to deal with here, and they might as well understand it now.

We are going to win this fight and save America for Americans.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFINITION

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "person" means an individual or an organization.

(2) The term "organization" means an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together for joint action on, or advancement of views on, any subject or subjects.

(3) The term "Communist political organization" means any organization in the United States having some, but not necessarily all, of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party, with respect to which, having regard to some or all of the following considerations:

(A) The extent and nature of its activities, including the expression of views and policies.

(B) The extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out and its activities performed, pursuant to directives or to effectuate the policies, of the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization in which is vested, or under the domination or control of which is exercised, the direction and control of the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this act.

(C) The extent to which its views and policies are the same as those of such foreign government or foreign organization.

(D) The extent to which it supports or advocates the basic principles and tactics of communism as expounded by Marx and Lenin.

(E) The extent to which it receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization.

(F) The extent to which it sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world Communist movement.

(G) The extent to which it reports to such foreign government or foreign organization or to its representatives.

(H) The extent to which its members or leaders are subject to or recognize the disciplinary power of such foreign government or foreign organization or its representatives.

(I) The extent to which (i) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, its membership (by keeping membership lists in code, by instructing members to refuse to acknowledge membership, or by any other method); (ii) its members refuse to acknowledge membership therein; (iii) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, records other than membership lists; (iv) its meetings are secret; and (v) it otherwise operates on a secret basis.

(J) The extent to which its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their obligations to such foreign government or foreign organization, it is reasonable to conclude (i) that it is under the control of such foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization, or (ii) that it is one of the principal instrumentalities utilized by the world Communist movement in carrying out its objectives.

(4) The term "Communist-front organization" means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist political organization and other than an organization having substantially all the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party) with respect to which, having regard to some or all of the following considerations:

(A) The identity of the persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office therein.

(B) The sources from which an important part of its support, financial or otherwise, is derived.

(C) The use made by it of its funds, resources, or personnel, and

(D) The position taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy.

It is reasonable to conclude (i) that it is under the control of a Communist political organization, or (ii) that it is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2, or (iii) that its views and policies are in general adopted and advanced because such views or policies are those of a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or such world Communist movement.

(5) The term "Communist organization" means a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

(6) The term "publication" means any circular, newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, book, letter, postcard, leaflet, or other publication.

(7) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

(8) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication (A) between any State, Territory, or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof, or (B) within any Territory or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone) or within the District of Columbia.

(9) The term "final order of the Attorney General" means an order issued by the Attorney General under section 13 of this act, which has become final as provided in section 14 of this act, requiring an organization

to register under section 8 of this act as a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

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

Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting late and I do not expect to take the full 5 minutes. There is a matter that I want to get into the RECORD, however. Unlike most of us who have taken part in the debate today, I have been doing a little work on the side.

The Washington Post is a great American institution, a great American newspaper. I ought to know because I have been writing newspapers for over 30 years myself. I am a great admirer of the Washington Post, although I doubt seriously if the Washington Post is a very great admirer of me, as they blame me for what they are accusing the Committee on Un-American Activities of, that is, having evil associations.

This morning, in a six-column full-page advertisement, is a perfect example of the new line of Communist-front organizations in the United States. The Mundt bill is beginning to work even before the bill has been adopted by the Congress and signed by the President. All of the arguments that have been given here today by those starry-eyed liberals who are constantly opposing all things brought here by the Committee on Un-American Activities, all the arguments are here in about four or five hundred words, and they are signed by 97 prominent people in and around Washington, D. C. Some of these people, I am told, have close connections with the United States Government. A check of the very thorough files of the Committee on Un-American Activities shows that of 97 persons who have signed this article saying that the Mundt bill was a police-state bill, and all that sort of thing, they found from 1 to 20 Communist-front organization memberships, and got a total of 153 affiliations of Communist-front memberships. This is the argument that you are getting here today against the Mundt bill. The Mundt bill was not put together by one Member walking up and offering this and somebody else offering that. The Mundt bill, as the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities and many other Members of the House on both sides of the aisle who have great judicial learning, know, has been hundreds and hundreds of hours in the making in the last 4 months.

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

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman have any information as to how many of the signers belong to one or more of these Communist-front organizations to which the gentleman referred?

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman from Indiana, I may state that 47 are shown in the committee records as having been affiliated with from 1 to 20 Communist-front organizations. All in all, in these 97 names there are a total of 153 memberships in some Communist-front organization.

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

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is it a correct statement to say that in general those who are in opposition to the Mundt bill are consistently in opposition to the wonderful work that the Committee on Un-American Activities is doing, and that they would oppose the bill in any form reported by the committee?

Mr. McDOWELL. It is a little annoying to be a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities and work as hard as at least one member has worked, and I am sure that applies to the other eight members also, to see Members rise on this floor and oppose with all sorts of constitutional arguments everything that we bring in here and then have them go back to their districts—New York, Chicago, or some other place—and spend hours and hours and hours making speeches on how they want to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities.

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

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Are the arguments used in the advertisement the gentleman has read any different than the arguments we have heard on the floor?

Mr. McDOWELL. Not one whit, only they are better written.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take time at this late hour because we have agreed to rise at about 5 o'clock, but I cannot help pointing out that the last speech we heard demonstrates conclusively what this is all about.

It has been the contention of the opponents of this bill that it is aimed at suppressing opposition to the views held by those who are allegedly in the majority. Here you have an advertisement placed in the Washington Post. This activity is a legitimate, time-honored, lawful, constitutional activity. It is as old as the Republic itself, in fact, pamphleteering antedates the establishment of the Republic. "Common Sense" of Tom Paine is the ancestor of the activity in which these American citizens engaged.

What did these American citizens do? They sought to draw the attention of their fellow Americans to some serious, sincere objections that they hold against this Mundt bill. How are those objections met? Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania given a single argument meeting a single argument advanced in this advertisement? Have we heard a reason advanced to meet a reason asserted? Oh, no; it is the same old technique which the Mundt bill expresses, the technique of fear, a crude attempt to threaten and intimidate Americans who dare voice dissent with the views of this committee. What does the spokesman of the committee do? He has said here that so many of the signers of the advertisements are members of Communist front organizations, so many of them are Communist-connected. The same wild statements and wild charges. What difference does it make even if the signers of this article were Communists? It is

your duty as a Member of Congress, the sacred duty that you owe to the American people, to meet these arguments and answer them on the basis of merit and not on the basis of attempted slander, not to inculcate fear in the hearts of those who attempt to dissent with the views of this committee.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not at this time.

That is what this is all about, the right of Americans to disagree, disagree with a policy with which more and more Americans are disagreeing. It is the concept of absolute rule by monopoly capital which this committee has been seeking to force on the American people. It seeks to impose on an unwilling people by the method of smearing, and now by the threat of imprisonment of men and women who disagree with that concept of a monopoly capital rule that will lead only to war and depression. This is the technique of thought control. You had an example of it when the gentleman from Pennsylvania stood up here and did not answer a single argument, did not meet a single argument advanced in this advertisement, but simply pointed out that 53 of the signers, or whatever number he said, are members of a Communist-front organization. There it is. It is thought control through smear yesterday, thought control through smear today, and thought control through imprisonment and bypassing the Constitution tomorrow. That is the issue before the Congress of the United States.

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

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

Mr. BUSBEY. As I understood the real meaning of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL], he was just simply trying to throw the spotlight on some of these people who were trying to bring out all this bug-a-boo against the Mundt bill, and these people did not like the spotlight. If they had the courage of their convictions they would join the Communist Party and take out a card.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If we are going to get into that kind of business, it is O. K. with me.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it was suggested by the gentleman from California that in the interest of expedition he expected to object to any request for additional time beyond 5 minutes. That rule has been followed all afternoon.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say to the distinguished majority leader that in distributing time in opposition we were so limited in time that I did not take a minute in general debate. Furthermore, the opposition has not been attempting to filibuster. Every speech we have made has been made on the issues and it has been in the process of normal debate. If you are going to start cutting off Members, we will be forced to resort

to every parliamentary procedure possible.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order. The gentleman has had his 1 minute in the meantime.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No. It has not been granted.

Mr. HALLECK. I am not objecting to it except in the interest of orderly procedure. The gentleman has been here a long time and he knows that this arrangement is frequently made and I suspect that the gentleman does not find himself in disagreement with the suggestion made by the gentleman from California earlier in the afternoon to expedite consideration of the measure.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute to answer the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute in view of the fact he apparently did not understand the agreement we had earlier in the afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has repeated the same display of attempts at thought control that the gentleman from Pennsylvania just gave us. He said that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania attempted to do was to throw the spotlight—throw the spotlight of attempted smear. Again the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Illinois as well, has not answered or attempted to answer the arguments advanced in the indictment. They have attempted to inculcate fear in the hearts of the signers by smear today and by imprisonment tomorrow if this Mundt bill is adopted. You are substituting fear for freedom in America.

Mr. BUSBEY. I have heard that Communist line many times.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But it is not the Fascist line from the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. NIXON: Page 21, line 16, strike out "(1)"; and in lines 18 to 20, inclusive, strike out the comma and the words "or (1) that it is one of the principal instrumentalities utilized by the world Communist movement in carrying out its objectives."

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, I think, is quite apparent, simply from the reading of it.

The committee is offering the amendment and is supporting it unanimously because we think that it strengthens the definition of "Communist political organization," which is, perhaps, the key definition in the bill. We propose to do this by placing the conclusion which must be reached by the Attorney General, and by the court which reviews the proceedings of the Attorney General, squarely upon the matter of control by

a foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization. As to the section which the amendment seeks to strike out, the one providing in effect that it is enough to establish that an organization is one of the principal instrumentalities utilized by the world Communist movement in carrying out its objectives, it has been suggested that it might conceivably cover an organization which unknowingly was under the control of a foreign government and unknowingly was taking part in a world Communist movement. That was not the intention of the section as it was written. It was the intention of the committee in including this section to place the entire matter of whether or not an organization will be found to be a Communist political organization squarely upon the fact of foreign control by a foreign totalitarian dictatorship or a foreign totalitarian political organization. That is the purpose of the amendment. I think that the Members will agree that it strengthens the definition considerably.

In the remaining time that I have I should like to answer a few of the objections that have been raised by some of the opponents to this measure in the debate this afternoon. The question has been often asked as to whether or not the committee had any hearings on this legislation. The rather technical point has been made by some of the opponents of the legislation that no hearings were held upon a bill designated by this particular number. All you have to do, if you want to find out what hearings were held on this legislation, is to look at a copy of the transcript of the hearings which were held on two bills before the subcommittee on legislation of the Committee on Un-American Activities, one requiring registration of the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations, and the other a bill which would, in effect, outlaw the Communist Party. Those hearings were extensive. Those hearings were complete, and some of the best legal experts in the country appeared before the committee and raised objections to both measures on constitutional grounds and on policy grounds, and on the basis of those objections amendments were made and a new bill introduced which, in effect, is the one we are going to act upon in this House.

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

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

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not also a fact that the Attorney General of the United States appeared before the gentleman's committee as a witness?

Mr. NIXON. As the gentleman has well pointed out, the Attorney General of the United States appeared before us, and if you read the transcript of the hearings you will see that on several occasions in his testimony he stated that existing legislation was inadequate for him to handle the menace of communism in the United States today.

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

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am sure the gentleman does not want to convey the impression that at any time the Attorney General of the United States has supported this legislation.

Mr. NIXON. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because the Attorney General of the United States, when he came before the committee, was specifically asked, if he did not like the legislation before the committee, to present his own legislation. He did not do so, but he did do this, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] pointed out in the debate on Friday. He did state that a registration statute applicable to such Communist organizations would be of assistance to him in meeting the danger. That is one of the principal effects of this measure, as we see it.

The point that I wish to drive home is this: The Attorney General and the other witnesses, all of whom had varying ideas as to what kind of legislation should be offered, all, with the exception of the representative of the Communist Party and one other witness, said that legislation was necessary to meet the clear and present danger of communism in the United States. On the basis of those opinions, the committee acted. We certainly did not think that the Congress, in the face of the Attorney General's own statement that he did not have, as the chief law-enforcement agent of this country, the legislative power to control this menace, should sit idly by and do nothing. That is why this legislation is before this House today.

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

Mr. Chairman, we on this side have no objection to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Nixon] but I want to answer some of the statements that were made here about this article that appeared as an advertisement in the Washington Post.

The statements as a rule are utterly false. It says the Mundt bill proposed by this committee will "gag freedom of speech" and "institute thought control."

Everybody knows there is not a word of truth in that statement.

It also says that efforts to change our Government by peaceful, constitutional means may become tantamount to treason. Every intelligent man in the House knows there is not a word of truth in that statement. The Constitution provides how it shall be changed, and as long as they pursue constitutional means this bill will not disturb them.

It goes on with a great tirade of attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] said we ought to invite his constituents who are Communists to come before the committee.

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

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

Mr. NIXON. The statement has been made here that we should have had representatives of the Communist Party before the committee. I want to tell

the members of this committee and this House that if they will read the hearings of this committee they will find that Mr. Benjamin Davis, a member of the executive council of the Communist Party, appeared before the committee in behalf of William Z. Foster, at the invitation of the committee; that the committee sat there during a period of 30 minutes while Mr. Benjamin Davis went down the line on the legislative proposals before us, on the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and virtually every institution we have in the United States today, and he made a vindictive attack on all of our institutions and on the legislation before us. May I point out to the gentleman that we heard those objections with complete courtesy. This shows that the Communist Party did have its opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RANKIN. If everybody in America could have heard that Negro Communist, Ben Davis, from New York, utter his tirades before the committee, there would be less opposition to this bill than there is today.

We summonsed some Communists here, and as a rule they refused to take the oath. We brought the Eislers before the committee. One of them said, "I am a refugee from persecution. I refuse to be sworn." The next man we put on the stand was a Negro who had been a Communist and had been to Russia. They had taught him to carry on revolutions, how to blow up bridges and waterworks and put out light plants, burn warehouses, and so forth. It had become so bad that this Negro had come back and turned state's evidence. He made one of the best witnesses I have ever heard. We asked him if he had seen that man Eisler. He said, "Yes, he was one of the instructors in that Communist school in Moscow when I was over there."

We brought a gang of them in here from Hollywood, and what did they do? I was not here but the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] was, and perhaps the gentleman from California was here. They proceeded to attempt to insult the committee in every possible way and refused to be sworn. They were afraid to put themselves in the grip of the courts of the country, under oath.

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

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

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman will recall that they called Robert Stripling, well known to this House as a patriotic American, "Mr. Quisling."

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. I want to say this about Bob Stripling. I am glad the gentleman mentioned it. He was with the Dies committee back in the old days when it was a special committee. He has been with this committee for the last year or two. There is no finer American in this country than Bob Stripling. There is no man in this country who has done more to expose these enemies of our country within our gates than Mr. Stripling has.

We have heard of these constant attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities by certain Members. Now

they get up here and accuse us of smearing that bunch who signed this advertisement in the Washington Post. I wish you could examine that entire aggregation under oath. I wish they could be taken before any court in Washington, or in America, and put under oath and have their backgrounds investigated and see how many of them have their hands behind them taking money from somebody representing a foreign power dedicated to the destruction of this Government.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment do now close.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NIXON. 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. WADSWORTH, 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. 5852) to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REGINALD MITCHELL

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 315) for the relief of Reginald Mitchell.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, 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, to Reginald Mitchell, of North Hollywood, Calif., the sum of \$106.85, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when a United States Army vehicle collided with another automobile and pushed it into the rear of the automobile which he was driving, at the intersection of East Seventh Street and Maple Street, in Los Angeles, Calif., on November 10, 1944: *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.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed last May 22 in the other body. It is identical to title 2, H. R. 385, of the omnibus bill, H. R. 5055, which was passed earlier today.

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.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings whereby a similar House bill (H. R. 385) for the relief of Reginald Mitchell, which was title 2 of the omnibus bill, H. R. 5055, was passed be vacated and the bill H. R. 385 be laid on the table.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several telegrams and letters.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a circular of misrepresentation on the Mundt-Nixon bill.

Mr. JENISON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN at the dedication of a plaque to the late Hon. Joseph Gurney Cannon.

Mr. HAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of Palestine.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and include certain quotations from court decisions.

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

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. LEA) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Los Angeles News.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a resolution from the Veterans' Committee and in the other a paid advertisement appearing in today's Washington Post.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore granted, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hamilton Faron of the Associated Press, sent to Germany, and I understand other countries, the following release:

WASHINGTON, May.—A squad of men marched sturdily into a committee room of the United States Congress.

They stripped off their army shirts. They pulled off their trousers.

They stood at attention in bathing trunks and shirts.

Then most of the group sat down naturally on narrow chairs, completely at ease.

Others walked to the front of the room, stood before members of the committee.

There they performed numerous "stunts."

They picked up ice-cream cones, marshmallows, sandwiches, paper cones, water glasses, papers, heavy weights attached to greased handles.

They climbed stairs. They climbed on top of tables and jumped to the floor.

The committee members watched with deepest interest.

Why? What's so remarkable about all this?

All of the men had lost one or more arms or legs.

They went before the committee—headed by Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Massachusetts Republican—to demonstrate the progress made by American engineers in making artificial arms, legs and hands.

That work has been moving along swiftly since the end of World War II.

And additional impetus is being given daily to the program as more men and women learn of the efficiency of devices now being made.

What interest does this have outside the United States?

A lot—to the scores of thousands of men, women and children victims of the war throughout the world. They are those who walk on crutches, hobble along with old-fashioned stiff artificial legs; tuck an empty sleeve in a pocket, spend their lives in wheel carts or chairs.

For the results of the giant research program are not going to be held for the benefit only of the Army and Navy veterans of the United States.

No, indeed. The improved devices are to be made available to all persons.

Pending legislation to authorize spending \$1,000,000 a year for the research, provides for this in these words:

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to make available the results of his investigations to private or public institutions or agencies and to individuals in order that the unique investigative materials and research data in the possession of the Government may result in improved prosthetic appliances for all disabled persons."

The bill already has been passed by the House of Representatives.

It now is awaiting action by the Senate before going to the White House for approval by President Truman.

Phillip Rogers, clerk of the Senate committee which handles such legislation, asked whether it will be passed by the Senate, replied flatly: "I have no doubt about it."

About the new types of legs, arms, and hands. One demonstrated to the committee, resembles in all respects a natural hand.

Its thumb and fingers move in response to movements of the wearer's shoulder muscles.

It can pick up glasses, papers, cups, perform most of the functions of a natural hand and exert a squeezing pressure of 25 pounds.

Let the demonstrator tell about it: "I wait on trade and see quite a few people. The hand is preferable (to the customary hook device) because I can still do so many things with it and it is natural looking."

Another device—a leg—has natural movements when walking. The knee and ankle flex, there are no signs of a limp.

William R. Smith, who demonstrated the hand, and Herbert E. Kramer, who wears the leg, like all others in the group consider themselves guinea pigs for prosthetic research.

They and the others all have full-time jobs supporting themselves. But once each year they take time off from their jobs and travel in a body to demonstrate the new appliances.

They were joined this year by one German war veteran. He is Hans Schuffenhauer of Bormsgrun 9, Sachsen, western zone, Germany. Hans lost both his arms in World War II. He came to the United States to help work on the improved appliances. He's wearing the latest type arms now and plans to return to Germany soon.

And, as for recent statements by Soviet scientists that they have developed an artificial arm that can perform even such an intricate job as operating a machine gun:

"Bunk, just bunk," said one of the group. "We've heard lots of claims from over there but that's fantastic right now. But keep our program going over a period of five more years, let us say, and then you really will see miracles."

Mr. Speaker, let me say again that these men who came here had full-time jobs, although they are not earning very much they are giving not only of their time but paying their own expenses. This is a very remarkable contribution not only to our own amputees but to the disabled of the world, and to science. Most of them gave exhibitions last year and great strides have been made in their prosthetic appliances and in their use in a year's time.

Mr. Speaker, there is a bill before the House, a bill already passed by the Senate, that provides automobiles for amputees. The cost is small. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has reported out a bill; it has been on the calendar for nearly a year. When you see these men, no Member of Congress would wait a day before passing such legislation. Those who have leg amputations have been given an automobile but not the arm amputees; that is discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, the time is getting short before the adjournment of Congress. We have numerous bills for the disabled before the Committee on Rules. They should be passed. There are widows and orphans living on a pittance. The gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, introduced a bill providing for a small increase for them. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs passed it unanimously weeks ago. Today when the widows go shopping in the grocery stores—if you watch them you see—they cannot afford to buy what their children actually need to be properly nourished. At a time when Congress is spending hours and hours and hours of debate to rid the country of Communists—which they should, at a time

when they are spending hours and hours and hours of debate on relief for foreign countries, and sending billions of dollars of food and supplies to foreign countries, it is imperative they take care of their own—the disabled and the widows and orphans of our war veterans should come first not last—in our legislative program. In war, we voted day after day, money for all kinds of supplies for our soldiers. Do we feed and equip them only to fight for us—and forget many of their needs when the battle is won. That cannot and must not be.

Rules for bills have been asked for greatly needed veterans' legislation by our Committee on Veterans' Affairs—not to grant them is cruel.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3350. An act relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5933. An act to permit the temporary free importation of racing shells, and increasing the amount of exemptions allowed for personal purchases abroad.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 15, 1948, present to the President, for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1308. An act for the relief of H. C. Blering;

H. R. 3505. An act authorizing an appropriation for investigating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrusion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Lake Mechant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4892. An act to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.);

H. R. 4966. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.;

H. R. 5669. An act to provide for adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6067. An act authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport Irrigation District, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 19, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1561. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report

showing credit operations through June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1562. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

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. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5433. A bill to transfer jurisdiction over certain school buildings in Vanport, Oreg., to the Federal Works Administrator and to authorize an appropriation to rebuild a school building in Vanport, Oreg., which was destroyed by fire; with amendments (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 1968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CURTIS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3825. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5983. A bill to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 1971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H. R. 6402. A bill to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 1973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5611. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5964. A bill to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the United States for burial; with amendments (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 6592. A bill to authorize Federal participation in shore-protection works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 6593. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Sixth Congressional District of West Virginia, or some other suitable location in the State of West Virginia, for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas from coal; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 6594. A bill authorizing the extension of functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 6595. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Canadian River reclamation project in the Texas Panhandle; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 6596. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 6597. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 6598. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6599. A bill to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the Territory of Alaska, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6600. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 6601. A bill to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6602. A bill authorizing the construction of flood-control work on the Red River

of the North, Minn. and N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 6603. A bill to authorize grants to enable local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments to increase school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. J. Res. 405. Joint resolution to clarify the application of the existing excise tax imposed on certain fans under section 2406 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. J. Res. 406. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day, 1948, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the President of the Chilean House of Representatives, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to commemorating Pan American Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 6604. A bill for the relief of Dimple Benoit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 6605. A bill for the relief of W. B. Terry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6606. A bill for the relief of William T. Orton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 6607. A bill for the relief of Clifford N. MacLloyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 6608. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacob Ornstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 6609. A bill for the relief of Jacob F. Hutt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6610. A bill for the relief of Albert Burns, of Covington, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6611. A bill for the relief of Maj. Jewell J. Frey, O340983, Monroe, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 6612. A bill for the relief of Raymond B. Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 6613. A bill for the relief of Paul Dacut or Pawlo Dacsuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 6614. A bill for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6615. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helene Pelzmann, of Salzburg, Austria; 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:

1952. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of A. H. McClelland and 34 other residents of Cincinnati and vicinity, urging passage of H. R. 6397, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1953. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of missionary group 4 of the First Baptist Church of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the defeat of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1954. By Mr. LECOMPTÉ: Petition of sundry citizens of Lucas, Iowa, in the interest of H. R. 5875 and H. R. 5993 and in opposition to H. R. 5711; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1955. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of members of William Graham Post, No. 173, American Legion, Whitewater, Wis., urging support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1956. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Donald Hess, Tampa, 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.

1957. Also, petition of Mrs. Mattie Yeomans, Tampa, 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.

1958. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Delaware, State of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to the construction of the proposed flood-control dam on the Charlotte River in the town of Davenport, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

1959. Also, petition of Cyril Weinstein and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1960. Also, petition of Dorothy Goldberg and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1961. Also, petition of Kathern R. Johnson and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the endorsement of H. R. 2953, a bill to insure equitable and fair administration of Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, May 10, 1948)

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

Dr. Joshua Loth Liebman, rabbi, Temple Israel, Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:

O God, Father of all men, we thank Thee for this great Senate of democracy in this hallowed America. Cause us to understand that laws are given that men shall live by them and not die by them. Inspire these lawgivers to make America an ever more beautiful gem of earth where cooperation shall be the dream and equal justice the dynamic goal—America thus the example to all the world.

Cause us to realize that now all nations, from the oldest unto the newest, Israel, dwell today on the same street of atomic destiny, and therefore we must live and work together so that our children's children shall have a planet to inherit.