

debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland and American books and technical equipment for institutions of higher education in Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to make January 30 a legal holiday dedicated to human freedom and dignity and known as Roosevelt Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election and term of office of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to make it unlawful for members of the Communist Party to be candidates for Federal elective office and to provide for the immediate deportation of aliens found to be members of the Communist Party; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution to provide for an investigation of the life-insurance industry of the United States with particular regard to the applicable antitrust laws and to the extent to which the operations of such industry comply with such laws; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 65. Resolution to protest the summary arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 66. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. Res. 67. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the recent reductions in the price paid to producers of Pennsylvania-grade crude oil; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Rudolf A. V. Raff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1976. A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1977. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ross Kennedy and Jane Rankin Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Boehme's Butternut Bakery, a partnership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1979. A bill for the relief of Soo Hoo Yet Tuck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 1980. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Houston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Carolyn McMillan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 1982. A bill for the relief of Cumberland Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1983. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Barreras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Kazuo Minami, Mrs. Yoshiko Minami, and Tadao Minami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1985. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Tibor Jankal and Irene Alexander Jankal, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1986. A bill for the relief of Ella Speilman Geiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1987. A bill for the relief of Jenő Stern and Aranka Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 1988. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Fry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1989. A bill to provide for the retirement with pay of Commander Nicholas T. Gansa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1990. A bill for the relief of Istvan Hedvig and Peter Paul Gulyas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Alexander Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 1992. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adelaide Dibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fadem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1994. A bill for the relief of Frank F. Miles; 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:

28. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolutions adopted by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of New York, expressing condemnation of the Hungarian Government for its arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

29. By Mr. LYNCH: Memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, urging that the Congress, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the President do everything in their power to bring about the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

30. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of the Puerto Rico Telephone Industry Workers Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution asking that their affiliate of the Puerto Rico State branch of the American Federation of Labor be given extension to Puerto Rico, in regard to the wages and hours law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1949

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we have entered upon a new week with tasks and responsibilities which are far beyond the wisdom of our own finite minds.

Grant that daily we may hold counsel with the God of all wisdom and yield ourselves unreservedly to the discipline and guidance of Thy Spirit.

May we also hear and heed the command which came to Thy servant in the long ago: "Stand thou still a while that I may show thee the word of God."

We pray that Thou wilt create within men and nations those finer feelings and nobler thoughts which are the progenitors of achievement in the building of a better world.

We thank Thee, O God, for the memory of Thy servant who ministered here in spiritual things. His sun went down while it was yet day, only to rise again in heavenly glory. We rejoice in the high and holy privilege that was ours to walk and work with Him for a little while upon this earth.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 27, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

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

On January 18, 1949:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

On January 19, 1949:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 27th instant,

The Vice President, on January 28, 1949, signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hoey	Mundt
Anderson	Holland	Murray
Baldwin	Humphrey	Myers
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	O'Connor
Bridges	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Broughton	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cain	Kefauver	Russell
Chapman	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoepfel
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Eastland	Lodge	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Taft
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McFarland	Thye
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Green	Martin	Watkins
Hayden	Maybank	Wiley
Hendrickson	Miller	Williams
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Withers
Hill	Morse	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT OF NATIONAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 31, 1949.

NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report and recommendations (annex I) regarding legislation to enable this Government to effect settlement of certain outstanding claims against the United States; and (annex II) a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON FOREIGN SURPLUS DISPOSAL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, dated January 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CHANGE IN FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting resolutions adopted by the Fono of American Samoa, relating to a change in the form of the government of American Samoa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL MOTOR LAUNCHES TO STATE OF NEW JERSEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the State of New Jersey had requested the Navy Department to transfer two 40-foot motor launches to be used by the Shell Fisheries Division of the Department of Conservation of that State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION TO AMERICAN BUSINESS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PARKING OF VEHICLES ON PROPERTY OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES FOR POSTAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the calendar year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and controller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law,

a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company for the calendar year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BALANCE SHEET OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and controller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of that company, for the year 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual report of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth semi-annual report of that Commission, dated January 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT

A letter from the representative of the United States, upper Colorado River Basin compact negotiations, transmitting a conformed copy of a compact entered into among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, to determine the rights and obligations of those States respecting uses and deliveries of water of the upper basin of the Colorado River (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A radiogram from the International Longshoremen's Association, local No. 1740, of San Juan, P. R., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the Fair Labor Standards Act and social security to Puerto Rico on an equal basis with the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

A letter and 28 telegrams in the nature of memorials, from sundry citizens of the State of West Virginia, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 248, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

"Legislative Resolution 5

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to defeat Federal aid to education

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a bill, Senate file No. 246, providing Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools of the United States; and

"Whereas, should this bill be enacted into law, there is reason to believe that it will lead inevitably to Federal control and supervision of the public schools of the Nation, thereby taking control out of the hands of the local districts; and

"Whereas the several States are now able through their own taxing powers to make ample provision for their elementary and secondary schools without Federal aid; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is already burdened with a staggering debt of more than \$250,000,000,000, calling for retrenchment if the solvency of the United States is to be preserved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska legislature in sixty-first session assembled:

"1. That Senate file No. 246, or any similar legislation now before the Congress of the United States, be defeated.

"2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from Nebraska."

PARITY PRICES—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GEORGIA STATE ASSEMBLY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relating to parity prices, and ask for its reference to the Committee on Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas the gross debt of the Government of the United States has increased from about 40 billion to approximately 252 billion dollars during the period of 1939 to 1949; and

Whereas interest must be paid annually and the debt gradually liquidated if the Government is to be saved from insolvency or bankruptcy; and

Whereas it must be self-evident that if we are to avoid lower living standards and if this debt is to be serviced and paid, it must be through the production of new wealth from the natural resources of the United States; and

Whereas the national income of the United States and the gross income of agriculture of this country have each only slightly more than doubled during the same time, and these must bear the chief burden of taxes (directly or indirectly) in maintaining the national solvency; and

Whereas our gross farm income represents about 65 percent in dollar value of our annual production of new wealth and in turn our national income regularly averages approximately seven times the dollar amount of gross farm income; and

Whereas a return to the 1939 price and income levels for farm products would reduce our national income about 50 percent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the senate and the house of representatives concurring, hereby petitions Congress to pass permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 90 percent of parity on all basic farm crops, to protect such floor prices with commodity loans of like amount and to prescribe such import duties, excise taxes, or quotas on competitive imports as may be needed to maintain these price levels and our national income; be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, and to Senators and Congressmen from the State of Georgia requesting their cooperation and expressing the appreciation of the general assembly for same.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938—MEMORIALS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I present a letter and 28 telegrams in the nature

of memorials concerning proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. I ask unanimous consent that a list of the names of the authors of these memorials be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the list of names of the authors of the memorials will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list of the names of the authors of the memorials was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In accordance with the second paragraph of rule 7, Mr. NEELY presented a letter and numerous telegrams in the nature of memorials relative to proposed amendments of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 from the following: E. C. Jones, president, Jones, Inc., Fairmont, W. Va.; Dewey E. S. Kuhns, secretary and treasurer, West Virginia Retailers Association, Charleston, W. Va.; H. P. Reip, controller, the Parsons-Souders Co., Clarksburg, W. Va.; W. A. Pankey, general manager, Bluefield Telephone Co., Bluefield, W. Va.; the Merchants Cooperative Association, Wheeling, W. Va.; Raphael Malsin, president, Lane Bryant, Inc., 465 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; J. W. Stokes, president, Hinton Chamber of Commerce, Hinton, W. Va.; John Morgan, chairman, retail council, Parkersburg Board of Commerce, Parkersburg, W. Va.; R. D. Kemp, W. T. Grant Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Dave Abrams, Modern Furniture Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Thomas J. Richards, president, Watts Sartor Lear Co., Clarksburg, W. Va.; E. E. Bibb, president, Beckley Hardware & Supply Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Nelson Clark, manager, chamber of commerce, Martinsburg, W. Va.; Paul F. Sheets, president, Clarksburg Trade Association, Clarksburg, W. Va.; E. D. Armstrong, Beckley, W. Va.; N. Joe Rahill, Beckley, W. Va.; S. C. Ballengee Furniture Co., Beckley, W. Va.; C. T. Stromberg, Leader Furniture Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Cliff Holdren, secretary, Charles Town Ransom Board of Trade, Charles Town, W. Va.; T. W. Keffer, secretary-manager, chamber of commerce, Moundsville, W. Va.; W. B. Woolfe, president, and Chester J. Compton, executive secretary, Mineral County Chamber of Commerce, Keyser, W. Va.; Arthur C. Cundy, managing director, Beckley Chamber of Commerce, Beckley, W. Va.; Gordon W. Lewis, White Sulphur Dry Cleaners, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.; Joseph W. Greer, president, J. M. Hartley & Son Co., Fairmont, W. Va.; Walter A. Hupp, American Laundry, Fairmont, W. Va.; R. J. Bryan, manager, Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp., Fairmont, W. Va.; Don Harper, president, Elkins Chamber of Commerce, Elkins, W. Va.; J. M. Bear, president, West Virginia Independent Telephone Association, Marlinton, W. Va.

RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR RELATING TO AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a resolution dealing with a number of problems of interest to the Government employees was approved by convention of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor in September. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Federal employees are an important and constituent part of the labor movement; and

Whereas the American Federation of Government Employees represents Federal employees; and

Whereas the American Federation of Government Employees is affiliated to the American Federation of Labor; and

Whereas Lodge 364 of the American Federation of Government Employees is affiliated to the Minnesota State Federation of Labor; and

Whereas the American Federation of Labor, in its national convention in 1946, endorsed the 1947-48 legislative program of the American Federation of Government Employees: Be it therefore

Resolved by Minnesota State Federation of Labor in regular convention, assembled at Hibbing, Minn., That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor endorses the following legislative program of the American Federation of Government Employees for 1948-49.

1. Legislation to effect a pay raise which will truly reflect the increased cost of living; that ceilings be eliminated from the pay scales, and a general revision of the salary schedules of the Classification Act of 1923.

2. Optional retirement at full annuity regardless of age after 25 years of service.

3. Optional annuity after 20 years of service for all employees engaged in hazardous occupations at rates provided in the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended February 28, 1948 (sec. 1-1).

4. Optional retirement after 20 years of service at a reduced annuity, if separated or demoted as a result of reduction in force.

5. Enactment of the Keating bill to increase compensation payments.

6. Legislation that will preserve competitive civil service for positions located in the Canal Zone for citizens of the United States.

7. Elimination of multiple taxation of Government employees' incomes by States or subdivisions thereof.

8. Legislation to exempt from income taxes any retirement annuities or pensions provided by the Federal, State, or other political subdivisions.

9. Legislation to provide employees of Government with complete uniforms, accessories, and equipment, where required, at the expense of the Government.

10. Increase in per diem and mileage rates of Government employees in travel status; minimum \$10 a day for subsistence and 7 cents a mile for privately owned auto in official travel.

11. Legislation to secure for all Federal employees fair overtime pay not otherwise provided at rates in accordance with Fair Labor Standards Act.

12. Repeal of a law which places professional employees in Veterans' Administration outside Classification Act.

13. Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

14. Legislation for payment of automatic within-grade increases on completion of respective periods of service required.

15. Reclassification of various positions of Public Building Administration guard force and that PBA guards be designated as United States Building Police.

16. Transfer to the Labor Department of the authority to fix local wage rates of per diem and unclassified employees; that all employees be given the right to appeal job classifications to the Civil Service Commission.

17. Medical and surgical treatment at Public Health Service hospitals for retired Federal workers.

18. That overtime be paid employees for work beyond 8 hours in any 1 day.

RESOLUTION AND PETITION RELATING TO BANNING OF YELLOW COLOR FROM OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

a resolution which I have received from Mr. Al Stoldt, president of the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association, of Monroe, Wis. This resolution expresses very well, I believe, the need for banning the yellow color from oleomargarine in order to prevent fraudulent competition with butter.

Along this very same line I have received a communication from several veterans who are receiving on-the-farm training under the GI bill of rights and who have commented on this same subject. I feel that their views represent true grass-roots sentiments, and I ask that their letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, following the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLEOMARGARINE

That whereas the principle of protection of the established identification characteristics of the products of the physical and mental labors of its citizens by the United States Government is evidenced by its laws pertaining to trade marks, brands, copyrights, patents, and similar subjects, designed to prevent others from profiting by indiscriminate imitation; and

Whereas the traditional yellow color of butter and the labor of all the dairy farmers who have created and maintained the high standards of the dairy industry are deserving of protection similar to that of other individuals and groups in our great country:

We recommend that if the present Federal tax is removed from oleomargarine, direct and effective Federal legislation be passed which will forbid the sale of any oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

PLYMOUTH, WIS., January 26, 1949.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Chamber,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, all veterans and students of institutional on-the-farm training and actively engaged in diversified farming, after due consideration of all facts, firmly believe that any change of the present oleo laws would be a death-dealing blow to the entire dairy industry as well as injurious to the welfare of the peoples of the Nation we love.

We believe that butter substitutes spread fraud and deception and should be sold only by their own colors and merits.

We believe that the 10,000,000 people directly gaining their livelihood from the dairy industry are entitled to protection because of their vital contributions to the Nation's diet and health, and to soil conservation. We believe what hurts the dairy industry hurts everyone, either directly or indirectly.

We believe that you, as the representative of America's dairyland, should and will do everything that is humanly possible to protect the interests of the dairy industry and the consuming public. We believe that the present laws should remain.

Very truly yours,

Carl E. Broph, Warren Lammers, Victor D. Last, J. Paul Tempas, Elroy Arndt, John H. Holbrook, Ray E. Richter, Harry Hortink, Irvin Arentsen, Roger Erneise, Howard J. Arentsen, Leonard J. Tauber, Reuben Arentsen, Alfred Verhulst, Homer Melvin, Instructor.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY SOUTH CAROLINA NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the RECORD, four resolutions adopted by the South Carolina National Guard Association, in conference assembled on January 22, 1949, at Columbia, S. C., relating to the National Guard, a long-range armory construction program, and universal military training.

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

Resolution for the preservation of the integrity of the National Guard of the United States

Whereas the National Guard of the United States is the successor to the Organized Militia, which was brought into being by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas democracy is the basic philosophy of the National Guard system, which is accomplished by keeping our Army close to the people through State control in time of peace; and

Whereas in its dual capacity the National Guard serves the States as a security force in time of peace, and the Nation as combat troops in time of war and by virtue of such dual status giving to the State and Nation the greatest amount of security for the least possible cost; and

Whereas the National Guard has preserved law and order in the several States of the Union on many occasions, and twice has gone to war, fighting with telling effectiveness all over the world and justifying the foresight and wisdom of the framers of the Constitution of the United States by its great contribution to victory in these two World Wars; and

Whereas at this time efforts are being made to destroy the National Guard by removing it from State jurisdiction and combining it with the Organized Reserves, another reserve component of the Army of the United States, to the end that the Army, including all components, will be organized and controlled in Washington; and

Whereas the South Carolina National Guard Association regards these efforts as far reaching in its impact on the political, economic, and military life of our country; and condemns strongly and without any reservation as unwarranted and down-right dangerous any movement designed to effect this radical change in the basic concept of our historic policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association, in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949, at Columbia, S. C., That the officers of the South Carolina National Guard Association are hereby instructed and directed to do all things which at their discretion they deem wise and necessary:

(a) To prevent the removal of the National Guard from State control.

(b) To prevent the interference in the slightest degree with the full command of the Guard by the Governors of the several States in time of peace.

(c) To prevent any change in the organization of the National Guard which would destroy or affect its integrity as both a State and National force, operating under the plan created by constitutional and statutory law; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this Association are directed to inform each Member of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives from South Carolina of this action and that they be fully informed of the background, the policies and purposes of the National Guard of the United States and our determination to see that the National Guard be not destroyed; be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this association are directed to bring this matter to the attention of the South Carolina General Assembly now in session in order that they shall have a full realization of the vital

necessity of memorializing Congress, through the medium of a joint resolution, in opposing any attempt to change our present military system.

Resolution condemning that part of the report of the Committee on Civilian Components appointed by the Secretary of Defense recommending the destruction of the National Guard and substituting in lieu thereof a single Federal reserve or militia to be organized under the Army clause of the Constitution

Whereas on or about June 30, 1948, the Committee on Civilian Components that had been appointed by the Secretary of Defense charged with making an impartial study of the civilian components of the armed forces submitted to him its report embodying certain conclusions and recommendations affecting the National Guard, and which report included therein the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. National security required that all services each have one Federal reserve force.

This should be accomplished:

(a) by establishing the reserve forces of the Army under the Army clause of the Constitution.

(b) by similarly establishing the reserve forces of the Air Force under appropriate legal authority;

(c) by incorporating the National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps into the Army reserve under the name of the National Guard of the United States;

(d) by incorporating the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve into the Air Force reserve force under the name of the United States Air Force Reserve.

and in support of which recommendations the Committee on Civilian Components stated that it had arrived at its conclusions concerning the National Guard only after the most careful consideration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949, at Columbia, S. C., That in common with the National Guard Association of the United States and the United States Conference of Governors, it condemns without reservation the report of the Committee on Civilian Components recommending the establishment of a single Federal reserve or militia as un-American and contrary to our concept and philosophy of life and government, and that the proposals made therein are not only ill-advised and illegal, but, if put into effect, would destroy the National Guard which, by the committee's own admission, has performed with effectiveness and brilliancy in two world wars and which has, in the brief space of 2½ years, organized more than 4,795 units with a strength of more than 320,000, contained in 27 divisions, other highly essential tactical units including Antiaircraft and Air Force units, all of which are a part of the M-day force and essential to the defense of the Nation; be it further

Resolved, That the South Carolina National Guard Association direct its officers to call upon and to write the Members of the Congress from South Carolina to resist this effort to centralize the military power in the hands of a few in Washington and to destroy the National Guard as it is today organized, and to forward each Member of the Congress from South Carolina a copy of this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded the Governor of South Carolina and to the National Guard Association of the United States.

Resolution calling on the Congress to establish a system of universal military training

Whereas the National Guard Association of the United States, the Reserve Officers'

Association, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled War Veterans, and numerous other veteran organizations, the Department of National Defense have consistently advocated the establishment of a system of universal military training to the end that there would not only be assured the greatest possible degree of national security, but that such responsibility would be recognized as a common duty, to be shared equally by all; and

Whereas the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training, after 6 months of exhaustive study and examination into the broad field of our national security, and the relation of universal military training to such a problem, has brought out a report of great significance on the subject, in which they urge universal military training as an integral part of our national security establishment on a par with Central Intelligence, research, and development, industrial mobilization, and an adequate Regular Establishment; and

Whereas this exhaustive study and the unanimous recommendations of the committee, in which it finds there is justified fully such a program in the interest and necessity of our national security, and emphasizes the urgency of such a measure, places great responsibility on the people and the Congress for passage of such an act as the fairest, most equitable, and most economical means of effecting national security; and

Whereas the mission of the National Guard as an effective component of the M-day force in being would be vitally promoted, the efficiency of the National Guard raised to a high level of training and its strength maintained so that the National Guard would be able to successfully meet its M-day missions; and

Whereas the findings of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training were fundamentally and substantially those principles long advocated by the organizations above-mentioned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association, in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949, at Columbia, S. C., That we endorse the stand supporting the principle of universal military training as advocated by the above-mentioned organizations and the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training and directs its officers to so inform each Member of the Congress from South Carolina and that they be urged to exert every effort in securing the enactment of legislation designed to accomplish this purpose; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of the State of South Carolina and to the National Guard Association of the United States.

Resolution providing for the enactment of legislation incident to a long-range armory-construction program

Whereas the reorganization of the National Guard has progressed to the extent that at the present time we have in the federally recognized units throughout the Nation a total membership of more than 320,000; and

Whereas many States have a strength which now exceeds the armory facilities available. If the National Guard is to continue forward along the lines contemplated, it is imperative that the Congress provide, in line with approved War Department policies, the necessary legislation and the funds with which to construct new armories, and to add additions to present armories for the proper housing of contemplated strength of the National Guard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949 at Columbia, S. C., That the officers of this association are hereby directed to write to each Member of the Congress from South Carolina of the ur-

gent need for legislation to provide for a long-range armory-construction program and to forward each Member a copy of this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of South Carolina and to the National Guard Association of the United States.

THE FARM PROGRAM—LETTER FROM MASSACHUSETTS FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my statement, a letter from the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, embodying two resolutions passed on November 18. I consider this letter so important that I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

Waltham, Mass., January 26, 1949.
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: There are two things which the Farm Bureau Federation in Massachusetts would particularly like at this time to call to your attention. These are resolutions adopted at our annual meeting November 18, 1948, at Worcester which read as follows:

"Whereas we realize that we cannot keep asking for favors and services without surrendering more and more of our independence: *Be it resolved,* That we favor legislation that will work toward the decentralization of both power and authority from Washington to the end that we shall have more and not less independence as the years go by."

"Whereas we realize the importance to the over-all national economy of some system of farm support prices until world conditions become more stable: *Be it resolved,* That we favor the continuance of a price support program at figures low enough to discourage overproduction and high enough to insure some protection in the event of price collapse."

The Farm Bureau in Massachusetts represents some 7,000 farm families in every county of the State. Our policy is arrived at by discussions of issues first within the county and second in State meetings. I think that the two resolutions are particularly important at this time when the question of a farm price support program is again becoming very controversial. Last year the farmers here favored the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948 and we see no reason at this time to change our position. We hope that you will do everything in your power to prevent a return to a rigid 90 percent of parity support price and to continue the act which would insure to agriculture a floor that would keep it from going into bankruptcy through its own high production and yet would not be high enough to call for governmental regimentation in our field.

We believe that this is no less important to our own economy than to agriculture. It seems hardly necessary to remind you of the severe attack farmers have been under in the metropolitan papers in Massachusetts because of such programs as the potato support program. Our organization wants no repetition of that sort of thing. Under a flexible support program such as is contained in the 1948 act, I am very sure that we will have provided against abuses and return the farmers to a freer market in most years.

Respectfully yours,

CARLETON I. PICKETT,
Secretary.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that I have appointed, pursuant to law, the following Members of the Senate on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation:

TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia; and H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 372. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 29).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 460. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 26); and

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will; without amendment (Rept. No. 27).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 492. A bill to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," without amendment (Rept. No. 28).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 35, submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on the 27th instant, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance 2,400 additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 208, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Recommendations for Social Security Legislation."

Mr. HAYDEN. I am advised by the printing clerk that the type has been saved and that the cost will be about \$500.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 25)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is the chairman of the Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, I submit that committee's final report,

entitled "Oil Supply and Distribution Problems."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 7

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Nebraska, who is unavoidably absent, I ask unanimous consent to submit and have printed as a Senate document the final report by the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee entitled "Independent Business: Its Struggle for Existence."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed as a Senate document.

PERMISSION FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business be allowed to file the remainder of its final reports with the Senate up to and including February 15, 1949.

This request is made because the committee expires as of midnight tonight, and, although the reports are all prepared, we have not had the opportunity to have them approved by the committee members.

I want to make it clear that this request does not allow the committee to employ any personnel or incur any further expense. This is merely to allow the committee to have time to approve and print these final reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 713. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. CHAVEZ also introduced Senate bill 714, to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia, to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States, and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 715. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 716. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Peters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 717. A bill to provide increases in compensation for members of the Police and Fire

Departments and teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 718. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and Air Force officers retired due to lack of funds and to correct injustices and inconsistencies; and

S. 719. A bill to correct injustices and inconsistencies in Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, approved June 29, 1948, designated as the "Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 720. A bill for the relief of Vesa Reijo Luukkonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 721. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

S. 722. A bill to create a Government corporation to operate cafeterias and conduct certain other activities in Government buildings and on Government property; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 723. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain agricultural dry land and irrigation field stations to the States in which such stations are located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. IVES):

S. 724. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of lower-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 725. A bill for the relief of Ralph E. Garlock; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 726. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees;

S. 727. A bill to provide that the Governors of the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska shall be elected by the people of those Territories, and for other purposes; and

S. 728. A bill to authorize the participation of States, Territories, and insular possessions in revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas subject to the primary administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, to provide for the acquisition of land within certain areas administered by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 729. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to extend the time within which claims may be filed for return of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 730. A bill to clarify the application of the tax on cabarets; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 731. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Edison Glenn a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 732. A bill providing for the taking of action in 1949 with respect to quotas for the 1950 crops of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. LUCAS):

S. 733. A bill relating to acreage allotments for certain farm products in 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 734. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts;

S. 735. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Connell;

S. 736. A bill for the reimbursement of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.;

S. 737. A bill for the relief of Henry A. Ninemires; and

S. 738. A bill for the relief of Earl B. Hochwalt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 739. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, to make the personnel ceiling provisions of such act inapplicable to employees of the Navy Department whose wages are fixed by wage boards or similar administrative authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) also introduced Senate bill 740, providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 741. A bill to place certain restrictions upon the transfer of generating plants and electric transmission and distribution lines financed in whole or in part through loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 742. A bill for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen; and

S. 743. A bill for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 744. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 745. A bill to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Illinois, as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 746. A bill relating to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before departments and agencies of the Government;

S. 747. A bill relating to dismissal of indictments, information, or complaints in criminal cases by the Attorney General or the United States Attorney;

S. 748. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Bishop;

S. 749. A bill for the relief of Ferd H. Gibler;

S. 750. A bill for the relief of Everett C. French;

S. 751. A bill for the relief of Olga Lengyel;

S. 752. A bill for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.; and

S. 753. A bill for the relief of Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 754. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 755. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 756. A bill making available certain funds for relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations. (Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) introduced Senate bill 757, to provide an effective method for the construction of low-rent homes for low-income families with a minimum of Federal control and expenditure, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Eiriksson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(Mr. FREAR introduced Senate joint resolution 45, to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to suspend the operation of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEM:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution authorizing a study of certain matters looking to the better protection and preservation of migratory birds and game mammals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill in which I believe the Senate will be interested. The bill provides for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia, to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings, and for other purposes.

The bill (S. 714) to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia, to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings, and for other purposes, introduced

by Mr. CHAVEZ, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

ALASKA RAILROAD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the construction of a railroad to Alaska, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter I have received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and a letter from the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget to Mr. Willis T. Batcheller, executive vice president and chief engineer of the Canadian Alaska Railway Co., be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 740) providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized, through such channels as he may deem proper, to negotiate and enter into an agreement or agreements with the Dominion of Canada for the survey, location, and construction of a railroad of standard gage to connect the existing railroad system now terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving the Territory of Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, together with all branches and extensions of said new railroad system, and in cooperation with the Government of the Dominion of Canada, to cause a survey or surveys to be made to determine the most practicable route for such railroad, as well as construction plans and specifications and estimates of the probable cost thereof, and plans for financing its construction, operation, and maintenance.

SEC. 2. The President is further authorized to designate such agency or agencies of the United States as he may select to carry on, either directly or under contract, the work of survey and location of the route for such railroad and, upon the completion of negotiations and the execution of the agreement or agreements herein authorized, to proceed either directly or under contract, with the construction, operation, and maintenance thereof after such route shall have been determined and approved by the President. Such agency or agencies are authorized and directed to cooperate directly with like agencies or officials to be designated by the Government of the Dominion of Canada for the purpose of coordinating and expediting the work of such survey, location, construction, operation, and maintenance thereof.

SEC. 3. The work of all existing agencies which may be engaged in like or affiliated activities in the Territory of Alaska and in western Canada shall hereafter be correlated with the work contemplated under this act.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary, to be expended under the direction of the President, through such agency or agencies as he may designate, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act: *Provided*, That no money shall be appropriated under this act for the construction of any part of such railroad outside of the Territory of Alaska until the agreement or agreements provided

for in the first section of this act have been entered into.

The letters presented by Mr. MAGNUSON were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington 25, D. C., December 13, 1948.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator,

Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: This will acknowledge your letter of November 24 to Mr. Webb concerning the construction of an Alaska railroad.

I believe you will be interested in the attached copy of my letter of June 22 to Mr. Willis T. Batcheller on the subject. So far as I am aware, the fundamentals of the situation have not changed since that letter was written.

In the interval we have received the views of Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State concerning House Concurrent Resolutions 214, 215, and 216 which are similar in many respects to your bill, S. 2867.

The Department of State has pointed out that negotiations with the Canadian Government on this matter would be likely to succeed only if they were based on specific and concrete proposals and that passage of these resolutions would be premature until the national defense and economic priorities of the project had been determined by the agencies concerned and until definite proposals were available concerning financing construction, operation, and related problems.

The Navy Department has indicated that it is sympathetic "to all measures which will facilitate the movement of freight and passengers to and from Alaska," but has pointed out that the Navy would not expect to be able to use the railroad transportation to any great extent in supplying their installations in the area.

The Army Department has indicated concern for the inadequacy of existing transportation facilities serving Alaska, but has pointed out that from a military point of view, a railroad to Alaska, "while being a valuable asset, is not sufficiently vital at this time to the defense of that territory or the continental United States to entitle it to priority over other projects. It cannot, therefore, be considered a military necessity. The Department of the Army is hopeful that the future development of the natural resources of Alaska will either warrant, for economic reasons, Government support of the proposed railroad project or will interest private enterprise therein."

The views of the Department of the Air Force are essentially similar to those of the Navy.

It is evident that the agencies primarily concerned with national defense and security do not advocate assignment of a high priority to the Alaska Railroad project. However, we feel that continuing study of economic prospects and development of the kinds of data suggested by the Department of State as requisite to negotiations with the Canadian Government are fully justified.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington, D. C., June 22, 1948.

MR. WILLIS T. BATCHELLER,
Executive Vice President and Chief Engineer
Canadian Alaska Railway Co.,
Mayflower Hotel,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BATCHELLER: Your letter of May 15, 1948, in the interest of a Canadian-

Alaskan Railway project, addressed to the President, has been referred to me for consideration and acknowledgment.

The very real interest of the President in the affairs of Alaska has been freshly evidenced by his special message to the Congress under date of May 21, 1948. In this message, of which a copy is enclosed, President Truman, after urging early enactment of legislation granting statehood to the Territory, discussed at some length the transportation needs of Alaska and outlined several specific steps toward meeting these needs. As you will note the message also recommends other important measures with respect to housing, community facilities, land settlement, agricultural and industrial development.

In connection with the broad studies of Alaskan needs and opportunities which are now under way in various Federal agencies the idea of a Canadian-Alaskan Railway has been advanced and given such consideration as present circumstances appear to warrant. It is quite obvious, however, that this project, involving as it would governmental action by both Canada and the United States, requires much more study and analysis before any formal proposal could be placed before legislative bodies for their consideration. It is also felt that from the standpoint of immediate needs the measures proposed in the enclosed message represent the highest priorities and that their attainment would have important bearing upon final judgment as to the need, value, and economic merit of the railway project.

Your interest in this proposal and in the general acceleration of Alaskan development is much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Assistant Director.

ISSUANCE OF STAMP COMMEMORATING LIFE OF EMILY P. BISSELL

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Delaware will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, introduced by Mr. FREAR was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. FREAR was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREAR

The contribution made by Emily P. Bissell in the battle against the ravages of tuberculosis can only be adequately measured in terms of human lives—lives saved because of Miss Bissell's notable efforts in promoting the sale of the Christmas seal, under the banner of the National Tuberculosis Society.

From 1907 when she founded the seal in America until her death in March of 1949, this gallant woman led the crusade for her little stamp until the name "Christmas Seal" became unanimous with the words "Fight Tuberculosis." Miss Bissell lived to see the battle against the disease being won—thanks in a large measure to the generosity of the American people who had faith in her idea

and who supported her undertaking in ever greater degree.

Miss Emily P. Bissell was born in Wilmington Del., May 31, 1861, and was a native of her State all of her life. Her grandfather, John Bissell, settled in Windsor, Conn. Her father, C. A. Bissell (1829-1899) graduated from Yale in 1850. Her mother, Josephine Wales (1832-1919) was a daughter of John Wales who was born in New Haven, Conn., but later settled in Wilmington, Del. He was a United States Senator. Miss Bissell was educated in Delaware and New York. She attended Miss Charlier's Private School in New York City.

Pioneer work always interested her. She started the west-end reading room in 1889 and it had the first free kindergarten, the first children's playground in Delaware, the first better babies' demonstration, the first boys' brigade (forerunner of the Boy Scouts), and the first free gymnasium for boys. In 1913, it began the first Americanization work in Delaware, in its Italian Neighborhood House.

Miss Bissell was instrumental in putting through the first child labor law in Delaware, and served on the first child labor commission. She was one of the organizers of the Children's Bureau, and served on its board until her death.

She was the first president of the Consumer's League, and aided the passage of the first law limiting the hours of women in industry. At the request of the Hon. George Gray, she aided him in establishing the Delaware Chapter of the American Red Cross in 1904, and was its secretary for many years.

She was a director of the Associated Charities for many years, and was chairman of Social Service in the Federation of Women's Clubs for 8 years.

In connection with all these responsibilities came the raising of large amounts of money. The Christmas stamp of 1907 was not a momentary idea—it was the result of a great deal of practical experience, in starting and carrying forward new experiments in Delaware, applied to this Government idea from Denmark. The Story of the American Christmas Seal, written by Miss Bissell herself was published in booklet form in 1946 by the National Tuberculosis Association.

Miss Bissell's contribution to mankind has been acknowledged nationally and internationally. In December of 1936, she was honored in Wilmington, Del., at a Christmas seal birthday luncheon attended by 400 friends and health workers representing many sections of the country and several foreign countries. In December of 1937, the city of Wilmington, the State of Delaware, and two nations, again paid honor to Miss Bissell when the Tuberculosis Associations of the United States unveiled a bronze tablet which was placed on the main building of the Brandywine Sanatorium, Marshallton, Del., with this legend: "This tablet commemorates the founding of the first Christmas seal in this country by Miss Emily P. Bissell, of Wilmington, Del., December, 1907. From small beginnings, the annual Christmas seal sale has financed the development of the organized fight against tuberculosis in every State, resulting in saving thousands of lives. Erected by the Tuberculosis Associations of the United States, December 1937."

In 1942, Miss Bissell was awarded the Trudeau Medal of the National Tuberculosis Association, the first nonprofessional worker to receive this reward since it was inaugurated in 1925. The award is given annually to the individual who, in the judgment of the association, has made the most meritorious contribution to the cause, prevention, or treatment of tuberculosis.

In 1945, Miss Bissell was honored by the Delaware State Board of Health when the main building at Brandywine Sanatorium was dedicated in her honor, hereafter to be known as the Emily P. Bissell Building. Miss

Bissell is the author of many poems, which have been collected in a volume entitled, "Happiness and Other Verses."

Miss Bissell was president of the Delaware Anti-Tuberculosis Society from 1909, until her death.

She was an honorary member of the National Tuberculosis Association, and in 1946 was again honored when her portrait appeared on each sheet of Christmas seals. Miss Bissell passed away on March 8, 1949.

POLITICAL FEDERATION OF EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

In order to encourage a peaceful and prosperous order in Europe, but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, it is hereby,

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the political federation of Europe.

EXTENSION OF TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FROM PRINCE GEORGE, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA, TO ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the development of the Territory of Alaska, its lands and resources, is essential to the economic welfare and security of the United States; and

Whereas such development is necessary to the defense of the Territory; and

Whereas adequate transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are essential to the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska; and

Whereas existing transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are inadequate for the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward determining the desirability of extending the existing railroad system now terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska, and to cause surveys to be made and plans, specifications, and cost estimates be prepared covering the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, with a railroad system extended from Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska; also including studies with the Canadian Government for reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements in connection with this project.

SEC. 2. The President is further requested to report to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate, within 60 days following enactment of this resolution, progress achieved in effecting the purposes of this resolution.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS AFFECTING THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION AND SUCCESSION

Mr. GREEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is

hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election of the President and Vice President from the time of the nomination of the President and Vice President, through the time of their election and the time of their inauguration until the termination of their respective terms of office, with the purpose of making the law certain as to the Presidential election and succession. These matters shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

(1) Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college, as at present, and if so whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

(2) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where before the election of Presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the Presidency or for the Vice Presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

(3) Whether or not provision should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

(4) How it shall be determined whether the President, or individual acting as President, is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office, and how the duration of such inability shall be determined.

(5) Whether or not provision should be made for an individual to execute the office of President in case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, where by reason of removal, death, resignation, or inability there is no individual upon whom the powers and duties of such office would otherwise automatically devolve.

(6) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and any other individual executing the office of President.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, including drafts of legislation recommended and of any proposed constitutional amendments considered necessary or desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than May 2, 1949, and thereupon the existence of the joint committee shall terminate.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ counsel, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make

such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the United States merchant marine, allied industries, and trained personnel therein are indispensable to national security; and

Whereas the reduction in ships flying the American flag is proceeding at an alarming rate; and

Whereas this places in jeopardy the employment of men skilled in repairing, constructing, and manning the United States merchant marine and creates the risk that skills and facilities will be unavailable in the event of national emergency; and

Whereas geographical dispersion and utilization of repair and construction facilities and the skilled manpower related thereto is essential to national defense and economy; and

Whereas the transfer of American ships and those of other countries to flags of certain nations jeopardizes world-wide stability of the maritime industry; undermines seafarers' and safety-at-sea standards; and deprives the United States Treasury of substantial tax revenues; and

Whereas revival of ship construction and operation in occupied countries is of legitimate interest to the United States merchant marine; and

Whereas participation of American bottoms in transporting United States financed cargoes has been threatened: First by failure of certain Government agencies to give proper consideration to the importance of maintaining an adequate United States merchant marine, and second by actual or proposed use, directly or indirectly, of funds and scarce materials to build or acquire ships for foreign nations; and

Whereas United States tramp operators confront problems which may require Government assistance for solution; and

Whereas there exists in and among the several agencies having jurisdiction over maritime matters, serious problems of coordination and efficiency; and

Whereas Congress, agencies affected, and industry have found no long-range solution to the problems of water transportation to Alaska, and coastwise and intercoastal shipping; and

Whereas shipping operations of the Armed Services bear a definite relationship to the present and future welfare of the United States merchant marine; and

Whereas there is urgent need for congressional study and expression of policy on these and related problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all such matters pertaining to the merchant marine as it may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1950.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

IDA RAFFEL KLAFF

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 46), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Ida Raffel Klaff, daughter of Louis Raffel, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AMENDMENT TO REVENUE BILL

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to a bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT (S. DOC. NO. 8)

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, there was transmitted to the Vice President today by Harry W. Bashore, the representative of the United States in the negotiations for a compact among the upper Basin States of the Colorado River, a report which includes the compact, which was entered into on the 11th of October 1948, and the recommendations of Mr. Bashore.

I ask unanimous consent that these documents may be printed as a Senate document for the use of Members of the Senate.

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

CHANGES OF REFERENCES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 32, a joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States

Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, was referred to the Armed Services Committee. However, the same joint resolution was considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the last session of the Congress. It is true that a report from the War Department was required, to give the committee full information about it; but the purport of the joint resolution shows clearly that it should have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Therefore, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to which the joint resolution was referred, I ask that the Armed Services Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made as requested.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, Senate bill 529, to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy, a bill introduced at the last session of the Congress, and again introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, was referred to the Finance Committee. Upon examination, it appears that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on Thursday last, Senate bill 672, to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945, was referred to the Finance Committee. I am advised that that was an inadvertence, and that the jurisdiction of the bill is in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on the day upon which the President delivered his first message to the Congress in this session, and following that message, I introduced Senate Bill 152, to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos (New Mexico) project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, a bill which was prepared at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission for the purpose of retroceding cer-

tain lands in New Mexico back to the jurisdiction of the State of New Mexico.

I had done some work on it last summer, at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission; and I have in my possession the various departmental approvals of that particular bill. I introduced that bill as Senate bill 152.

Thereafter the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] introduced a bill known as Senate bill 210. It is identical in verbiage with the bill I had previously introduced. I have no pride of authorship or concern about the measure, except that it be passed in orderly fashion.

But at the last meeting of the Senate, I noticed that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] requested the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], to whose committee both bills were referred, to consent to the discharge of his committee from the further consideration of Senate bill 210, and the reference of that bill to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Senator from Wyoming, with his usual courtesy, and realizing that the bill did relate to atomic energy, said he would give such consent; and the requested change of reference was made, with the result that the bill now has been referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

However, no mention was made of the previous bill, Senate bill 152, which I had introduced. As I have said, Senate bill 210 is a comma-for-comma, sentence-for-sentence duplicate. Of course, as to that I make no complaint. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming, in whose committee now reposes my bill, Senate bill 152, whether he would have any objection to having a similar change of reference made in the case of Senate bill 152, which is identical with Senate bill 210. In that case Senate bill 152 would be referred, likewise, to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I believe that should be done because I believe that at least duplicate pieces of proposed legislation of that kind and on that subject are properly lodged with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have not seen the Senator from Wyoming before, today, and this is my first opportunity to present the matter to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in giving the consent of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the change of reference of Senate bill 210 at the last meeting of the Senate, let me say that it was the purpose and thought of the chairman of the committee that all bills dealing with that subject should be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am sure I speak for the entire committee in saying that we have no objection to the requested change of reference of the Senator's bill.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is that the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, Mr. President.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 152, and it will be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

THE FUTURE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Future of the Republican Party," delivered by him at the McKinley Memorial, Niles, Ohio, January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTEGRATION OF COUNTRIES OF WESTERN EUROPE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. O'CONNOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on American policy favoring the integration of the countries of western Europe, delivered by Senator LODGE before the Maryland Bar Association at Baltimore, Md., on January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS ON ATOMIC ENERGY BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

[Mr. O'CONNOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on atomic energy delivered by Senator HICKENLOOPER before the Association of Commerce in Baltimore earlier this month, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND AT KANSAS DAY DINNER

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Kansas Day dinner at Topeka, Kans., on January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL ADDRESS ON FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator KEFAUVER at a memorial dinner for the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on Friday, January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIMITATION OF DEBATE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him on January 28, 1949, on the subject of limitation of debate, which appears in the Appendix.]

CLOTURE IN THE SENATE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Republicans in Senate Seen Making Mistake in Favoring Cloture" written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—LETTER FROM PAUL R. HAWLEY AND STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Dr. Paul R. Hawley, chief executive officer of the Blue Cross, together with a statement prepared by Senator LODGE, commenting upon the letter, which appear in the Appendix.]

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain newspaper editorials commenting on the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2, which appear in the Appendix.]

NEED OF INCENTIVES TO INVESTMENT—ARTICLE BY MRS. FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt dealing with the

need of incentives to investment, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY LUCIUS E. BURCH, JR.

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address by Lucius E. Burch, Jr., a corporation lawyer, discussing the subject of labor-management relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RENAH F. CAMALIER TO GRADUATING CLASS OF ANACOSTIA HIGH SCHOOL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Renah F. Camaller to the graduating class of Anacostia High School, in Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

A NATIONAL PROSPERITY BUDGET—ARTICLE BY LEON H. KEYSERLING

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "For a National Prosperity Budget" published in the New York Times magazine of January 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. WHERRY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "God Hates a Coward" published in the Omaha, Nebr., Evening World-Herald of January 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST OFFICE DEFICITS—EDITORIAL FROM THE TRENTON EVENING TIMES

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "A Good Suggestion," published in the Trenton Evening Times of January 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PETER MARSHALL—ARTICLE BY TRIS COFFIN

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article relating to Peter Marshall, late Chaplain of the Senate, written by Tris Coffin and published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREWORD TO THE MEMOIRS OF GEN. CLAIRE LEE CHENNAULT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the Foreword to the Memoirs of Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, written by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION—EDITORIAL FROM SEATTLE TIMES

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record, an editorial entitled "Nations Pull Together So Everybody's Happy," published in the Seattle Times of January 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPERATIONS OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION—LETTER FROM FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION OF SPOKANE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter dated January 21, 1949, from the Farm Credit Administration of Spokane, correcting certain impressions in an article from Life magazine of December 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR RETRENCHMENT IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURE—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial en-

titled "What Are We Promising?" published in the Christian Century of January 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHO PAYS THE TAXES?—EDITORIAL FROM MILES CITY (MONT.) STAR

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Just Who Does Pay the Taxes?" published in the Miles City (Mont.) Daily Star of January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIAL OF COMMUNIST LEADERS—ARTICLES BY VIVIAN MEIK

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record two articles written by Vivian Meik, discussing the New York trial of Communist leaders, published in the Deseret Evening News, of Salt Lake City of January 18 and January 19, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO TO INDEPENDENT BROADCASTERS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address recently delivered by him before a group of independent broadcasters at Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

NATURAL RESOURCES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement on the subject of natural resources, made by him before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on January 31, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED DENIAL OF MARSHALL PLAN AID TO THE NETHERLANDS—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Missions Parley Urges ERP to Cut Off Dutch," published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, January 26, 1949, was the anniversary date of the birth of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. On that date a testimonial dinner in commemoration of the event was given at Hotel Astor in New York City. At that time a scroll was prepared and ordered sent to the general. The general was advised in advance of the dinner, and sent a communication to those participating in the dinner.

I ask to have printed in the body of the Record at this point a copy of the scroll, and likewise a copy of the reply sent by General MacArthur to the Veterans' and Citizens' Committee.

There being no objection, the scroll and the reply from General MacArthur were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TO GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS, TOKYO, JAPAN

Who chose to remain at his post of command in Tokyo rather than return to his homeland to receive a hero's acclaim from a grateful people and place himself immediately available for the nomination to the Presidency of the United States of America.

His sincere and forthright reply to invitations to return to Washington to testify on serious conditions in the Far East is best exemplified by his own words, "It would be

peculiarly repugnant to me to have it felt that I sought to capitalize to political advantage the public good will which might manifest itself upon my first return to American soil following the victory which countless gallant Americans, living and dead, contributed by unflinching and invincible devotion." That document typifies the honor, statesmanship, and discipline which has always guided his distinguished career. It was a tribute to the memory of and the spiritual devotion he felt for the men of his command who made the supreme sacrifice.

His fearless leadership against the encroachment of communism and other subversive manifestations in the preservation of the true American way of life will ever remain a matchless contribution to the welfare of our country.

To Americans, and to history, the name of Douglas MacArthur will ever be an inspiration for love of God, duty, honor, country.

Presented by the Veterans and Citizens Committee on the birthday anniversary of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, at Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y., January 26, 1949.

Following radiogram received from Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the Veterans and Citizens Committee birthday dinner in his honor on January 26, at the Astor Hotel, New York City:

"I am profoundly moved by this gathering of fellow Americans on the anniversary of my birth in welcome manifestation of the strength of their friendship, the invincibility of their trust, and the enduring quality of this support. I accept it in humble gratitude, not only as a mark of valued friendship, but more particularly as a reconsecration of tried and true Americans resolutely to advance the American cause. For that cause is imperiled by enemies both at home and abroad who, by misrepresentation and deceit, sow the seeds of distrust, contention, and discord as the means to undermine the public confidence in the integrity of American effort, American efficiency, and American personnel. In the resulting confusion they hope to destroy the traditional unity of the American people. If our cause in the preservation and advance of human liberty is to prevail, complete unity of purpose is essential, with the maximum support of which Americans are capable—a deep spiritual support such as prompted Stephen Decatur so eloquently to pledge himself to 'My country, right or wrong, my country.'

"Standing on this outpost far from America's shores, with the vast continent of Asia aflame before the Communist sweep to engulf civilization's gains in the liberty and the dignity of man, and charged to preserve here an impenetrable western frontier for the forces of human freedom, the trust and support of my fellow Americans is, indeed, the source of my greatest strength.

"While unable to estimate the military potentialities because of the many yet undetermined and imponderable factors beyond my assessment or control, I can and do give complete assurance that with the firm spiritual support of the American people, this frontier outpost of democratic freedom, regardless of the tide of conflict upon the adjacent mainland, will not yield to political or social pressure, communism, or any other concept of enslavement. For the Japanese people are now blessed with a way of life, patterned after our own concepts of freedom and justice, which provides them with moral values which communism can neither offer nor supply; they will not fail to cherish and do all in their power to preserve it. This is well known to the local sponsors of the Communist doctrine who, despite complete freedom to propagate their cause under the protection of those very concepts they seek to destroy, have failed to gain converts among Japan's responsible citi-

zenry. It is even better known to their mentors in Moscow who, in an increasing sense of frustration at being unable to gain an ideological foothold, are coming to see goblines in every nook and cranny of this well-ordered and peaceful land.

"To all my friends and comrades in arms present, I send my cordial and affectionate greetings, and I gratefully acknowledge their rededication of American support to this distant American effort. Without that support, the American cause here could not prosper—this frontier of freedom could not survive.

"MACARTHUR."

PRICE AID TO DAIRYMEN—ARTICLE BY ALFRED D. STEDMAN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, and written by Alfred D. Stedman, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks on the question.

The dairy farmers throughout the United States who are dependent upon an outlet for their dairy products through the process of manufacture—such as butter, powdered milk, and powdered buttermilk—are meeting with ruinous low prices, and unless something is done immediately the young farmers will go broke, more especially the veterans who have commenced farming in the past few years, assuming great financial obligations in the purchase of machinery, livestock, and feed. With milk prices decreasing as they are, they will not be able to meet their obligations, and that means financial foreclosure and disaster for the veteran who has gone into the business of farming in the past 3 years. The article by Mr. Stedman covers the question so clearly that I should like to have Senators, as well as Members of the other legislative body, read it. For that reason I ask that it be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

SOLONS JOIN DAIRYMEN IN PRICE AID DEMAND
(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Four hundred harassed dairymen were joined by Minnesota legislators here Thursday in demanding that the Truman administration make good its pledge that the farmers will not again be the first victims of a postwar depression.

Mincing no words, they called on two top dairy officials of the United States Department of Agriculture to assure immediate, emergency Government action to stop the present slump in milk prices and save co-op and other dairy plants having backs to the wall.

The two administration spokesmen, Philip Nelson and Don S. Anderson, were told bluntly by dairymen and legislators assembled in the Capitol Office Building auditorium that the farm vote in the dairy States swung the recent Presidential election against Dewey and to Truman.

The farmers voted in expectation that the Truman administration pledges of price protection would be fulfilled. Now, when the dairymen are being forced up against it, is the time to make those pledges good, the Federal officials were told.

STEPS OUTLINED

Responding to those demands, the two officials who are, respectively, Director of the

Production and Marketing Administration's Dairy Branch and Chief of its Manufactured Dairy Products Section, told the mass meeting these three things:

First, They believe the Secretary of Agriculture has discretionary power to establish a separate parity for manufacturing milk, as distinct from bottled milk, as the dairymen demanded.

Second, That an official search now is on in Washington for funds to finance Government buying to support country milk prices up to 90 percent of that new parity. (A support price of \$3.11 a hundredweight as against recent bottom prices between \$2.50 and \$2.70 was discussed.)

Third, That the way for dairymen to have permanent price supports is to get together on a long-time program which provides funds and disposal outlets through school lunches, stamp plan, or otherwise for Government purchased products.

THIRD POINT IS HOT

Clearly calling for new dairy legislation, this third point was a "zinger." It plunged dairymen into the coming congressional scramble over amendments to the Aiken-Hope Act, one of whose provisions strikes out three little words allowing Government dairy price supports at more than 90 percent of parity in a pinch. In fact, official warnings were sounded to dairy, wheat, and other farmers that the administration likes room for flexibility of any Government farm price supports, is against inflexible and mandatory supports, and also is against piling up huge surpluses in the Federal hands without having definite, legal methods of disposing of those surpluses.

Three Minnesota farm legislative leaders, State Senators Ancher Nelsen and Oscar A. Swenson, and Representative August B. Mueller, served notice that the Minnesota Legislature will take a hand in the budding fight for a better deal for dairymen.

TOO MANY PLEDGES

Also it was Senator Swensen, Fred Rohe, president of the Twin City Milk Producers Association, and Frank Stone, Land O'Lakes Creameries executive, who laid the Truman administration's political responsibilities to Midwest dairymen on the line.

"The situation is especially embarrassing to me," said Rohe, "because I happen to be a Democrat. We Democrats made altogether too many pledges before election. Now we've got to keep them. If this price drop had come before November 2 this whole thing could have been settled in 10 minutes."

"If these same farmers that elected Truman are going to repeat 4 years from now, there will have to be a dairy program to help them," warned Senator Swenson.

From W. A. Gordon, editor of the Dairy Record, and Harry R. Leonard, chairman of the board of the American Dry Milk Institute, both of St. Paul, who called the meeting, came these warnings:

The recent drop of farm prices for milk from \$4.50 a hundredweight to \$2.50 or \$2.70 means that dairymen are face to face with a critical situation. A basic trouble, they said, is that the Government's present method of averaging in \$6 eastern bottled milk prices with the Midwestern \$2.50 prices and interpreting the average to mean that farmers are getting more than parity is a severe discrimination against this region. It is like averaging up a barefooted man with a man wearing \$20 shoes and saying both are well shod on an average of \$10 shoes.

NEED HELP QUICK

The Government help must be immediate if it is to save many dairies in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa, the meeting heard. But with quick action a good recovery is possible, dairymen said, because of basically sound demand for dairy products.

The situation now is such that Midwest dairymen have been heavily selling their cows to eastern dairymen. These in turn have been expanding production in response to the much higher prices there, and putting their surpluses into manufactured dairy products in competition with Midwestern dairymen who sold them cows in the first place. This is a process which is complicated by recent increases in railroad freight rates, and by steadily rising costs of production on farms and in creameries, cheese factories, and milk powder plants that buy milk for manufacturing.

BUTTER AID NOT ENOUGH

Speakers brought out that the Government practically forced dairymen to go heavily into powder production to meet war needs. So supporting powdered milk prices is the Government's moral responsibility now, dairymen declared. Just supporting butter prices alone won't do the protection job, they declared.

The frankness and unflinching good humor with which the two Federal officials answered questions made a hit with the crowd of very earnest dairy farmers and manufacturing plant executives.

Arrangements are being made now to carry the dairymen's case to Washington with representations at the White House, the Department of Agriculture, and Congress.

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further concurrent and other resolutions or routine matters, the morning business is concluded, and, under the unanimous-consent order of Thursday last, the Chair lays before the Senate as the unfinished business Senate bill 547, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN ARTICLES INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me in order that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, without displacing the unfinished business, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) be taken up for present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution of June 25, 1948 (Public Law 769, 80th Cong.), entitled "Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1948" and by inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. The resolution was passed in the Eightieth Congress. It merely permits the

entry into the United States of the so-called Thank-You Train sent by the people and the Government of France. The joint resolution is simply to provide an extension of time. The train having been delayed, it is now expected to arrive in New York over the week end. The joint resolution was passed by the House unanimously, and was recommended by the Senate Finance Committee. I ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia requests unanimous consent, without displacing the unfinished business, that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the joint resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, let me ask the Senator from Georgia, in the event the joint resolution extends the time for entry, do the goods ultimately have to go out of the country again, or do they remain here permanently?

Mr. GEORGE. They remain permanently in the country, I may say to the Senator. The goods that come in are to be sent to the capitals of the several States, there sold, and the proceeds devoted to charity. Certain railroad cars in which the goods are loaded will remain in the country, but they cannot be disposed of to any commercial enterprise, and, under the terms of the resolution or of the report accompanying it, they are to be turned over to veteran organizations in the several States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Thank You Train is merely a good-will train; we have already passed one resolution, and the train was delayed. The present joint resolution is to extend the time?

Mr. GEORGE. That is all there is to the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

RELIEF OF STORM-STRICKEN AREAS IN THE WEST

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

Mr. MAYBANK. Without displacing the unfinished business, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it was necessary for me to be absent from the Senate at the last session when the bill was introduced and passed for the relief of the storm-stricken areas in the West. I want to add my hearty approval to the action which was taken by the Senate, and that which no doubt will be taken also by the House today. In the meantime, the President himself has come to the rescue of the people in the stricken area. I, for one, want to express my heartfelt approval of the action which was taken by the President in the issuance of a letter dated January 29, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, which I think should be made a part of the RECORD at this time. I may state

that the storm damage still continues and is pronounced by everyone in that area who is familiar with it to be by far the most destructive storm the western country has ever experienced. There is no way to estimate the damage, but now that, through the orders of the President, the Army and all other Federal agencies are cooperating on the job, we feel that everything is being done that can be done to afford relief.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 29, 1949.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The disaster caused by the unprecedented storms in several of the Western States makes it imperative that the full resources of the Federal Government be mobilized immediately to furnish such emergency assistance as can be made available through the various Federal agencies.

Acting through any department, agency, officer, or employee of the National Military Establishment as you may designate, you are authorized and directed to utilize such resources of the National Military Establishment as are appropriate to the relief of this area, based on requests by the Federal Works Administrator, whom I have designated as the coordinator of Federal relief activities in the disaster area.

The departments of the National Military Establishment are authorized and directed to expend such sums as are required for this purpose from any funds now available to those departments, including funds available for river and harbor and flood-control works of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, without regard for existing apportionments. I will transmit to the Congress a request for such appropriations as may be considered necessary to replace such funds of the departments of the National Military Establishment as may be used for this purpose.

A copy of this letter is being furnished to General Fleming for his information and guidance.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

IRVINE L. LENROOT

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

Mr. MAYBANK. Without displacing the unfinished business, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I am asking the distinguished Senator to yield for a few moments, in order that I may say a few words in relation to the passing of a former distinguished Member of this body, Senator Lenroot; and I ask that the unfinished business be not displaced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, for the purpose stated?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to pay a few words of deep respect in tribute to a great former member of this body, the Honorable Irvine L. Lenroot, who has gone on ahead in the journey

which all mortals must take. As Nancy Byrd Turner says—

Death is only an old door
Set in a garden wall.
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk,
When the thrushes call.
Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond, the light lies still.
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.
There is nothing to trouble any heart,
Nothing to hurt at all.
Death is only a quiet door
In an old wall.

The story of Irvine Lenroot, United States Senator from Wisconsin, who started as a grocery clerk in Superior, is truly an American saga. Irvine Lenroot, who would have been 80 years old today, could look back to a great career in the service of his State and his Nation.

I first knew Irvine Lenroot back home, 40 years ago, and in all my contacts with him during these years, I always felt a deep sense of pride that the Badger State had reared so great and self-made a statesman.

The late Senator Lenroot served in the Wisconsin State Assembly from 1900 to 1906; in the House of Representatives from 1908 to 1918; and in the United States Senate from 1918 to 1926. These are, however, the bare facts which can hardly tell the memorable saga of Irvine Lenroot's contributions to his Nation. The newspapers have recorded the closeness with which he approached nomination to the Vice Presidency in 1920. They have recorded how former Senator Lenroot, who served for many years with distinction as an able captain to the Honorable Robert M. La Follette, Sr., later broke with Senator La Follette over the war issue, and thereafter parted the ways with this other great son of Wisconsin. Theirs was a difference of opinion as wide and as deep as had been their friendship and harmony previously. But although they did part in political ways, these two great sons of Wisconsin showed how men can differ with one another in opinion, but still have a great respect for one another in the true American way.

Members of the Senate knew Irvine Lenroot as a splendid debater and able parliamentarian, a diligent worker, an independent in voting. It was he who led the successful fight for American adherence to the World Court. It was he who championed the St. Lawrence seaway for many years in this body.

Later, following his retirement from the Senate, he served with distinction in the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Mark Twain said, in answer to the question of how to take this life:

How to take life? Take it just as though it was—as it is—an earnest, vital, and important affair. Take it as though you were born for the task of performing a merry part of it—as though the world awaited your coming. Take it as though it were a grand opportunity to do and achieve, to carry forward great and good schemes, to help and cheer a suffering, weary, and, it may be, a heartbroken world.

Mr. President, I had the privilege of visiting with former Senator and later Judge Lenroot in his home in this city on a number of occasions. I knew him from the days when he was a young, vital, dynamic character in Wisconsin, working for those concepts which have since been called progressivism. As the years came and passed, he mellowed, and saw that in this world men with differing ideas could be right. His philosophy of life was of the kind we need in order to guide our own steps as we progress.

So it might be said of him:

Let us not think of our departed dead
As caught and cumbered in these graves of earth;

But think of death as of another birth.
As a new freedom for the wings outspread.

A new adventure waiting on ahead,
As a new joy of more ethereal mirth,
As a new world with friends of nobler worth,
Where all may taste a more immortal bread.

Senator Lenroot leaves behind him a great record of which his family and his State may be proud. Father of a distinguished daughter, Katharine Lenroot, Director of the Children's Bureau; uncle of another distinguished bearer of the family name, Arthur A. Lenroot, Jr., of Superior, State senator in Madison, Senator Lenroot also leaves behind him a brother, sister, and devoted wife.

Speaking of his passing, the Milwaukee Journal has stated:

In the traditional American sense, Irvine L. Lenroot was a self-made man. Without wealth, powerful friends, or formal education, he fought his way to the State legislature, to the House of Representatives, to the United States Senate, and almost to the Presidency of his country.

Irvine Lenroot was a strong man, an able man, and a friendly man. He was a brilliant debater, and excellent parliamentarian. On occasion he showed a remarkable independence. He rates in the upper bracket of men Wisconsin has sent to the United States Senate.

The Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter has stated:

Mr. Lenroot has long been away from the Wisconsin scene. But he was a native son of the Badger State, which loses one of its really great leaders in his death. * * * The Lenroot family helped to pioneer much of the legislation which has made Wisconsin a leader in the social-security field.

We bid hail and farewell only to his physical presence from this scene because we know that the spirit of devotion to the land to which his father and mother emigrated from Sweden, this spirit of faithfulness and loyalty to the American way of life, to the United States Congress, and to the American institution of government—this spirit of Irvine Lenroot will go on for all time to come.

If I could sing the song within my heart
Of loves immortal, gates of death and birth,
And sleeps and wakings; if I could impart
Some measure of my gladness to the earth,
And men could understand and know it true,
This consciousness that thrills me through
and through.

This memory of never-broken being,
This vision seen and yet beyond all seeing,
More joy were mine than since the world
began

Because of joy that I could give to man.

If I these sweet assurances could tell
And show how clear and certain is the
truth;

If I could bring all souls beneath the spell
Of spirit in its never-ending youth;

If I could give what God to me has given
And prove it as it has been proved to me,
'Twould make the earth seem nearer unto
heaven

Than ever it has seemed since Galilee.

And can I not? Will not the power divine
That works in other spirits as in mine
Help me to tell, and then to hear, the story
Until all earth is brightened with its glory?

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has considered S. 547, has reported favorably on that bill, and has recommended that the bill pass.

S. 547 would extend through September 30, 1949, section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress. This action provides that the President may consult with representatives of industry, business, and agriculture, with a view to making voluntary agreements providing, among other things, for "priority allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production."

After the approval of such agreements by the Attorney General, the President may request compliance with them and actions taken in compliance with such requests are exempted from the provisions of the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The purposes for which these voluntary agreements may be entered into are, as stated in section 1 of Public Law 395—

to aid in stabilizing the economy of the United States, to aid in curbing inflationary tendencies, to promote the orderly and equitable distribution of goods and facilities, and to aid in preventing maldistribution of goods and facilities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production.

The President, under Executive Order 9919, of January 3, 1948, delegated this authority under section 2 of Public Law 395 to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation.

The Department of Commerce has had considerable success in formulating and carrying out voluntary plans for the allocation of steel and pig iron for various essential purposes.

At the present time the Department of Commerce has 14 of these voluntary

plans in effect, and is about to put into effect 2 more. These plans, and the tonnage of steel or pig iron allocated under them for February 1949, are as follows:

Voluntary allocation plans

Purpose	Monthly tonnage (as of February 1949)	
	Steel	Pig iron
1. Freight cars.....	250,000	-----
2. Atomic Energy Commission projects.....	22,265	-----
3. Warm-air heating equipment.....	31,622	-----
4. Housing products.....	-----	102,525
5. Factory-made steel houses (69,000 tons total).....	19,835	-----
6. Anthracite industry.....	2,570	-----
7. Armed forces.....	102,505	-----
8. Barges and towing vessels.....	25,000	-----
9. Tank and oil-field production equipment.....	16,530	-----
10. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	1,926	-----
11. Oil tankers.....	40,380	-----
12. Merchant vessels.....	15,415	-----
13. Mining machinery.....	26,400	-----
14. Manganese ore cars (13,000 tons total).....	12,192	-----
15. Pipe line for Oak Ridge (25,500 tons total).....	14,750	-----
16. Farm-type grain storage bins (50,400 tons total).....	18,400	-----
Total tonnage.....	559,790	102,525

¹ Average.

In addition to these plans, the Department of Commerce has under consideration other proposals to set up plans for the allocation of steel to the Economic Cooperation Administration countries and to distressed municipalities needing steel for important public health and welfare needs, and possible additional provisions for housing and for the armed forces. The possibility of additional assistance to increase the production of such scarce materials as aluminum was discussed at the hearing.

While these programs have not by any means solved all the problems arising out of shortages of materials, they have accomplished very desirable results in directing scarce steel and pig iron to uses important to our domestic economy and to our national security.

At the hearing the committee inquired at length into the operations under section 2 of Public Law 395, and the way in which these voluntary plans have been formulated and carried out, with particular reference to the consideration given to small business and the effects on small business.

The testimony revealed that several steps occur in the formulation of these plans.

When the Department of Commerce, either on its own initiative or at the request of a steel-consuming industry, reaches the conclusion that a plan seems appropriate, it calls a general meeting of the consuming industry, to which all members, or a substantial cross section, of the industry are invited. The proposal is discussed generally, and if the sentiment of those present is in favor of the proposal, suggestions are requested from those present as to possible members of an industry advisory committee.

Industry advisory committees are selected by the Secretary of Commerce. The order under which these committees are set up provides that—

The committees are formed of representatives of the minimum number of companies necessary to represent a fair cross section of the industry from the standpoints of (1) large, medium, and small companies; (2) geographical distribution; (3) trade-association membership; and (4) segments of industry (types of products, degree of integration, etc.). In forming industry advisory committees, the Department of Commerce will be governed by the principles of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 (80th Cong.) and the President's memorandum to heads of executive departments and agencies of December 12, 1947, with respect to the representation of small business on Government committees.

After a voluntary plan has been worked out by the Department of Commerce, in consultation with the industry advisory committee of the consuming industry and the industry advisory committee of the steel-producing industry, a public hearing is held to which the public is invited. Notice of these hearings is given in the Federal Register and by press release. Consideration is given to any changes needed in the light of the public hearing.

The plan is then forwarded to the Department of Justice, for the approval of the Attorney General. Representatives of the Department of Justice are invited to all the meetings, and work closely with the Department of Commerce in the formulation of these plans.

If the Attorney General approves the plan, written requests are made by the Secretary of Commerce for compliance with the plan. The plans, and the requests, are then published in the Federal Register in accordance with the law.

I have here a copy of the Commerce Department order setting up this procedure, which I ask permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, at all stages of the formulation of a plan, at the preliminary general meeting, the meetings of the industry advisory committees, and at the public hearings, full opportunity is given to small business to cooperate in the formulation and approval of the plan.

In the operation of the plan small business is also given a full opportunity to participate. Allocations are made by the Secretary of Commerce, after taking into consideration recommendations of a task committee of the consuming industry; these allocations are based on the capacity of the individual firm and its production plans for the product covered by the program, as well as its past production. An outstanding example of this principle was discussed at the hearing, the warm-air heating industry. In that

case some 43 concerns, all small business with little or no historical base, did not apply for any steel at the time the plan was promulgated. The problem was presented to the Steel Products Committee and an additional 2,000 tons of steel a month was made available to these small firms.

I have here a table prepared by the Office of Industry Cooperation of the Department of Commerce showing the number of large and small firms receiving steel under 10 of the programs, showing the amount of steel going to large and small firms, and also showing the percentage of the amount requested which was allocated to the large and medium firms on the one hand and to the small firms on the other hand.

In terms of number of participants in these programs small business firms range from 28 percent, in the case of freight cars, to 86 percent in the case of the steel house program. In the case of six programs, 75 percent or more of the participating firms are classified as small business.

The tonnage going to small firms varies from 7 percent in the case of the anthracite program to 29 percent in the case of pig iron for housing products.

In the case of three programs small business received a larger proportion of the amount requested than did large or medium firms. In the case of four programs small firms received a somewhat smaller proportion of what they requested than did large or medium firms. In the case of three other programs the proportion was virtually the same.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, or would he rather wait until the end of his statement?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should rather wait until I have concluded, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. President, I ask that the table to which I have just been referring also be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the committee heard two witnesses, representatives of small firms receiving steel under the tank and oil-field production-equipment program, who testified as to the benefits they had received under the program, as well as the benefits of the program to the oil industry.

It appeared, therefore, that while the plans are designed to carry out programs essential to the domestic economy and the national security rather than specifically to assist small business as such, full consideration is being given to small business in the formulation of these voluntary plans and in their operation, and that many small firms have been benefited greatly by the operations of the program.

The voluntary agreements promulgated by the Department of Commerce provide, in accordance with the law, that they terminate on or before March 1,

1949. In accordance with a ruling of the Attorney General, however, provisions have been made for a wind-up period of 6 months under section 2 (f) of the law. This wind-up period is of limited effectiveness, as no amendments or modifications can be made during that period. This would reduce substantially the benefits of the existing plans. Furthermore, no new plans can be entered into under this provision, and it would be impossible even to consider the pending proposals for the Economic Cooperation Administration for municipal programs and for increased assistance for housing and the armed services.

I am advised that a broader stabilization program will be submitted to the Congress. Pending consideration of this broader program, the proposed temporary extension of section 2 of Public Law 395 should be promptly enacted in order that the important benefits of the voluntary program to the domestic economy, the national security, and the foreign policy of the United States may be preserved.

EXHIBIT 1

TITLE 15—COMMERCE

SUBTITLE A—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Part 11—Organization and functions of the Office of the Secretary

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS

Sec. 11.11. Voluntary agreements under Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress—(a) Consultation with industry and the public under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress: Under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, the President is authorized to consult representatives of business and agriculture with a view to making certain voluntary agreements and to approve and request compliance with such agreements. Executive Order 9919 (13 F. R. 59) delegates this authority to various officials, including the Secretary of Commerce. This Executive order also provides that consultation with industry may be through representative industry advisory committees and that an opportunity shall be given to industry, labor, and the public generally to present their views with reference to a proposed agreement or plan.

(b) Organization of industry advisory committees: As the purpose of industry advisory committees formed under this section is to give advice to the Department of Commerce on proposed voluntary agreements and plans affecting an industry, their members are selected so as to assure that the advice so obtained will represent the viewpoint of all parts of the industry. The committees are formed of representatives of the minimum number of companies necessary to represent a fair cross section of the industry from the standpoints of (1) large, medium, and small companies; (2) geographical distribution; (3) trade-association membership; and (4) segments in the industry (types of products, degree of integration, etc.). In forming industry advisory committees, the Department of Commerce will be governed by the principles of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 (80th Cong.), and the President's memorandum to heads of executive departments and agencies of December 12, 1947, with respect to the representation of small business on Government committees (appendix A attached). To promote free discussion, different levels of production and distribution are generally represented by

separate industry advisory committees consisting of customers and suppliers. The membership of industry advisory committees is checked with compliance proceedings of the Department of Commerce in accordance with the policy of suspending or removing from the committee members who are found in violation of Department of Commerce orders and regulations. Members of committees pay their own expenses and are entitled to no compensation for their services as committee members.

(c) Functions of industry advisory committees: The functions of an industry advisory committee formed by the Department of Commerce under this section are to furnish information, to give advice, and to make recommendations to the Department of Commerce, at regular committee meetings, on problems affecting the industry either in connection with the formulation of a proposed voluntary agreement or plan or in connection with an existing voluntary agreement or plan. In order to eliminate any question as to the propriety of the activities of these industry advisory committees under the antitrust laws, the activities of these committees are limited strictly to those specified (see the Attorney General's letter of January 29, 1948; appendix B). No other activities by these industry advisory committees or by their members are sponsored or authorized by the Department of Commerce under this section. These industry advisory committees are not authorized to determine policies for the industry nor are they authorized to compel or coerce any person to enter into any voluntary agreement or plan or to compel or coerce any person to comply with any request or order made by the Department of Commerce.

(d) Industry advisory committee meetings: Industry advisory committee meetings will be called by the Department of Commerce when a voluntary agreement or plan is under consideration or at any other time when the advice of an affected industry is appropriate in connection with a voluntary agreement or plan. The agenda of the meeting will be prepared by the Department of Commerce. Representatives of interested agencies of the Government will be invited by the Department of Commerce. If a member of a committee is unable to attend a meeting, he may suggest the name of another representative of the same organization to serve as his alternate for that meeting, and as a general rule the Department of Commerce will invite the suggested alternate to that meeting. A representative of the Department of Commerce will preside at every committee meeting. The Department of Commerce will keep minutes of each meeting, and will make summaries available to members of the committee, and the industry and the trade press, and will issue press releases concerning the meeting.

(e) Hearings on proposed agreements and plans: In order to carry out the requirement of Executive Order 9919 that an opportunity shall be given to industry, labor, and the public generally to present their views with respect to a proposed agreement or plan, the Department of Commerce has adopted the policy of holding a public hearing at which such views may be presented. Notice of such a hearing will be given by publication in the Federal Register, by press release, and by any other method considered appropriate by the Department of Commerce. The notice will include a statement of the time, place, and nature of the hearing, and either the substance of the proposed plan or agreement or a description of the subjects and issues involved. The notice will ordinarily provide that persons who desire to participate in the hearing must file in advance a written notice of appearance and

that persons failing to file such written notice in advance will not be heard unless good cause is shown. The scope, time, or place of a hearing for which notice has been given may be changed when necessary. Reasonable notice will be given of the hearing and of any changes. Ordinarily the time set will not be less than 10 days nor more than 15 days from the publication in the Federal Register of the notice of hearing. The hearing will be conducted by an official of the Department of Commerce as hearing officer. The hearing officer will regulate the course of the hearing, including the order in which statements may be presented and the length of time to be allowed for making oral statements. He may adjourn or continue the hearing to a later date or different place and will receive written statements and memoranda at the hearing or within such time after the hearing as he may determine. Such statements and memoranda should be filed in triplicate. The hearing will be informal in nature. A stenographic transcript or summary will be made of the proceedings. After the close of the hearing, the hearing officer will prepare and file a report with the Secretary's office summarizing the statements made at the hearing and will file with his report all written statements presented in connection with the hearing.

(f) Requests for compliance with voluntary agreements and plans: When a proposed voluntary agreement or plan under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, has been formulated by the Department of Commerce with the advice of the appropriate industry advisory committee or committees and after a public hearing has been held, the Secretary of Commerce may forward his favorable recommendation of the proposed agreement or plan to the Attorney General for the latter's approval, together with the statement of facts required by Executive Order 9919. If the Attorney General approves the agreement or plan the Secretary of Commerce, upon giving his final approval, will make written request to carry out and comply with the agreement or plan to each concern which is to take action under it. The agreement or plan and the requests will be published in the Federal Register and forwarded to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Attorney General in accordance with Public Law 395. (Pub. Law 395, 80th Cong., Executive Order 9919, Jan. 3, 1948, 13 F. R. 59.)

Issued this 30th day of January 1948.

[SEAL]

W. A. HARRIMAN,
Secretary of Commerce.

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM TO THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND ESTABLISHMENTS

Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 (80th Cong.) provided

"That the Congress recognize the valid claim of the small-business men of America to equal representation as an entity with labor, agriculture, and other groups, on those Government commissions, boards, committees, or other agencies in which the interests of the American economy may be affected; and that the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, and other officers of the Government be, and hereby are, respectfully urged to accord the small-business men of America representation on such Government agencies including particularly policy-making bodies created by Executive appointment."

In determining whether a business is a small business for the purpose of this resolution, the appointing agency should consider the relative size and position of the

business in relation to the industry, the nature of its area of operation, the size of the group supplying capital and holding ownership and control, and the independence of its management.

As an alternative guiding principle for the appointing agency, a business may be considered a small business if it is a business enterprise, or a group of business enterprises under common ownership or control, which is not dominant in its field and which:

(a) If a manufacturing enterprise, has 100 employees or less; or

(b) If a wholesale establishment, has less than \$500,000 annual net sales volume; or

(c) If a retail, service, hotel, amusement, construction, or other enterprise not included under (a) or (b), has annual net sales or receipts of less than \$100,000; or

(d) If engaged in two or more separate types of businesses, does not exceed the maximum applicable under either (a), (b), or (c) to any of such businesses.

The heads of the executive departments and establishments should bear in mind the will of Congress as shown by this resolution when asking appointments to commissions, boards, committees, and other agencies in which the interests of the American economy may be affected.

The appointment of representatives of small business should be made in such a manner as to provide the small-business man an equal opportunity for representation along with labor, agriculture, and other groups on those Government commissions,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

December 12, 1947.

APPENDIX B

JANUARY 29, 1948.

HON. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN,
Secretary, Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY HARRIMAN: I have received the annexed procedures, which you propose to adopt in connection with the operations of the Department of Commerce under Public Law 395 and Executive Order 9919.

In my opinion, the procedures which you propose are appropriate under Public Law 395 and Executive Order 9919. Under such procedures the functions of industry advisory committees are limited to the furnishing of information and advice to your Department in connection with proposed voluntary plans and agreements and related matters at regular committee meetings. Such committees do not have any authority to determine policies for the industry. Neither the committees nor any of their members have authority to compel or coerce any person to enter into a voluntary plan or agreement or to compel or coerce any person to comply with any request or order made by the Department of Commerce.

I wish to advise you that the activities of industry advisory committees in conformity with your proposed procedures and within the limitations contained therein would not constitute a violation of the Federal antitrust laws. I believe it would be appropriate, however, to make clear to any persons whom you appoint as members of an industry advisory committee that their membership on such committee does not create any immunity under the Federal antitrust laws for any other activities which might be in contravention of those laws.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.

(13 Federal Register 495)

EXHIBIT 2

Approximate small-business participation in certain voluntary programs

Program allocation	Number of consumer participants			Allocations made (monthly unless otherwise noted)				Allocations requested (monthly unless otherwise noted)			
	Number of large and medium firms	Number of small firms	Percent of small firms	Tons	Tonnage to large and medium firms	Percent of tonnage to small firms	Tonnage to small firms	Tonnage requests, large and medium firms	Tonnage requests, small firms	Percent of requests allocated to large and medium firms	Percent of requests allocated to small firms
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Steel houses.....	1	6	86	1 53,415	42,395	21	11,020	79,600	15,451	53	71
Tank and oil-field production equipment.....	6	18	75	18,530	14,469	22	4,061	18,492	4,467	75	90
Warm-air heating.....	74	268	78	1 238,364	173,812	28	64,552	347,956	133,056	50	40
Anthracite.....	24	31	56	2,570	2,232	7	164	2,232	164	100	100
Mining machinery.....	51	79	61	26,400	22,430	15	3,865	23,767	4,500	94	86
Housing products (pig iron).....	20	88	81	103,730	73,195	29	30,535	104,937	51,409	70	60
Freight cars.....	183	72	28	247,980	224,886	9	23,094	280,574	26,523	80	87
Barges.....	18	70	80	24,760	20,818	16	3,942	29,465	2 6,745	71	58
Tankers.....	9	10	53	40,380	34,745	14	5,772	36,024	5,983	96	96
Merchant vessels.....	7	22	75	15,415	11,882	23	3,533	12,621	3,795	94	93

¹ Cumulative tonnage for program period.

² Tonnage applications were excessive in comparison with actual orders on hand by some small firms.

³ Figures shown combine new construction firms and repair firms.

⁴ Data combined for repair, reconstruction, and reconversion.

Source: Department of Commerce, Office of Industry Cooperation, Jan. 27, 1949.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to Senate bill 547. I move to strike out "September 30, 1949", in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof "March 31, 1950"; to strike out "September 30, 1949", in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof "March 31, 1950."

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendments is to continue the voluntary allocation controls for a full year from the expiration date of the present law. Senate bill 547 would continue them for a period of 6 months. Under the bill there could be an end of the program 6 months after the expiration of the authority to enter into the voluntary agreements.

When this matter was under consideration at the last session there was skepticism as to whether or not the plan would work. It was generally understood that the most imperative need was in the field of steel and steel production, the allocation of steel to various starved industries which were dependent upon steel in the fabrication and foundry business.

At the hearing on Senate bill 547 the Secretary of Commerce came before the committee and brought to our attention the fact that the voluntary allocation program has been working very effectively; that the Department is satisfied with the cooperation of industry, which was generally entered into the program; that the only program they have put into effect has been in the steel industry, that they are now studying the aluminum industry, the production and distribution of aluminum, to determine whether there is a desire or any need for the program in that field. Generally conditions have improved throughout the country, prices have come down, production has increased, and the result is that the only program put into effect has been in the steel industry.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Commerce testified that there is need for continuing the program as long as there is a shortage of steel. His figures were to the effect that this year there would be a shortage of 7,000,000 tons of production

under demand in this country, taking into consideration the need for 4,200,000 tons in the export field.

Representatives from small business also came before our committee, particularly from the outlying sections of the country and the far West, which before this program was put into effect had been practically starved out of the field of steel production and steel processing. They testified that the voluntary allocation program under the Department of Commerce, administered through the industry generally, has been very effective, and as the result of the program they have had sufficient steel to establish or reestablish themselves in business and continue their production effectively.

The bill, S. 547, would continue the authority for a period of only 6 months. My amendment would continue the authority for a period of 1 year. At that time, March 31, 1950, the Congress will be in session. We would have the advantage of another year of production. We would then be in a position to know whether prices have actually stabilized, as it is indicated at the present time they are going to stabilize. We would know then what world needs might be.

As an indication of the fluctuations in the world's demands for steel in the past few years, it was estimated 2 years ago that there would be a need for 6,600,000 tons for the past year, 1948. The demand for steel in the export field dropped from the 6,600,000 tons in the year 1947 to 4,400,000 tons in 1948. The Department of Commerce estimated that there would be a need in the export field of only 4,200,000 tons in 1949. The production in Europe, in the Ruhr, in France, in Belgium and in England, is such as to give encouragement that the export need for the year 1949 will be even less than the figure of 4,400,000 tons estimated by the Secretary of Commerce.

With respect to the steel production in this country, some very significant facts are now apparent in the record to indicate that the steel industry may be able this year to meet practically the total demand not only in this country but for ex-

port purposes as well. The Secretary of Commerce, as I have stated, testified that there is a gap of 7,000,000 tons. His production figures were based upon an increase this year of 2,300,000 tons, as I recall. The industry generally believes—and these are the figures from the Steel Institute—that there will be an increase in steel production in this country this year of between three and four million tons if there is uninterrupted production. Of course the only thing that will interrupt the production of the steel mills which are now operating at actual capacity will be something in the nature of a strike, or may be the cutting off of the manganese supply without replacement of it, as is threatened at the present time. But in the absence of those factors entering into the full production program in 1949, the Steel Institute estimates that the steel industry will be able to produce steel ingots to the total capacity of 92,000,000 tons, and if the January production, for which we already have the records, shall be continued throughout the year, there will be a total production of 97,000,000 tons of steel ingots, an unprecedented production in the steel industry for all time.

Compare that with 1948. In 1948, 88,533,729 tons of steel were produced, as against 92,000,000 tons anticipated in 1949. There were 60,848,000 tons of pig iron produced in 1948, as against an estimated 68,000,000 tons this year, if there is uninterrupted production in the steel field. So we can look forward, I think, to a production that will within a year's time meet the demands generally, domestically and in the foreign field.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that by the end of the year there will be proof that there is no need for any compulsory controls, such as suggested in the committee, such as has been suggested by the administration, and that at the end of the year it will be perfectly apparent, if the present program of production is continued, if the present world-wide trend continues, and if increased production in foreign countries, in which there is the most imperative demand, con-

tinues as it is at the present time—and we have no reason to think that it will not continue—that by the end of the coming year, or by March 31, 1950, there will be no need at all for any kind of controls, either voluntary or compulsory.

So with that in mind, and with the Secretary of Commerce, the representatives of small business, and the administrator of the program testifying fully as to adequacy of voluntary allocation and its success in the field, I think that we in the Congress should continue the present arrangement for another year, until the Congress is in session, and that we may then take a look at the whole field of production and of world-wide demand, as well as the domestic demand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio one question. He said that the supply of steel might be stopped in two ways; first, by labor difficulties and, second, by shortage of raw material. Would the Senator be willing to go a little more in detail into the second phase, the possible shortage of raw material?

Mr. BRICKER. The raw material involved is manganese, and we are threatened at the present time with a cutting off of the supply from Russia. The supply coming from Russia is approximately 25 percent of the need for manganese in the country for the finished products. There are adequate supplies available in other places. It is a question whether they can be made available soon enough if the supply from Russia is cut off; whether there may be a slowing down or a drag on the production of steel between the time Russian supplies may be stopped and arrangements can be made, with the aid of the Government, to furnish an adequate and timely replacement of the Russian shipments if they should be cut off.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say in addition to my previous statement that the committee held hearings on the pending legislation only on the point of whether the voluntary arrangement should be extended through September 30. No hearings were held by the committee respecting whether the arrangement should be carried on for another 15 months. As the Senate well knows, the Department of Justice is concerned about this matter. The Tariff Act is also affected by it. Many other factors are involved in the subject. When we gave notice of public hearings on Senate bill 547 it was with the distinct understanding that the arrangement was only to be continued through September of this year. Had there been a suggestion of further extension, other witnesses might have appeared and testified on that point. Other testimony, no doubt, would have been made with respect to the matter.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I merely wish to ask a question. I notice in the report of the committee the following sentence:

The committee finds that the existing voluntary plans have provided substantial benefits to the national interests.

That is a very conservative statement of what has been repeated here by the distinguished Senator from Ohio in wholehearted support of the continuance of this particular method of dealing with allocations. What I should like to ask my distinguished friend from South Carolina is whether or not any witness who appeared testified in any way that these voluntary allocations were not adequately and successfully meeting the situation? Was there any opposition to the extension of this method of allocation?

Mr. MAYBANK. There was no opposition to the extension of these allocations through September 30, but no one was asked a question as to extension of the program beyond that date. There was nothing but favorable comment respecting the voluntary allocations. I agree with the Senator from Ohio when he says that all those who testified had only the kindest word to say respecting the steel companies themselves and the voluntary plans in which they participated. There was one point brought out respecting fraud, a case which the Government is now prosecuting in New York, in connection with other things that might be taken up by the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice is investigating the matter. No one, however, testified against the voluntary allocations. I wish to reiterate that no one testified respecting the extension of the voluntary allocations beyond September 30. The meeting was called for the sole purpose of discussing the advisability of extending the voluntary allocations to that date.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The voluntary allocations have been in force or in operation for more than a year. The provisions of the law are more than a year old. Can the Senator enlighten me, why, if the voluntary operations have worked as well as they have until now, there is something peculiar and mystical about the date, September 30, beyond which the operation should not be extended? Can the Senator state what those circumstances are?

Mr. MAYBANK. I can easily answer that. The majority of the committee felt that the committee should have an open mind and hear representatives of business firms and of the various departments, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and others, and then we should make up our minds whether or not these agreements should be continued, or whether other amendments to the bill should be offered. The administration believes that if these voluntary allocations are to be continued, they should be continued for 2 years, and not for 1 year. We should

not have to go through all this again next January.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that these agreements ought to be extended for 2 years?

Mr. MAYBANK. The administration believes that these voluntary agreements, along with other agreements which are now being prepared, should be extended for 2 years.

Mr. BALDWIN. Why do we not cross that bridge now?

Mr. MAYBANK. We have had no hearings.

Mr. BALDWIN. The fact remains, does it not, that this program, laid down in the Eightieth Congress in December 1947, really has worked adequately and successfully? Is not that a fact?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should say that it has worked successfully in the case of steel. I would not say that it has worked successfully in other fields. The agreements are purely voluntary. The steel companies did a good job in their voluntary agreements. However, there are other fields which the administration wishes to consider—for example, aluminum, copper, zinc, and other products.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, the pending bill picks up section 2 of the anti-inflation act which was passed by the Eightieth Congress, and seeks to have it continued.

Mr. MAYBANK. Through September 30.

Mr. BALDWIN. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio would continue it for a year.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. It has already been in operation for a year; and all the testimony before the committee indicated that it has worked successfully. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. The Congress did a good job in enacting that legislation, and the administration and the executive departments have done an excellent job with business and industry.

Mr. BALDWIN. So the program has been an unqualified success to date.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should say so, but only insofar as the voluntary agreements are concerned, and insofar as those who were under such voluntary agreements are concerned. But the program is limited entirely to those who are willing to enter into such agreements.

Mr. BALDWIN. The voluntary agreements apply not only to steel but to other metals as well and to other shortages.

Mr. MAYBANK. They apply to some, for example, aluminum, manganese, zinc, and copper. I believe there is a list of approximately 20 products.

Mr. BALDWIN. So far as the other items are concerned, the voluntary allocation plan is working well, is it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator that, as I understood the testimony, other agreements, such as that relating to aluminum and other items have not yet been worked out or agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN. But they are in process.

Mr. MAYBANK. They are in the discussion stage; but they have not been concluded.

Mr. BALDWIN. The section which the Senator seeks to continue is section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act which was passed in the Eightieth Congress, in December 1947.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, neither the committee nor the administration is yet prepared to present to the present Congress any anti-inflationary measures other than those contained in this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not say that. The administration has been working on the problem for some time. Certain proposals will be presented by Senators on this side of the aisle, and perhaps other proposals will be presented by Senators on the other side of the aisle. I cannot say exactly when these proposals will be introduced, but it will be very shortly, perhaps in a week. We cannot do everything all at once. Congress has been in session for less than a month. We must consult the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and others.

Mr. BALDWIN. I remind my distinguished friend that the President of the United States suggested that we should deal with this and 17 other measures in 2 weeks. We have already been in session for 4 weeks. It is true, is it not, that so far as the administration is concerned, or so far as any of the Federal departments or agencies are concerned, they are not prepared with any anti-inflationary program other than the continuation of a measure which was enacted in a Republican-controlled Congress in December 1947. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Unfortunately the administration has to go into what the Republicans did in the Eightieth Congress, and it takes a little longer, perhaps, to suggest some undoing in order to better the legislation.

Mr. BALDWIN. I will say to my distinguished friend that I understood that he and his colleagues had all the answers last fall in the campaign, and that this problem was to be taken care of immediately.

Mr. MAYBANK. We had the answers, but we did not expect to undo in 30 days everything the Eightieth Congress did.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator is not trying to undo something. He is asking that it be continued.

Mr. MAYBANK. We are asking that the program be continued for a few months, until we can handle the problem properly.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator from South Carolina recall that Mr. Clark, representing Secretary Sawyer, stated, in answer to a question of mine, that if the Congress saw fit to extend the voluntary control system beyond the limitation date suggested by the Secretary, no harm of any kind would result?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not prepared to testify for Mr. Clark. I am not questioning the Senator's statement at all.

The record may show that. I know that Mr. Clark stated that they would not object. It is understandable that a bureaucrat, or anybody connected with a bureau, is not going to object to the enactment by Congress of a law extending its powers, and which he feels is doing a good job.

Mr. CAIN. If I may be so bold as to suggest it, the question was more important than that. It was obvious to some of us that Mr. Clark and Secretary Sawyer simply had not given much consideration to a longer period of extension than was recommended by the Secretary, and he quite honestly said, "If that is what the Congress wants to do, it will give us no cause for concern."

I should like to be of assistance to the thinking of all Members of the Senate. Let me refer for a moment to page 3 of the hearings, and to a comment made in conclusion by Secretary Sawyer in his testimony. Secretary Sawyer said:

In conclusion, I feel that the voluntary program, while not the complete solution to our stabilization problems, has been successful so far in overcoming many of the problems arising from shortages of goods and facilities and in contributing to mitigating inflationary pressures. Consequently, I will urge a longer-term continuation of the program when the broader stabilization program is presented to the Congress. Until that program is presented and acted upon, I believe that the current voluntary program should be kept on a going basis, and, for that purpose, strongly recommend prompt enactment of S. 547.

We, as members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, listened to Mr. Sawyer and were impressed by what he said, namely, that this voluntary system was working well. During the remainder of the day we listened to representatives of industry who stated that the plan had meant the difference between failure and success so far as they were concerned. They were most complimentary. So quite naturally we raised the question, Why should we jeopardize a good thing through a termination date which, logically enough, should be further in the future than the administration has recommended?

We want to cooperate with Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Clark, and the administration. Mr. Sawyer said that in due time—he could not answer the question as to when—recommendations for continuing voluntary agreements would be presented to the Congress.

I join with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] in thinking that we would be doing ourselves and the Nation a service by extending these agreements reasonably beyond the limitation of extension suggested by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from Washington read and quoted is exactly what I said. Secretary Sawyer testified in favor of Senate bill 547. It provides the September 30, 1949, date.

Mr. President, this matter concerns not only the Department of Commerce, but it concerns the Department of Justice. It concerns the oil allocations under the Department of the Interior. It concerns the Department of Agriculture. Those

agencies must meet and combine their views, if the plan is to be a success.

A present distinguished Member of this body was formerly Secretary of Agriculture and served as such when this plan was in operation. He will bear me out in saying that the plan has not worked in agriculture. It has worked in the Department of Commerce in connection with the steel allocation program; but the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] knows it has not operated successfully in agriculture.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I do not know that we are bound by the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce in favor of the proposal, or that we are bound to conclude that the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce in favor of a 6 months' extension was an argument against a year's extension. He testified very clearly, I feel, that the voluntary program has been successful so far in overcoming many of the problems arising from shortages of goods and facilities, and in contributing to mitigating inflationary pressures. He also testified that there are investigations proceeding in other fields of production, as well as in the field of steel production, looking toward putting into effect a voluntary allocations program, if it is shown to be needed.

Mr. President, the extension time now proposed is not sufficient to take care of such investigation and to permit the program to be put into effect. We have the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce and the testimony of Mr. Clark, who is in charge of this program, the testimony of representatives of small business, who are extremely well satisfied with the operation of the program, and the testimony of witnesses from the oil fields that already there is an adequate supply of pipe and drilling material for the needs of the industry this year. That includes, because we expressly asked the question of the representatives of the industry in Texas and Oklahoma, the industry located there, which has tremendously increased its capacity in the last year. At the same time there is an application before the RFC for a loan of \$65,000,000 to expand a steel production plant at Daingerfield, Tex. The testimony at the hearings was that already there is an adequate supply of steel products to take care of the needs in the great production areas in Texas and Oklahoma.

It was only toward the end of the last day of the hearings that it became apparent that the steel industry, within a year—and I think the figures thoroughly support this statement—will be able to meet the demands domestically and in the export field. As a result of that testimony and the statement by Mr. Clark that no damage would be done, I thought it would be advisable to provide a further extension. The only argument against the plan is that probably there would be a desire to have the present Congress put into effect a compulsory program of some kind. I wish to say here and now that I am confident that a majority of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, do not expect or anticipate a compulsory program, and do not expect to vote for one.

So we might as well face the issue, as it became apparent in the hearings, that a year's extension will be sufficient to take care of the need, and by the end of that time the steel supply will be adequate.

Congress will be in session on March 31 of next year, and then will be able to face the issue again. By that time we shall have the experience of a whole year's production and demand, and we shall be able to ascertain the needs of the country before we pass upon the matter at that time.

The program has been working well. It is continuing to work. There is no opposition to a year's extension.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that the steel industry has done a fairly good job. I wish to say to him further that when a proposal for a compulsory program comes up, there will be hearings and debate. No one knows what prices will be in the next few months, and no one knows what the armed services and the plants at Oak Ridge will need in the way of steel in the next few months.

So I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. I still do not quite understand all the arguments for and against the different provisions.

If the extension is desired to run for a full year, instead of 7 months, is there any way the Senator from South Carolina knows by which the steel companies could continue the extension of time 5 months beyond the time proposed in the bill? I still do not see the difference between a 12 months' and a 7 months' extension of time. There must be some reason back of the proposal for an additional 5 months, and I should like to know what it is.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is no reason back of it, except it had been hoped the Congress would extend the present law for a few months until a complete study, through the Banking and Currency Committee, could be made of all legislation along these lines.

Mr. AIKEN. Why was the September 30 date taken?

Mr. MAYBANK. Because, as was explained to those of us on the committee, it seems that various firms make their business and earnings, statements, and reports on a quarterly basis. The September 30 date was taken merely because that is the nearest date to the ending period of the business concerns which make quarterly statements.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked the question for the reason that it seems possible that Congress may not be in session at that time. I think all of us hope it will not be in session then.

Mr. MAYBANK. That date was taken for the benefit of the various businesses and industries concerned. I may add that the Committee on Banking and Currency will have ample opportunity to consider other legislation along these lines before the end of this session.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as a part of the debate, I think Senators will be interested in an article on the steel industry which is pertinent to the discussion. It

appeared in yesterday's New York Times. The article is by Thomas E. Mullaney, and the heading reads: "Demand for Steel Is Seen Dwindling—Cancellations are occurring and placement of any new orders is slackening."

I think all of us will have a deep concern as to the validity of such comments, so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEMAND FOR STEEL IS SEEN DWINDLING—CANCELLATIONS ARE OCCURRING AND PLACEMENT OF ANY NEW ORDERS IS SLACKENING

(By Thomas E. Mullaney)

Although high-level steel operations will be required of the Nation's mills for several months yet, the end of the acute postwar shortage of steel is in sight, several of the industry's leaders intimated last week after releasing their 1948 financial statements.

Steel executives say that demand and supply for steel products, except pipes and tubes and a few other items, may be balanced fairly well in 6 months. Some members of the industry are even beginning to wonder whether too much, rather than too little, steel capacity has been installed during the 41 months since the end of World War II.

These statements on the steel outlook were the most important development emanating from last week's quarterly meetings of steel company directors. Also significant, however, were the record profits for 1948 reported by many companies of the industry and the proposed three-for-one split of the common stock of the United States Steel Corp.

Up to now, the steel industry had seen only prospects for maximum operations for an indefinite period. Record tonnages of steel were being produced and yet backlogs of unfilled orders seemed to be increasing. Now, however, the backlogs are dwindling, order cancellations are occurring and the placement of new orders is at a slower pace.

PUNGENT VIEW BY GRACE

E. G. Grace, chairman of the Bethlehem Steel Corp. and one of the top steel officials of the country for many decades, made the most pungent observations on the steel-supply picture.

"There isn't any question but that there is a softening in many lines for steel," he said. "The household-goods lines are filled to the gunwales. There have been even some important cancellations of steel orders recently in both the capital-goods and the consumer-goods fields."

It is understood, for instance, that the demand for steel by oil-well drilling-equipment manufacturers has subsided somewhat. The demand for steel for shipbuilding and ship repair work is also considerably smaller as is the pressure for fabricated structural steel.

Mr. Grace said that his company would have full steel production schedules until the middle of 1949, but he refused to make any predictions beyond that. He also remarked that he considers steel supply and demand in "very good order right now" and indicated actual demand for steel "has been very much padded."

The head of the Nation's second largest steel company also disagreed with an estimate of the Department of Commerce that the shortage of steel at the end of 1949 would be some 7,000,000 tons.

Irving S. Olds, chairman of United States Steel, also disclosed a slackening in steel demand, but his statement was more conservative. United States Steel, the Nation's largest producer, now holds a volume of unfilled

orders equal to "4 or 5 months' operations at the present rate," he said. In previous quarters, the estimate had been "5 or 6 months."

Another steel official likened the current situation to the 1920-21 period. He pointed out that in the middle of 1920 steel was still riding high on the crest of postwar orders from the peacetime economy—from the construction, automotive, and railroad industries. Orders vanished almost overnight, he added, and the industry did not get back to its former levels until 1925.

The records show that in 1920 the domestic steel industry produced 47,188,886 net tons of raw steel from operations averaging 75.7 percent of capacity. In August of that year, however, United States Steel noted a decline of 313,430 tons in its future business.

At that time, the decrease was ascribed to the following reasons: (1) New business was not coming in as rapidly as ordinarily because of uncertainty over prices for the following year; (2) shipments were moving faster because of the improved supply of freight cars; and (3) orders were being canceled, principally from the automotive companies. A little later, higher steel production in Europe reduced the need for American steel in foreign countries.

Today, steel orders are declining because many consumer lines are being filled, earlier estimates of steel demands in certain lines have proven to be inflated, and steel production in foreign countries is expanding rapidly.

It was in 1921 that the post-World War I bust came for the steel industry here. Companies such as Bethlehem Steel saw their operations decline to levels even below 20 percent of capacity, and the whole domestic industry operated at only 34.5 percent of capacity in turning out 22,157,853 tons. It was the worst steel-production year since 1905.

It is doubtful whether so drastic a transition would occur in this era, but the domestic industry is eyeing the situation closely and warning persistently against rash over-expansion of steel facilities, as some Government officials have been advocating.

With respect to steel earnings last year, the industry considers them only fair because of the decreased purchasing power of the dollar. Most companies reported record earnings for the year, but, because of heavy requirements for their expansion programs, much of the earnings had to be reinvested in the business.

The generous dividend action and proposed common-stock split-up of United States Steel has attracted considerable speculation in financial circles. The stock division will give broader distribution to the stock, as the company announced was its intention. But one observer wondered whether the dividend action and the plan for the split might not be the prelude to some new financing. Bethlehem Steel took similar stock action at the end of 1947 and then successfully accomplished \$70,000,000 of stock and bond financing within a year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope Senators will study the article. It bears out what I have been saying, namely, that no one really knows what will happen between now and September. So why extend this plan for a full year? Let us first have the benefit of the experience of the next few months.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator asks why we should extend it beyond the date recommended by the administration. I think there is a good reason for doing so. Admittedly we are concerned about a good many features of the steel industry and other industries, but we are certain that the voluntary allocations system has been and is working well.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the case of steel,

Mr. CAIN. Yes; in the case of steel. With reference to that problem, there can be no possible harm, it seems to some of us, in extending the program into the future. If in the meantime we should find good, sound reasons for improving upon the legislation, I know of no reason why that could not be accomplished through an amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, or I am glad to yield the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. I simply wish to inquire whether there is any presumption of difficulty whatever in connection with extending for 13 months the date of this admittedly good arrangement, in view of the fact that the Senate can at any time between now and the end of this session modify the bill in any way it pleases. Is it not true that back of the proposal to shorten it to a 7 months' period is the presumption that there is something wrong with it? Is not that the presumption?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I do not think there is anything wrong with it, or is any presumption implied by the 7-month extension or compared with a 13-month extension. Just as the Congress could pass a 15 months' extension, and then cut it down, so the present Congress can pass an extension to September 30 and continue it for another year after September 30. If we want to extend the plan to June or July, that can be done. It works both ways.

Mr. FLANDERS. The question, it would seem to me, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina, is that, nevertheless, there remains a presumption unfavorable to the present working of the program. Is it quite 50-50 whether we extend and shorten, on the one hand, or whether we shorten and extend, on the other? It would seem to me, I may say to the Senator, that he introduced into this proposal an unfavorable presumption not warranted by the testimony.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only say to the Senator with respect to the 50-50 proposition to which I referred, as to whether it is extended for 13 months and is then cut down, or whether it is cut down to 6 months or 7 months, and later extended, we should keep in mind that the bill S. 547 extended the program only to September 30 of this year as it was introduced in the Senate. Hearings were conducted and the newspapers throughout the country carried accounts that the plan was to be extended by that bill only until September 30. There was never a word of testimony by qualified witnesses that we should extend voluntary agreements for 1 year. The Department of Justice, charged with enforcement of the antitrust laws, was not consulted about it. Neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Interior Department appeared. In the hearings I distinctly stated that the Secretary of Commerce told me he had discussed with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and with the Attorney General himself the question of the agree-

ments, and that the Attorney General had agreed upon the date of September 30.

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

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut, who has been waiting some time.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator was on the floor on December 17, 1947, as I recall, when we were debating the previous bill. Does the Senator recall that at that particular time the distinguished minority leader, the present Vice President of the United States, offered an amendment calling for compulsory controls? Does the Senator from South Carolina recall that?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall have to refresh my memory.

Mr. BALDWIN. My question is, Why is it, if that particular provision was so good at that time, that it is not offered now, instead of asking a continuance of the Republican control measure? Of course, the measure is working better than the compulsory method would have worked.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only answer the Senator's question as I did before, that it is going to take the Democrats a long time to undo some of the Republican measures enacted during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. I might remind my distinguished friend that in that day and time, December 17, they were here with an amendment that they said would provide adequately for the situation. Let me quote from what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky at that time said. Today, it has added authority to what it had then, because he is now Vice President of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to yield for a question, but if anyone wants to make a speech I shall be glad to yield him the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I again press my question, which is, why is it that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky when he was minority leader, which was represented at that time as something that would adequately take care of the situation, and in the place of this voluntary plan, is not offered now?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am not here to speak for the distinguished former Senator from Kentucky, who is now the distinguished Vice President of the United States and the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I feel certain that if he were still the majority leader, he could answer that question.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from South Carolina obviously has several reasons

for opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have three reasons.

Mr. CAIN. But it seems to me that the Senator's primary reason for objecting to the proposal is that he thinks, because there were no hearings with respect to any date other than the date recommended by the administration, we should adhere to the date recommended by the administration. Is that true?

Mr. MAYBANK. Not only that. I shall be perfectly frank with my friend from Washington in saying that was one of the reasons, but as I said in the committee, I had other reasons. We ought to keep the matter open. We ought to keep an open mind about it in deference to the people who on November 2 overwhelmingly chose Mr. Truman as President and Mr. Barkley as Vice President.

Mr. CAIN. But I may say in answer to the Senator's first proposition—

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want the Senator from Washington to understand for one moment that I have any controls in mind. I have only an open mind. All I want to know is what is proposed, and all I want to know is that I may be my own judge, in my own mind, of what is in the interest of my people.

Mr. CAIN. I think this question is fundamentally important. I assume from the Senator's opposition to this particular date that he conceives that whenever the administration, on a proposed piece of legislation, recommends a date, it must necessarily follow that that is the only date we can use.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator suggests an inference. I am sure he did not mean, if the administration were to send a measure to the Congress containing a certain date, that I would follow it blindly.

Mr. CAIN. Not the Senator; no.

Mr. MAYBANK. Because I never did and never intend to do such a thing.

Mr. CAIN. No, not the Senator from South Carolina personally; but I refer to his objection to the date, because we did not have hearings on any other date. I think my contention is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, because, as the Senator knows, I stated very definitely at the meeting that the Secretary of Commerce had told me he and the Attorney General had agreed on this date, in order that they might make a further study in the Justice Department in connection with antitrust suits, and the New York case, which is undergoing prosecution.

Mr. CAIN. But the Senator from South Carolina would agree that if the Senate saw fit to determine a different date, the Senate would have the perfectly sound ground, in its legislation, to call for any date it saw fit, would he not?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, to conclude my remarks in regard to the 1-year extension, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on January 19.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator, if he will permit me to do so, I shall yield the floor to him,

since I stated I would yield only for a question otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield the floor, unless the Senator has a question.

Mr. BRICKER. No, I have no questions.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish merely to conclude my remarks in regard to the matter by the insertion of this editorial in the RECORD:

No one, probably, would say that the allocations system has worked out perfectly or to the satisfaction of everyone. But, as Secretary Sawyer observes, it "has been successful within the limits inherent in any voluntary program" in overcoming some of the Nation's recent shortages in goods and facilities. It has been especially valuable in providing for the steel requirements of the armed services and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Those are two very important fields. This program has met the needs for the production of steel of atomic energy activities and the activities of the armed services.

Coming to the question of the Senator from New Hampshire as to whether or not there is an inference that the program is perhaps belittled by limiting its time, I think he is upon perfectly sound ground when he concludes there must be some inference of failure, if the program is to be limited to 7 months. At that time the Congress will not be in session. We hope we can conclude the program, as it has been laid out for us, in less time than that. Congress will not be here at the time, then, when the voluntary program ends. At any time, in the operation of this voluntary program, either industry or the Department of Commerce can cease to function under it, but there is no question, if it terminates in September 1949, that this perfectly wholesome and constructive and, thus far, successful program could be continued without a violation of certain of the statutes, particularly the antitrust laws.

But if we continue it until March 31, Congress will again be in session and can amend or discontinue the program if there is further need for it.

Furthermore, if the real reason for advocating a year's extension is that there is a demand for a compulsory program, such as that suggested by the President and the leadership on the other side, certainly such a compulsory program could be put into effect by the Congress, and it would override the voluntary program. Many faults may be obviated and many dangerous situations may be corrected if we continue the program until March 31.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete editorial from the New York Times of January 19, 1949, in regard to controls, be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

CONGRESS AND CONTROLS

Steps were taken yesterday, with the backing of the administration, to see that two of

the Government's basic controls over shortage materials are continued in force pending congressional action on the eight-point program laid down by the President in his state of the Union message.

Chairman SPENCE, of the House Banking Committee, introduced two bills for this purpose. One of these calls for the extension for 6 months of the voluntary agreements anti-inflation law enacted by the Eightieth Congress. The other provides for continuing export controls for another 27 months, or through June 30, 1951. Almost simultaneously, Chairman MAYBANK, of the Senate Banking Committee, announced that his group would speed action on companion measures. Without such legislation both of these laws would expire automatically at the end of next month.

The so-called voluntary agreements program is the compromise plan worked out by the Republicans last year as a substitute for the stand-by price production controls proposed by President Truman. It authorizes industries to enter into agreements for the allocation of materials in short supply. Agreements of this kind have been employed by the steel industry: for example, to guarantee minimum quantities of steel for certain essential uses under Government-established priorities. The export-control law gives the Government authority to say what can and what cannot be shipped out of the country. Its principal purposes are: (1) to prevent domestic shortages from being aggravated by the export of items needed at home; (2) to safeguard supplies of materials required in the interest of national security; and (3) to see that, in the words of Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, critically needed commodities are made available to "those areas where they will be used to promote world recovery."

Extension of these controls is obviously desirable and necessary until Congress has decided what, if anything, it wishes to do about Mr. Truman's recently proposed program, two of whose suggestions, at least, go further in the direction of Government control than the country has gone except when it was at war or on the fringe of war. No one, probably, would say that the allocations system has worked out perfectly or to the satisfaction of everyone. But, as Secretary Sawyer observes, it "has been successful within the limits inherent in any voluntary program" in overcoming some of the Nation's recent shortages in goods and facilities. It has been especially valuable in providing for the steel requirements of the armed services and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Demand for steel is still running ahead of current production, and probably will continue to do so for some time to come. But there are signs that this bottleneck is widening rather than narrowing. In situations such as these the market is usually a more reliable guide than personal judgment, and it is a noteworthy fact that gray-market premiums on steel, like black-market premiums on automobiles, have recently shown pronounced declines. In scrap steel, a sort of subbottleneck, prices are reported as beginning to crack under the weight of increasing supplies. At any rate, with present controls extended Congress will be in a position to consider, without feeling that it is under too great pressure of time, the wisdom of moving further in the direction of Government control.

Should voluntary allocations fall short of meeting the Nation's emergency needs, the next logical step would seem to be that indicated in the fifth of President Truman's eight points: namely, priorities and allocations of key materials in short supply. But the President's program goes on from compulsory allocations to price control, and from price control to a suggestion that the Government either finance the private expansion

of certain shortage industries or build its own plants to compete with such industries.

It is interesting and encouraging to note that Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, the President's chief economic adviser, has disassociated himself from the last-named proposal. Productive activities, Dr. Nourse pointed out in this city on Saturday, "are affected by conditions that can only be known by those right on the ground." But basically the chief criticism of Mr. Truman's program, as we see it, is that when it goes beyond compulsory allocations it moves into plans which presuppose a wartime economy and by the time it reaches point eight it is assuming the country is ready to try its hand at state socialism. The first of these assumptions is implausible; the second is, we think, virtually inconceivable.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have been very much interested in the question of inflation and high prices, as have all of us. At the two sessions of the Eightieth Congress I worked as vigorously as I knew how to get some legislation which would deal adequately with the existing situation. The subject matter is one which is very close to my heart. In the last campaign and during the first and second sessions of the Eightieth Congress, there was great tub-thumping on the part of the administration and those representing it regarding the whole subject of inflation and high prices and what a Democratic-controlled Congress would do to reduce high prices for the benefit of all the people.

I am surprised and astounded that the first measure which comes from the other side of the aisle to deal with the whole subject of anti-inflation is what? Is it a proposal for some new legislation to deal with the situation? Is it something that the administration or some of its many agencies worked out to deal with one of the most critical situations before the American people? No, Mr. President; it is not that. It is a request to continue on the statute books a measure to deal with inflation which was passed by the Eightieth Congress, a Republican-controlled Congress. That is the first step in the President's program—a continuation on the books of Republican measures which were passed to deal with inflation.

Why, Mr. President, is it asked to have this legislation continued on the books? Because witnesses from various agencies have testified that the act has been working successfully.

In the day and time when we were considering anti-inflation measures I remember that the former distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who was then the minority leader, offered an amendment and urged its adoption, and those on the other side of the aisle vigorously supported him in connection with that amendment. The amendment would do away with section 2, which it is now asked to have continued. It would place in effect compulsory allocations and compulsory controls. It was pointed out, with great vigor and great enthusiasm, that the Republican measure would not work, that there must be compulsory controls.

But, Mr. President, where is that provision now? Where is that amendment? Why did not the committee, which is controlled by members on the other side of

the aisle, bring forward that proposal which appeared to be so marvelous in December 1947? We are now asked to continue the Republican measure which was urged upon the Congress on the basis that it would work—a Republican measure, Mr. President, which has worked, according to the open testimony before the committee and by the admission which is implicit in the bill asking a continuance of these powers. Why will it not continue to work? What is the great difficulty with regard to it?

The bill now pending would continue voluntary allocations until the 30th of September. If we live up to the provisions of the Reorganization Act, the Congress will not be in session on the 30th of September. Then we could not do anything regarding inflation, Mr. President, if nothing is done in the meantime—and there is every indication that nothing else will be done about it in the meantime.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has offered an amendment to continue the law in operation for another year. According to the argument made by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the law's provisions have helped in large part to settle the situation as to one of the basic commodities of our economy. If it is desired in the meantime to offer some kind of substitute, let it be offered, debated, and considered on the floor.

Mr. President, I say I am surprised and astounded that the first step the administration and its representatives on the other side of the aisle take in dealing with the matter of high prices is a continuation of a Republican measure passed in the Eightieth Congress.

I should like to call attention also to the fact that this bill deals only with one provision of that legislation, section 2. So far as we know, up to date—and it is more than a month after the opening of the Congress—all the other provisions passed by a Republican-controlled Congress dealing with the subject of inflation will be continued on the books.

In the political campaign, we were given to understand that legislation which we had passed was fundamentally wrong, that we had committed a grave error in passing it. Yet, I repeat, Mr. President, the first suggestion that comes from the administration is for a continuation of one section of a Republican law to control inflation. Apparently the administration is perfectly satisfied to have all the remainder of the law continued; in fact, it has asked that it be further continued. That is a strange action, after all the talk about what a Democratic-controlled Congress would do. The answer to it is this, and it is being demonstrated day after day in the newspapers and over the radio, that prices are falling. This legislation, passed at the previous session, was wiser than we thought it was. It adequately dealt with the situation; it worked.

I am happy, indeed, to stand here and see the irrefutable proof of the fact that the legislation has worked, proof in the form of a bill introduced by a Democratic-controlled committee of a Democratic-controlled Senate, asking that one

provision of the law expiring by limitation of time be continued in effect.

Mr. President, I looked over the record of the debate in connection with adopting the amendment offered by the former distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY. Some of that debate, Mr. President, I think would bear repetition here. I wonder why, in the face of the language used in that debate, our friends are now urging the continuance of what appeared to be such an iniquitous and unworkable piece of legislation.

Said the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] on page 11501 of the RECORD:

I think the Congress and the country appreciate any step toward meeting this very serious situation, but I think the country is going to be disappointed in the probable effectiveness of the program the Senator from Ohio is now outlining.

The Senator from Ohio being Mr. TART, then chairman of the committee, as I recall, who was proposing the particular legislation under consideration.

Has the country been disappointed? The supply of steel has risen tremendously, and we have been able adequately to meet the situation.

I continue reading what the distinguished Senator from Florida said at the time:

The alternative action that might be taken, it seems to me, if the program were intended to be most effective, would be to give the President authority to fix prices in certain selective fields, either by forcing concurrence in a so-called voluntary agreement, or by prescribing what is a fair price, and simply to order that price put into effect, at least in the selective fields, in the case of steel, for example, and in the case of certain other commodities which might be regarded as key commodities. But if we continue without one of the emergency measures being adopted by the Congress in the present session, it simply means more time will pass and the situation will become far worse, and we shall still be tinkering with some sort of questionable procedure.

The distinguished Senator from Florida so described the procedure. Has that happened? I know the distinguished Senator from Florida is a great and able Senator, and I have high regard for him, but I say that in this particular instance he turned out to be a very poor prophet, indeed.

Then the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the present great Vice President of the United States, in urging the adoption of an amendment which would impose compulsory controls, had this to say about the matter, as appears on page 11515 of the RECORD. He was replying to a statement by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] to the effect that what was proposed would make it impossible to pass the measure then pending before Christmas. I read from the RECORD:

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that. I am not sure that even the milk-and-water proposition we are now considering will pass before Christmas.

Now, Mr. President, what do the administration spokesmen ask us to do? They ask us to reenact and continue in force this Republican milk-and-water proposition about which they had so

much to say a year and some months ago. Why do they ask that it be continued? Because time has demonstrated that it has worked well, that it has been effective.

Then the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], speaking in favor of the amendment which would put into effect compulsory controls, said:

I think the Senator's amendment is entirely in order. Something of the kind is absolutely necessary if we are to do anything more than hand out a campaign document in an effort to show that we have done a great thing for the economy of the country.

Mr. President, I for one entertained some doubt at that time as to whether or not we were going far enough with the particular measure then being considered. But time has demonstrated to me that my doubts should have been completely dissipated, and, indeed, they have been by the adequacy with which the measure as passed has dealt with the situation.

I remember the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] saying:

Mr. President, I should like to add a few words to those which have been said by the distinguished minority leader. I believe we are dealing with one of the most important and difficult questions ever presented to this Congress. That statement has been made several times in the last few years. That is because the world itself has been in turmoil.

The issue which is now presented in section 2—

The one which would be continued under the pending bill—

between the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the amendments which have been offered by the Senator from Kentucky, is simply the issue of whether we shall have an economic government in this crisis by those who have controlled our economic system, privately, or whether we shall have the Government in charge. It could be stated even more simply. It is an issue between private government and the people's government.

Mr. President, I am one who does not wish to see big business, or big labor, or big anything else, run this country or control our economy. But I was again surprised and astounded when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, said on the floor of the Senate that he complimented the leaders of the steel industry for the fine, patriotic manner in which they had cooperated to carry out these voluntary allocations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Why should the Senator be surprised if I said a good word for corporations?

Mr. BALDWIN. I know the distinguished Senator from South Carolina well enough to understand that he is most charitable, and that he always says a good word for everybody and everything. I grant him that. The point I wish to make is that we were told by spokesmen on the other side of the aisle

that big-business men would run away with the situation. On the other hand, we are now told from the other side of the aisle that which is uncontroversially true, namely, that these men have cooperated, that big business and little business have cooperated, and the law has been a great success.

I grant that my distinguished friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is a great statesman and a great Senator, but I say that he, like the distinguished Senator from Florida, is a poor prophet in this particular situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for one question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. There is only one question in issue in connection with the pending bill, namely, the fixing of a proper date for the termination of the program. Can the Senator from Connecticut tell the Senator from Illinois just why the Republicans chose March 1, 1949, for the termination of their program?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I cannot.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I was not a member of the committee. Perhaps the Senator from Ohio can answer the question.

Mr. BRICKER. It was merely because the Congress would be in session then. That is the real reason why the date March 1 was recommended and chosen. The Congress would then have been in session long enough to see how the program was working. That was the date fixed from a practical standpoint, and it seemed to be the most reasonable and best date.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate passed the original bill in December 1947.

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. And the termination date fixed in that bill was March 1, 1949; was it not?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the Senator from Ohio if that is correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is the correct date, as fixed in the original bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. That demonstrates that we have had more than a year of satisfactory operation under this particular measure, and my reason for supporting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is that if we have had a year's experience with it, and with an improving situation, it is fair to assume that the program will continue to be satisfactory, and that we should continue the act.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. I was informed that I was honored by some reference in the able Senator's remarks.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am always delighted to honor my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was greatly honored to receive even temporary recognition by my able friend, but naturally I should be even more pleased to hear him repeat what he said. He spoke about my being

a poor prophet in what I said about the workability of the voluntary allocation program.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should be very glad to repeat what I said. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eightieth Congress, page 11501, where the distinguished Senator from Florida is reported to have said:

I think the Congress and the country appreciate any step toward meeting this very serious situation, but I think the country is going to be disappointed in the probable effectiveness of the program the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] is now outlining.

The alternative action that might be taken, it seems to me, if the program were intended to be most effective, would be to give the President authority to fix prices in certain selective fields, either by forcing concurrence in a so-called voluntary agreement or by prescribing what is a fair price, and simply to order that price put into effect, at least in the selective fields, in the case of steel, for example, and in the case of certain other commodities which might be regarded as key commodities. But if we continue without one of the emergency measures being adopted by the Congress in the present session, it simply means more time will pass and the situation will become far worse, and we shall still be tinkering with some sort of questionable procedure.

In order that the Senator might be fully informed, I want to say that I questioned the Senator's ability as a prophet, although I paid the Senator high tribute in other respects, and then I went on to say that the first step in the President's program of combating high prices was a continuance in operation of a measure passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. That was the first step. I ask the Senator why we were asked to continue something that the distinguished Senator said was a "questionable procedure."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am perfectly prepared for the RECORD to indicate the accuracy or the inaccuracy of the prediction I made when the President's proposals were before the Republican majority of Congress and declined. I think if the Senator will make a canvass of small business in America, and of the little-business men, the little manufacturers, to see whether or not they have obtained under a voluntary allocation system steel in quantity comparable to what they should have had, he will find that the little manufacturers have not. I know of many instances in my own State where little manufacturers, the little fellows who are trying to secure a small quota of steel, have not been able to secure it because they are not on the favored list of big steel producers. I realize that sort of thing always occurs when there is a voluntary allocation system.

What the President was proposing, and what he repeated, as I understand, in his recommendations to the Congress in his state of the Union message, is authority to impose compulsory allocations when he finds that the public need requires it. I supported that proposal last year. I shall support it again when the matter comes up.

The Republican majority was opposed to the President having even an alter-

native authority that might be compulsorily exercised. But I go back to the basic proposition that if we are to have allocations, if we are to have rationing, the only way we can be assured that there will be a fair distribution of what is allocated and what is rationed is for some public authority at least to have supervision over it, if not direction of it. So I am perfectly prepared to let the small-business men of America who need steel to be the conclusive witnesses as to whether they have obtained the share of the Nation's output of steel they would have had if we had had a compulsory allocation and distribution system.

Mr. BALDWIN. I will say in reply to my distinguished friend that he apparently is prepared to ask the same question I am. If what he says is so, why do we not have reported from the committee a measure providing for compulsory control? Why does not the committee have the courage to report such a measure? Why has not the committee in a year and 3 months prepared the legislation necessary to deal with the subject on a compulsory basis?

Mr. President, I would not vote for it, but what I am wondering is why, if voluntary allocation has not worked successfully, some compulsory measure along the lines my distinguished friend urges, has not been presented to the Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me state what the facts are.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to say a word more on this particular point.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut allow me one moment?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Florida?

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

Mr. PEPPER. So far as writing a program is concerned, I would have vested in the President the authority which might be compulsorily exercised when in the President's opinion the public need requires. The President asked repeatedly of the Eightieth Congress, and has asked the present Congress—and he asked the Eightieth Congress especially in the special session—for the power to allocate by authority, if the situation requires it, and the side of the able Senator from Connecticut has steadfastly and successfully opposed such legislation. Now today, while it may be that the measure now proposed is not all that some of us would like it to be, yet it is twice as good as that advocated by the Republican side of the aisle. The measure before us seeks only 6 months' extension of the temporary authority to allocate by the steel industry, but the Republican side of the aisle is insisting upon 12 months' extension. So our proposal, while defective, no doubt, and I think it is, and I think it

is inadequate, yet is twice as good as what the Senator from Connecticut now associates himself with on the other side of the aisle. He wants a year of immunity of the steel industry from any public control, whereas the bill before us suggests only the extension for 6 months of the voluntary control now in effect, until the matter can be more thoroughly investigated.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, if the Senator feels the way he has just expressed himself he should submit an amendment for the Senate to consider. Let the Senator offer such an amendment as the distinguished former Senator from Kentucky offered when section 2 was under consideration in December 1947. Let the Senator from Florida propose such an amendment, which provided for compulsory control. It was suggested at that time by spokesmen on the other side of the aisle that it would be adequate. If my friend from Florida is so anxious to have compulsory controls, let him offer that proposal again by way of amendment. What I am saying is that the majority party is attempting to carry water on both shoulders in this matter.

Replying now to the question as to why the President was not given authority to take compulsory measures, I call my friend's attention to section 6 of the act we are discussing. Section 6 happened to be an amendment which was incorporated in the bill as the result of the efforts of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself. It provides a method by which the President can require Congress to give him or to deny him the right to impose compulsory controls on specific selected items, and yet not once in all the time since the law has been on the books has the President attempted to exercise the broad powers he has had under this particular provision of the law. So, Mr. President, there are in the existing law provisions under which compulsory controls could be required.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not the President's official spokesman in this body, and have no right to speak his mind, but I can imagine that it may be that the President is not asking for compulsory authority, although he did recommend stand-by power, because the President unequivocally recommended that additional steel-production facilities should be provided, and if private industry would not provide them, then that the Government of the United States should see to it that they were constructed. The President may have felt that if we could increase the steel output by new facilities—and that policy may be still under consideration by the administration—perhaps rationing of any sort might not be imperative. I hope the Senator from Connecticut, who I am sure wants every business and industry to have a reasonable and fair quantity of steel, will join us in supporting the President's proposal that provision be made for additional steel facilities in the

country so that steel production may be increased. May I hope the Senator from Connecticut will take that attitude?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I may say in response, that the testimony before the committee—and like my distinguished friend, the Senator from Florida, I was not on the committee, and so I had no opportunity to know what the testimony was until I read it and saw the report—was that the situation was being taken care of very adequately. My point is that if the situation is being taken care of very adequately in the absence of compulsions, we had better continue in that particular course rather than put into effect some other program when we do not know how it will work in this day and time.

Mr. President, there is no State in the whole Nation which for its size uses more steel than does Connecticut. I do not recall any particular pressure from any business people back home. As a matter of fact, I received a letter the other day pointing out that the particular small company represented by the writer could not obtain steel, and when I went to work on the subject and obtained a report on it, the company advised me that since they had last corresponded with me they had been adequately taken care of. So I assume in that particular situation at least that the present method we are using in dealing with the situation is working satisfactorily.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if I correctly understood the Senator from Florida several minutes ago, he stated that he would be willing to call as witnesses small-business men, particularly in his State, to testify that the voluntary system was not working satisfactorily. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. I stated that in my State there were numerous instances which had been very forcibly brought to my attention, of little users of steel being unable to get it because they were not included in the voluntary allocation system. Obviously the steel companies favor their old customers; and if one were not an old customer or a favored customer—at least in my State—he could not get steel. Many small-business men complained that they were unable to get steel. The able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is seated at my left, tells me that he has recently talked with representatives of the Department of Commerce, and that the Department had stated that there was not sufficient steel to satisfy the small users of the country; that it simply did not exist. Therefore they could not get it.

Mr. CAIN. The statement of the Senator from Florida was to the effect that small-business men generally believed that the voluntary allocation system was not working effectively.

Mr. PEPPER. I was simply saying that there is not sufficient steel for all the small steel users of the country. It is only human nature, as well as confirmed business practice, that when those who produce a commodity do their own rationing, they give it to their old customers or to their friends. That is

not only human nature but business practice.

Mr. CAIN. It is an obvious fact that when there is a shortage of a particular commodity, we are by no means certain that a better distribution will follow from a mandatory, as opposed to a voluntary, allocation system. It is that question with which we are seriously concerned concerning ourselves. Let me ask the Senator from Florida if he has read the testimony given before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which gives rise to the whole question now before us.

Mr. PEPPER. No. I am not a member of that committee and I have not read the testimony. But I know that during the war if all the allocation systems and all the quota systems had been left to voluntary judgment and conscience, a few would have been favored, and many would have been discriminated against. That is inherent in the voluntary system.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator has stated that he is not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Some of us are. We therefore take it for granted that the Senator from Florida would like to know the character of the testimony before that committee, and by whom it was given. The Senator from Florida has just stated that small-business men would testify to the unworkability of the system which we are discussing. Let me state to the Senator from Florida that the witnesses before the Committee on Banking and Currency were small-business people. They said that whereas a year and a half or two years ago, in the absence of the voluntary system, they were rapidly going out of business, with the adoption of the voluntary system, they were today getting every ounce of steel they considered they were entitled to.

Mr. PEPPER. How many small-business men testified?

Mr. CAIN. Approximately half a dozen.

Mr. PEPPER. Approximately half a dozen small-business men. Unless they were elected to speak for the small-business men of America, or had made a survey of the small-business men of America, I do not believe that they could be regarded as decisive spokesmen.

Mr. CAIN. But we, as representatives of the Senate, were interrogating them. If the Senator does not care to consider that testimony as valid, does he feel that the reference which he has just made to small-business men in Florida as being out of harmony with this program should be considered as valid?

Mr. PEPPER. I was only saying that I had received numerous complaints. I could name those who made the complaints. Other Senators tell me the same thing. I know that the steel mills have been working at capacity. The President has found it necessary to propose additional facilities. I know that with a limited output and a voluntary system of distribution, the little fellow is going to get the least.

Mr. CAIN. But the testimony clearly indicated to us that conditions are becoming materially better, and that a con-

siderable degree of credit is being given to the very system the duration of which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], through his amendment, seeks to extend. That is important to us. If it is good, we must be very cautious about getting rid of it, in the absence of something better to take its place. Nothing better has thus far been advanced on either side of the aisle.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that we do not want to confuse the record. Is it not a fact that the simple question before the Senate is whether the voluntary method now in existence shall be extended for 6 months or 12 months? The Democrats are recommending an extension for 6 months, and saying that in that time we shall know more about what to do as a permanent policy. The Republicans are saying, "No; exempt the subject from consideration for a whole year."

Mr. CAIN. May I answer that observation for the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is leading the opposition, is chairman?

During the previous remarks of the Senator from Florida, he stated that the Democrats want to extend the program for 6 months, and that the Republicans want to provide immunity to the steel industry for a year. The Senator said essentially that, did he not? He stated that he thought the Republicans wanted to give immunity to the steel industry for a period twice as long as that recommended by the Democrats.

Mr. PEPPER. I stated that I thought the issue was whether the present voluntary method should be extended for 6 months, as provided by the bill reported by the Democratic leadership, or whether the whole subject should be sealed up for 12 months, so that we would not be able to reconsider the matter in the interim, and perhaps determine upon something else as a permanent policy. So, today we are not voting for compulsory control or voluntary allocation. We are merely voting whether we want voluntary allocation for 6 months or 12 months. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator from Florida will be interested in the testimony which came from the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer. He said, in substance, "We are asking for a temporary extension of this law because we are presently preparing a broader stabilization program to be presented to the Congress, in which we are going to recommend an extension of the voluntary system for not less than 2 years."

Mr. Sawyer stated that such a recommendation was to be included among the recommendations for a broader stabilization program. So it is a little difficult for us on this side to see any valid opposition to our recommendation for a reasonable extension beyond the time recommended by the committee, in view of Mr. Sawyer's declaration of purpose of an extension for 2 years.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Washington

that Secretary Sawyer did say that a 2-year extension was to be recommended in the over-all bill. I want the RECORD to show that as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I talked not only with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture, but with many others. If there be any fault in recommending this particular provision, it is mine, because I suggested to the various secretaries that I hoped that legislation on this subject would be considered piecemeal, bill by bill, considering separately the Federal Reserve legislation, agricultural legislation, and legislation affecting the Commerce Department. That is one of the reasons why there is no over-all bill at this time. If anyone is to be charged with responsibility for that situation, I am glad to assume the responsibility, because it is my thought that the legislation should be considered bill by bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I merely wish to say to the Senator from South Carolina that there was no intention on my part to assess responsibility with reference to the presentation of the pending legislation. We merely take exception to the date. But what is so clearly familiar to members of the Committee on Banking and Currency on both sides of the aisle is not the information which was available to the Senator from Florida. It was for that reason that I wanted to clear in his mind, if I could, the details concerning the subject about which we are actually talking.

Mr. BRICKER and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be clear and that the Senator from Florida may have clearly in mind the facts as to the testimony adduced at the hearings, let me say that the chairman of the committee was very careful to ask every witness whether small business was being adequately considered by the Department and by the industry in the allocations program. The testimony was universal, from all the witnesses, that they were being adequately taken care of. There were present a small-business representative from the Middle West, one from the far West, and one from the Oklahoma and Texas area. Not only did they testify to that effect, but, likewise, the Department of Commerce, through Secretary Sawyer, testified that they were taking care of small business. The administrator of this program testified likewise.

Furthermore, in direct answer to an explicit question as to whether a man desiring to go into the steel business or into a fabricating business or a processing business could get an adequate supply of steel, the Secretary of Commerce testified that an adequate amount had been set aside, or adequate at least under

the proportion that had been established and set aside for supplying new businesses, as well as supplying established businesses.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Ohio will not leave the floor until I have an opportunity to present a letter which is on its way here, and to which I should like to call attention.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, during the course of the argument on this matter on December 18, 1947, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming said:

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order to exculpate myself for voting for a measure which contains section 2, I desire to say that I associate myself with everything the Senator from Kentucky has said. I wish to add that, in my judgment, it will be utterly impossible to carry out the provisions of section 2, and that the waiver of the antitrust laws in these circumstances is utterly improper. I wish to express the opinion that the President will find it impossible to approve any agreement drawn under the terms of this joint resolution. Although I am convinced of the impracticality of that portion of this measure, nevertheless, I think I am justified in casting my vote for the joint resolution in order that there may be an extension of the powers of the Government to control exports and to allocate transportation facilities.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that, as learned and distinguished a statesman as I think the Senator from Wyoming is, nevertheless he turned out to be a poor prophet in this case, because the plan has worked, because the President, through the various agencies, provided for the program under the legislation, and the agencies he has authorized to do so have approved the agreements, and they have been effective.

In response to one of the statements made by the Senator from Florida, let me point out that if he feels as strongly as he seems to about the need for compulsory controls to deal with the situation, then let me remind him that if we turn back to the debates of December 17, and 18, 1947, he will find that what was proposed by Senators on his side of the aisle at that time was an amendment which provided for compulsory controls. Feeling as strongly as he does, why does he not offer such an amendment now? I would not vote for it, but he would have an opportunity to do so. Why does not his party offer an amendment providing for the form of controls they urged upon the Congress so vigorously back in those days?

Let me add that the then Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY, was the one who ably presented that side of the argument. He urged that the compulsory controls be imposed; and at the end of the argument Senator BARKLEY said this:

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I neglected to say that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who has been called away from Washington because of the death and funeral of his secretary, has just advised me that he wishes to associate himself with the sentiments I have expressed here in regard to this measure; and for the same reasons which I have given as actuating me in casting my vote, he wishes to be recorded as voting for the joint resolution if he were present and voting.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks, I ask this simple question: Why is it that this administration, which now controls a majority of the Congress, which has had so much to say about the subject of high prices, and whose representatives in Congress voted in large part against everything the Republicans had to offer in the Eightieth Congress—why is it that they choose, as the first step in their program to combat high prices, the reenactment, the continuance in force and effect, of a vitally important provision of a measure passed by a Republican-controlled Congress?

My answer to that question, Mr. President, if I may venture one myself, is that they have no better program than the one the Republican Party put through the Eightieth Congress, and which, on the testimony before the committee, and by the fact that they now ask to have it continued, is shown to have worked successfully.

Mr. President, I submit that the voluntary program having worked so successfully, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio should be adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, when the able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was listening to the debate and the discussion a moment ago, he said to me that he had on his desk a letter which pertained to the subject of the discussion. He has obtained the letter, and I now have it before me. It is dated December 21, 1948, and is from the J. Gruman Iron & Steel Co., by J. G. Meyers, of 537 Seventh Avenue North, Minneapolis 11, Minn. The letter is addressed to Mr. William Simms, 3204 Coquelin Terrace, Rock Creek Knoll, Chevy Chase, Md. It reads as follows:

J. GRUMAN IRON & STEEL CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., December 21, 1948.

Mr. WILLIAM SIMMS,
Rock Creek Knoll, Chevy Chase, Md.

DEAR SIR: We have been attempting to purchase steel for warehousing purposes from several steel mills, but our efforts for the past 4 years have been unsuccessful.

Knowing that Senator-elect HUMPHREY is desirous of helping small businesses, I am taking the liberty of writing to you so as to acquaint you with conditions in the steel industry, and also in the hopes that perhaps you can do something to help us in obtaining steel. The picture briefly is as follows:

In order to obtain new steel in 1944 it was necessary to produce records of past sales, and the mills then permitted you to replenish your stock only to the extent of the amount of the sales. Since we were just getting started in the sale of usable steel, we naturally were only able to buy a small quantity at that time. By the time we were in a position to reorder, the mills adopted a system of allocations, using the years 1939 and 1940 as base years, and apportioning their customers steel on that basis. That left us out of the picture, as we did not handle any steel during those years.

I made several efforts by mail, phone, and personal visits to Inland, Carnegie, and Bethlehem Steel Co.'s, and others, but have been unable to purchase anything from any of them. Our only sources of supply have been other warehouses, and in some instances free-lance brokers, and, as a result, we have paid more for the steel than we would have had to were we able to purchase direct from the mill. Naturally, we have had to charge more than the normal warehouse price when we resold this steel.

I believe that the mills in refusing to sell us steel direct have discriminated against us and have been indirectly responsible for making it necessary for the veteran to pay more than he should have for the I-beam or other steel he needed to build his house. The blacksmith who needed steel to repair farm equipment, the small factory that manufactured farm equipment, and numerous others who needed steel in small quantities and who normally turn to a source like us for their needs had to pay more than they should have.

While I realize that there is a shortage of steel, I feel that, since we were able to get it in roundabout ways, it should have been possible for us to get some steel directly from one or more of the mills I contacted in the last 4 years. Our customers for the most part are contractors, blacksmiths, small factories, and generally people who need small quantities of steel for essential purposes. We are in a position to use from 500 to 1,000 tons per month, and if we were able to obtain the steel from the mills I believe it would be of great benefit to the people we deal with, and in some measure would help the economy of the country.

I would thank you to call Senator-elect HUMPHREY's attention to this letter, and perhaps something can be done to eliminate the discriminatory practice of the mills.

Yours very truly,

J. G. MEYERS.

Mr. President, in my opinion, that letter accurately and fairly depicts the situation. It is exactly the kind of thing that has been brought to my attention by a small steel user in Bradenton, Fla. What is said here about farm implements was brought to my attention by Mr. George Morrow, of Graceville, Fla., telling me about the high gray-market prices, which in substance are the black-market prices, they had to pay to get farm machinery and the steel for farm purposes.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I take it from what my distinguished friend says that he is very much concerned about the opportunity of small steel users to get steel.

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly am.

Mr. BALDWIN. If that be so, I press the same question I have asked before. When we were debating this subject in December 1947, the former distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who was then minority leader, offered an amendment which would have provided for compulsory controls. If my friend from Florida feels as strongly about it as he does, why does he not offer a similar amendment? Why is it that his party comes forward, not with an amendment calling for compulsory controls, but with one merely asking for continuation of an act already on the books, passed by a Republican Congress? If he feels so strongly as he does, if he believes in compulsory controls, let him offer the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I may say to the Senator he must realize, when he views this matter in perspective, that we had a rather effective allocation and price-control system in this country until mid-1946. In mid-1946, with Republican Senators voting almost solidly—and I regret to say, a few Democrats on this side of the aisle joining with them, but only a minority of the Democratic Party membership in Senate and in House—the

control system was destroyed. In a little while it had to be eliminated entirely. That is when we had an effective and fair compulsory rationing and allocation system. The President of the United States vetoed the bill, which was designed to destroy those effective and fair rationing, allocation, and price-control provisions. Later on, the President made numerous recommendations for restoration of a compulsory control, allocation, and price system. They were all refused and denied by the Congress, and I may say, solidly, by the Republican membership of both Houses. Later on, when it appeared that that was the only thing he had any possible hope of getting, the President recommended stand-by controls, after the amendment of the then Senator from Kentucky, our present able Vice President, had been defeated. I, of course, voted for the amendment. I am afraid the Senator from Connecticut did not. His colleagues did not, but I certainly voted 'or it, and most of my colleagues on this side of the aisle voted for it; but it was defeated. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky was defeated, and the Republican majority adopted the voluntary allocation system.

Now, the President comes back to the Congress. He recommends two things—first, that he have stand-by authority which could be used in case of necessity. I hope the Republicans are going to support us Democrats in voting to give the President such authority. The President also sees the shortage of steel in the country, to which this writer has referred, which had been a matter of common knowledge. The President says we must have greater steel production facilities if the economy of America and the world is not to suffer. We are required to limit the amount of steel exports, of course, because of the limited steel production here at home. So he says: "Give me stand-by authority, and give me the authority to bring about, through Government aid if necessary, the production of more steel by providing additional production facilities."

Then we come to this day, when the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, having before it the same evidence that our Republican friends have been able to observe and to hear, recommends a 6 months' extension of the voluntary provision which is now in effect in the law. But the Republicans say "No; we are not satisfied with a 6 months' extension, and giving the Government time and opportunity to study the proposal for new facilities, or to see, in the light of conditions 6 months hence, what may be necessary." They want to say, "No; we will do nothing for 12 months. We will let the Government do nothing for 12 months along the line of providing the steel which is necessary, and assuring its fair distribution to the people of this country." So today, as I say, we come back to a simple issue: Do you favor this voluntary system for 6 months, with the Government having an opportunity in the meantime to determine what our policy should be thereafter, or are you willing to put the cloak of immunity around the subject for a guaranteed minimum of 12 months, and de-

prive the Government of the opportunity to review the policy, unless the law is set aside in a shorter period than that? So it seems to me the issue is very clearly drawn on the immediate question of what we should do. At the end of 6 months, it will be determined by circumstances as they exist at that time.

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely want to call attention to the vote on the passage of the measure to which reference has been made. There has been much talk about the amendment offered by the then Senator from Kentucky. On final passage of the bill, the vote was 77 to 10. I do not see how any side can claim all the credit for this one section of the bill which was passed. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky was defeated by two votes.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the Senator from Florida is familiar with what has happened because of the fact that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was not adopted. Today there are 23,000 miles of REA posts, for which steel cannot be obtained for use in the conductors. There are 23,000 farmers, therefore, who are unable to get power. That is only a small fraction of the number, because posts have been set for thousands of miles, and it is impossible to obtain the wire conductors.

Again, if one goes into a farming community like Minnesota and tries to buy a combine, he will find that a second-hand one costs \$5,500. Every crook and grafter in the country has enriched himself by being a parasite on the farmers in the Great Plains States who had crops they had to harvest. They were unable to buy new combines. I myself telephoned to the heads of every manufacturing company engaged in the production and sale of combines or farm machines. In the little county of Hettinger, N. Dak., according to the sworn testimony of the county agent, the farmers lost more than \$1,000,000 on crops, because they could not obtain repairs for the old binders and combines they had—\$1,000,000 in one county.

Again, when it comes to well tubing, there is an institution that needs well tubing. The institution is connected with a veteran's home and with trailer camps. It took me over 3 weeks, with all the support I got from the War Assets Administration, to locate tubing for even a quarter of a mile.

Compare the prices of farm machinery with the prices the farmers are getting today for their products. On page 2 of the report it is stated that the President delegated his authority under section 2, of the law enacted by the Eightieth Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce. How did the farmers fare? Let us take hogs. What happened to the price of hogs?

The high during last year was \$31.75 a hundred. A week ago, it was \$20.50. Now it is less. Steers were \$39. Two weeks ago they were \$28.25. Heifers dropped from \$35.50 to \$25.50—\$10. The price of cows dropped from \$24.75 to \$19. The price of oats dropped from \$1.39½ to 65½ cents.

Mr. MAYBANK. What about the price of steel?

Mr. LANGER. I do not have the figures for steel. I think the price increased, as a matter of fact.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator is showing how farm prices have suffered. In the last half of last year United States Steel made as much profit as it made in the whole previous year.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Let us consider the price of eggs. The price dropped from 33 cents to 23 cents. The price of butter, in Chicago, dropped from 88½ cents to 57½ cents. The price of apples dropped from \$3.83 to \$1.12.

That is the situation which has developed so far as agriculture is concerned.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not true that the price of fats and oils has gone down by a very large percentage?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. President, in the Middle West it is not possible to buy automobiles promptly. They are sold with one hand under the counter, trying to get a few hundred dollars more.

As a Republican on this side of the aisle, I simply want to say that I agreed with the position taken by the Senator from Kentucky at the time his amendment was offered, so far as the farmers are concerned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, much has been said regarding this so-called Republican measure. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] a few minutes ago rather took the majority of the Banking and Currency Committee to task for bringing forth a measure which seeks to extend only one provision of the law. I believe it might be well for us to consider why the committee has done that particular thing.

First, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that this so-called Republican law was, as the able chairman of the committee has pointed out, passed by the vote of every Democrat with the exception of eight. Two Republicans voted against the bill, and eight Democrats voted against it. In other words, it passed with almost the unanimous support of this body, in spite of the fact that it contained a provision relating to the antitrust laws to which many Members were conscientiously opposed.

There were given to the President three powers which expire on a particular date. Section 2 expires on February 28, 1949; section 3 expires on that date; and section 4 expires on that date. Those are the only three provisions which have an expiration date.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Did not he and the other members of the committee believe that we should first take up those provisions which expired in February and March before going into the consideration of new legislation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is exactly correct. In accord with the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, I personally spoke to Secretary Brannan who, as I understood, would handle this legislation before the respective committees, and suggested to him that instead of waiting to bring all these measures forward in one package, we should act early on the particular measures which had an early expiration date. Of the two measures which came to us—and, as I recall, they both came at the same time—one related to voluntary allocations of scarce materials, and the other to export controls. We first took up the matter of voluntary allocations. There was a reason for considering that matter first. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, that power expires on February 28 of this year. Unless there is an early extension, the whole effectiveness of the program will be lost for a certain period of time. It requires about 60 days to work out one of these voluntary agreements, because certain notices are required and certain invitations are sent to members to come in and participate. A committee has to be established and notice given to the public in order that anyone who may be interested may appear and be heard.

If Senators will read the hearings before our committee it will be seen that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, very pointedly said that if we are to avoid a delay, this extension must be made quickly.

That is the reason for our acting first on this particular measure. Other measures will be before the Senate before very long. The question of allocations of transportation facilities for grain will come up very shortly before our committee, and in ample time a bill will be reported to the Senate relating to that particular subject.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, the first step of the President's program is to continue in force section 2 of a measure passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. The second step, as I understand, in the anti-inflation program is to continue in effect another section of a bill passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I do not say it is offered in such a sequence as the Senator suggests. I just finished stating that different members of the Banking and Currency Committee asked that this legislation be in a form in which it could be acted on quickly. Particularly we were interested in the voluntary-agreement legislation because of the 60-day period which is necessary to put any agreement into effect and make it operative.

If the Senator will allow me, I do not want to rest only on that statement; I should like to go on, because I think I know the next question which the Senator will ask is whether we could not extend it just as quickly for a longer period of time.

There are reasons why this stop-gap legislation is desirable at this particular time. I shall mention one. There are many things which have not yet been fully studied and cannot be fully studied by our committee and given the thorough consideration they should have, in order to have legislation perfected and passed before February 23. Even if that were done, there would be a 60-day drag, which I mentioned a few minutes ago.

For instance, on January 19 the Secretary of Commerce, I believe it was, issued a press release regarding the misuse of some steel which had been allocated under one of these voluntary agreements. He has referred that matter to the Attorney General. It is not yet known whether or not the party charged can be prosecuted under the law as it exists today for a very definite infringement of what was intended under such a voluntary agreement as that which has been approved by the Attorney General's office.

It was stated a few minutes ago that the Secretary of Agriculture has not yet given his opinion as to how the act has worked with reference to the farmers; that the Secretary of the Interior has not yet told us how it has worked with reference to many of the metals, minerals, and scarce materials, basic materials—our natural resources. In other words, we have not been able, and we will not be able before February 23, to give to this law the kind of careful study it should have before we take a step toward continuing it to some far distant future date.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. In regard to the extension of the particular section under discussion, section 2, granting that there are in contemplation all the plans he mentions to propose further legislation, what harm would come if the law were extended for a year? The other legislation could still be offered. The limitation date suggested by the bill would end the program when Congress presumably would not be in session. The limitation which the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio places on the program would make it expire when the Congress was in session.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me answer briefly, and then I shall yield.

We certainly do not plan to wait until Congress has adjourned and will have to be called back into special session, as was the case with the Eightieth Congress. We plan to act before the present session of Congress adjourns.

The Senator asked me why we should not do what is proposed by the Senator from Ohio. I might ask in the same language, why not do what the committee has suggested, and when the permanent

program, or the regular program, comes before us, if that is not satisfactory to the Senator from Connecticut, then he can propose an extension to suit his wishes at that time.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have been asking myself the very question which the able Senator from Connecticut has just asked the Senator from Alabama, and I have resolved by own thoughts in support of the committee's position, for the reason that if we extend the program through to March 1950, and then find that the extension has been too long, and we desire to pass some other legislation, we will be in the position of having told the steel industry, for example, that up until March of next year this will be the plan upon which they can proceed to do business, whereas if we extend it only until September of this year, we have then the option of extending it still further if we think that is the desirable thing to do, or writing substitute legislation prior to September 1949, in either of which events we will not have told the industry it can proceed for a definite length of time, and then change the rules before that length of time has passed. So, in answering that question for myself, in complete sympathy with the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, I have found that I cannot support it because to do so and then vote for legislation which would take effect prior to March 1950 would be the equivalent of changing the rules after the steel industry had proceeded to act upon the basis first presented. Therefore, for that reason, it seems to me that as between the two alternatives, the safer policy and the fairer way in which to treat the subject would be to give industry a definite date when they can act in complete confidence that the rules will be thus and so, and subsequently to extend the time for six more months if that should be found to be desirable, or to curtail it beginning September 1949 rather than to take the other alternative, of extending the time for a full year, and then make a new policy before the full year has run out. I think for that reason the committee date is the preferable of the two proposed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am certainly indebted to the able Senator from Maryland for what I consider to be an absolutely correct analysis of the situation.

Furthermore, suppose we extend the time to some date beyond September of the year 1949, and agreements are drawn up looking to that date, and those agreements, according to the provisions of the law, are approved by the Attorney General of the United States in the face of the antitrust laws; and suppose further that we find, or the Attorney General finds, that a party could not be prosecuted under one of those agreements; then we would have hanging over our heads every one of the commitments which had been entered into, and they would be fast commitments until March 30, 1950.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator by illustration has supported the exact point I raised, that Congress should not place itself in a position where it purports to tell business it can proceed under one set of rules, and then, if it desires to change the rules, and actually does change them, puts business in the position of having made commitments for the future which are canceled automatically by a change of the legislation fixing a date prior to the first date the Congress fixed.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In a moment. I do not care to get into a legal argument with the Senator from Maryland, with whom I am in agreement, but it seems to me we might find ourselves even more embarrassed than as he states it, because I am of the opinion that the agreements which are made will become commitments, will become obligations, contracts will be made under them which we cannot cancel, and they will become binding in the face of the antitrust statutes which we waive by this so-called Republican measure.

By the way, Mr. President, in that connection, I am delighted to see the Senator from Connecticut deriving so much pleasure out of one Republican measure that did work. I hope he will get full pleasure out of it. It is the first one that came out of the Eightieth Congress, I have yet heard of that he or anyone else on the other side, or anywhere in the country, could boast of, even though it was passed with almost the unanimous support of the Democrats in the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more observation? If so, I will not interrupt him again.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we make September 30, 1949, the termination date to which these voluntary agreements may run, and then desire to extend the time for six more months, we can do so, and thereby adopt what the so-called Republican measure purports to have done. On the other hand, if we extend it until March 1950 and find that we desire to contract it to a date within that period, we run into the very situation which the Senator from Alabama is discussing, namely, of having told business it can proceed under one set of rules and having business proceed on that expectancy, and then before the expectancy has terminated, have Congress say, "Notwithstanding you have made contracts and agreements upon the theory that you had a year to go, we are going to give you only 6 months," and thereby in the courts and in other places where controversies are discussed and settled bring into question our authority to curtail the time because contracts were made in good faith.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Maryland. By the way, there is another thing to keep in mind, too. In extending this stopgap legislation, as is proposed, for a period of 6 months, we are in effect bringing the cut-off date and the effective date to the same time. In other words, it is just a halfway extension, after all, because under the law as

it now exists these agreements can be entered into up to February 28, but deliveries may continue to be made under them until September 30, 1949, or during a 6-month period, so that what we are really doing is to bring the two dates together.

Mr. President, I said something a moment ago about the pleasure some of the distinguished Members across the aisle are deriving from the fact that a Democratic Senate now is asking for a continuation of a Republican measure, and there has been much said here about how well this measure has worked. I agree that so far as it has gone it has worked well. But how far has it gone? Only a very small number of agreements have been entered into, most of them dealing with steel and steel products.

It has been said here that small business has indicated its complete satisfaction. I do not want to be understood as agreeing to any such statement as that. As a matter of fact, we had two representatives of small business before our committee. We had one other witness from Arkansas who really presented the case of the failure of the agreement to provide pipe to enable the opening of the Jones Mill aluminum plant, designed to produce aluminum, which is certainly in critical shortage in this country, and he said the plan had not worked in that instance.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD the protest I had received from some small-business men in my State. It had to do with one of the things the able Senator from North Dakota mentioned, soil pipe, which is absolutely essential for any housing program that may be undertaken. I do not know whether it is generally known, but the great center of the soil-pipe industry of the United States, and in fact the greatest in all the world, is located in my State, in the Birmingham-Gadsden-Anniston-Tuscaloosa area. Sixty-eight percent of all the soil pipe produced in the United States is made there. So I believe I know something of what has been happening with respect to the soil-pipe manufacturers in connection with iron and steel.

Reference has been made at different times to one or two individual plants. Mr. President, I want to say that it has not been a small matter with me. Complaints have come in from small-business men engaged in the manufacture of soil pipe. I placed in the RECORD a short quotation from one of the letters I had received, in which the writer stated that the voluntary agreement, so far as he was concerned, simply would not work and that was all there was to it. I remember he came to my office and talked with me personally after he had attended the industry committee meeting here, and he told me the agreement was not going to work. I asked him why. He said, "The Big Steel boys first say how much we are going to receive. Then we are supposed to form a committee to see how that is to be divided among ourselves, and of course that committee will be made up of the large users, the regular customers of the big steel companies, and they are going to receive just what they have been receiving."

I submit, Mr. President, that the record in this case shows that very largely that prediction came true. For instance, a soil-pipe manufacturer in my State wrote me that, whereas some of the big producers of soil pipe were able to buy pig iron in the Birmingham area at \$36 a ton, he could not buy it there. The allocation program was not helping him to obtain \$36-a-ton pig iron. He was obliged to buy pig iron from Texas, and pay \$75 a ton for it. Yet he had to go on the market and compete with the manufacturers or with the syndicate the members of which were able to buy their pig iron at \$36 a ton. I have received many complaints on the subject.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] referred to the fact that many manufacturers in his State used steel and steel products, but that he had received no complaints with respect to the shortage of steel. I want to tell of a friend of mine in Birmingham who called me on the telephone not long ago, and said, "I am simply being starved out of business. I cannot obtain iron." He told me a story. I said, "I wish you would write me a letter to that effect. What you have told me are facts which I should like to see referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to the Small Business Committee, and to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I should like to make some use of this matter." He said, "Oh, no, I am not going to write you a letter. I do not dare do that. If I wrote you a letter and it got out I would not even receive the small amount of steel I am now receiving."

I was interested in the extension of a natural gas pipe line in my area of the State.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I should like to read a statement made by the administrator in charge of the program, as it appears on page 9 of the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency on January 25, 1949. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asked the question:

Here is an elementary question:

Once a firm has made its request known, does it automatically share in the allocation?

Mr. CLARK. If it has made its request known, it does share, providing it qualifies in terms of the product required and the type of end product which is being produced. If they qualify, they are then taken care of.

I recall to the Senator's mind the testimony of Secretary Sawyer as it appears on page 6 of the record, wherein he mentioned cast iron pipe radiation, plumbing-drainage products, and cast-iron soil pipe particularly, which is manufactured largely in the Senator's State, and he said there were 40 participating firms, of whom 35 qualified as small business. That may not encompass the industry, but certainly it would seem that the small business in the soil-pipe industry has been taken into consideration, and sits as a part of the committee which makes the allocation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Sawyer said that they had the privilege of participating, and that a great many small businesses had participated. However, if

anyone wants to see the extent to which small business has participated, I simply refer him to a table on page 48 of the hearings, and suggest that he compare the number of small businesses given there to the number of small businesses throughout the United States.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. No problem with which I have been confronted in the past year has caused as much work, worry, and concern as the shortage of steel to the small-business man. I honestly believe that if it had not been for the Small Business Committee functioning in Congress the small-business man would have had a greater problem than he actually did have. The Small Business Committee did a splendid job, as I observed it, in policing the affairs of the big steel companies to see that small business was given a certain amount of steel in every monthly allocation.

I do not care to hold a post mortem over yesterday. What I am concerned about is this: Do the facts, as the committee now finds them, show that the future will be brighter and that there will be more steel for the small-business men, or is there a necessity at this time actually to put into effect positive, rigid control? That is the question I think we are all wrestling with. Is it necessary to fix positive controls? If it is, we should be moving in that direction. If it is not, then surely we should extend the time through the interim, or the fall months, when we expect Congress to be in recess, into the next year when Congress will be back in session. In that view of the case, then an extension for a period of a year would be more reasonable than an extension for 6 months. So the whole question is: If we are going to have ample steel then we might as well extend the voluntary agreement provision for a year. If we are not, then we might as well talk about regimentation and doing something about it, rather than merely converse about it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for one question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I take it from what my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alabama, has said, that he considers the situation to be still critical and grave?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator refer to the shortage of steel?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I consider the situation critical and grave. I may call the attention of the Senator to the fact that Mr. Sawyer, in response to a question I put to him, said that he anticipated the shortage for 1949 would be 7,000,000 tons.

Mr. BALDWIN. If that is the case, I should like to recall to my friend's mind that when we were debating the subject in December 1947, an amendment was offered to section 2 of the bill, the extension of whose provisions we are discussing by the then minority leader the distinguished Senator from Kentucky,

Mr. BARKLEY, providing for a system of compulsory controls. That amendment is still in existence somewhere. My question is this: If my friends on the other side of the aisle feel that this is so urgent, and requires immediate attention, why do they not bring forward that amendment and let us have an issue on the question of compulsory controls now? Why postpone it? Why delay? Why not have a show-down now? The people of the country were given to understand that if control over the Congress were placed in Democratic hands, the matter of prices would be disposed of in short order. We have been in session for four weeks, and the first measure which comes before us to deal with the question of prices is the continuance of a Republican measure. Now my friend tells me that the next measure to come before us is to call for the continuance of another Republican measure. I ask my friend, if he is so disturbed about this thing, why he does not offer as an amendment the amendment which was offered a year and a half ago? It was most earnestly urged at that time that that amendment was the type of legislation needed to deal with this situation. Why does not my friend offer such an amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am very glad my friend the Senator from Connecticut asked that question. I am also glad to have the question of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. I believe that the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota are quite pertinent to the discussion we are having. There is a shortage of steel—

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I finish answering the question?

Mr. BRICKER. I merely wished to verify some figures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Having to do with the tonnage of the shortage?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes. The Secretary of Commerce did say that, according to his best estimates, there was a shortage of 7,000,000 tons, including our European shipments, upon a production basis of 68,000,000 tons this year of finished products. That was based upon a production of steel ingots estimated at 92,000,000 tons. The production in January, if carried throughout the year, would give us 97,000,000 tons of steel ingots, which would raise the production of finished products to approximately 72,000,000 or 73,000,000 tons, an increase over the estimate by the Secretary of Commerce. Likewise, production in Europe is going up rapidly. Production in Germany, France, Belgium, and England is increasing, so there will be a more adequate supply there, which might cut down the amount estimated for export, of 4,200,000 tons, which would, of course, narrow the difference between supply and demand in this country. As the best proof of that, in 1947 foreign shipments were, as I recall, 6,600,000 tons. Last year they were 4,600,000 tons, and the estimate for this year is 4,200,000 tons. If our production of ingots remains where it was this month, there will not be a difference of 7,000,000 tons, but it will be appreciably smaller than that. Frankly,

on the basis of the estimate and the production capacity, I believe that if there is no interruption by strikes or in the supply of some of the component parts, there will be almost an adequate supply of steel by the end of this year, if not quite an adequate supply to take care of the domestic and foreign needs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his suggestions. I certainly hope that his hope may be realized. I know of nothing that would be better for the economy of the country than for that to come to pass. However, I know that the Senator from Ohio would be one of the first to realize that the statement he has just made had six or eight different contingencies in it. It is one of the "iffiest" statements I have ever heard. I think it may very well serve as an answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. We do not know whether rigid controls are going to be necessary. A year ago last December I supported the amendment for rigid controls, and I have no apology for having supported the amendment. I still believe that had that amendment been written into law we would have been much better off from the standpoint of manufacture of steel and steel products, and all the various products of which steel is the basic material.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have listened nearly all afternoon to the debate upon this subject, and especially the questions which have been repeated over and over by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. At least five distinct times he has asked why some Senator does not offer the amendment which was offered by the distinguished Vice President when he was a Senator, 2 years ago. He has claimed all the credit for the measure which was enacted by the Republican-controlled Congress.

At this point I think it is well to remind the Senate that the only way the Republicans got back into session in 1947 was that the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, called Congress back into extraordinary session to do something about inflation after the Republicans had adjourned the Congress. It was through the efforts of the President that any legislation whatever was enacted having anything to do with the problem of inflation. I mention that in passing.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama that if the Senator from Connecticut can get any enjoyment out of this legislation he is welcome to it. Instead of criticizing and condemning us for trying to continue it for 6 months, he ought to be commending us and thanking us for going along with such a wonderful piece of legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress, which was Republican-controlled.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may say a word in response?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me point out to my distinguished friend that I am enjoying this discussion, because, as I stated in my previous remarks, I am not only surprised but I am astounded that after 2 years of debate on what the Democrats would do to combat high prices if they once got in control of the Congress the very first step is to continue in force and effect a Republican measure, and their second step is going to be to continue in force and effect another one.

If this problem is so urgent, why do we not have the legislation which we were led to believe we were going to have? Apparently we do not have it because what the Republicans did is working. That is demonstrated by the fact that the Democrats now ask to have it continued. It is demonstrated by the fact that the heads of the agencies downtown say that it is adequate and is working. I do not believe that we ought to allow this occasion to pass without taking some note of that fact.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say in response to my friend from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] that I have never seen anyone really excited or astounded who was also happy. The Senator from Connecticut may be happy about this measure, but he has also been astounded all afternoon by the fact that we dared bring in a proposal to continue something which the Republican-controlled Congress adopted 2 years ago. The only reason Republicans adopted any sort of an anti-inflation measure was, as I previously stated, that the President of the United States, Hon. Harry S. Truman, called the Congress back into session at that time and prodded it into action upon the serious question of inflation. It did nothing until the latter part of December of 1947, and then only in self-defense.

The Republicans took all the time they wanted in order to bring forth these few little pogon anti-inflation measures.

Now, because the President of the United States wants a little time, working with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and other agencies of the executive branch of Government who are vitally concerned with economic stabilization, we find this political criticism on the opposite side of the aisle. We are criticized because we do not rush in and do this, that, or the other thing. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, if I can only get my brethren on this side of the aisle to go along with me, we will control the date for the enactment of legislation instead of letting the Republicans do it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me say a few words in my own time, and then I shall be glad to yield again. Particularly do I wish to yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who has been on his feet for some time.

Before we get too far away, I should like to correct the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] in connection with one statement which he made, in fact, in connection with several statements.

I admit that the measure which we are considering today was passed by the Republican-controlled Congress as a substitute for the anti-inflation program recommended by the President, and advocated in legislation introduced by the then able minority leader, who is now Vice President. But when the Senator from Connecticut talks about export controls being Republican legislation, I should like to call his attention to the fact that that legislation has been on the statute books since 1940, and all the Republican Congress did was simply to extend it. When it comes to the question of the allocation of transportation facilities for grain, I should like to call his attention to the fact that that was provided for in the War Powers Act of 1942. So I do not know but that perhaps he has been getting a little too much pleasure out of what we Democrats propose to do with this so-called Republican measure.

I say again that I am glad we did find a little good in one measure they presented. I do not agree with him when he says it was adequate. It was not adequate; it has not been adequate. It has accomplished some good, and I hope that when we have had an opportunity to study this measure in the light of testimony that will be given to our committee by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and—do not forget—the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce, we may be able to continue a voluntary system of allocations that will be workable. I am not saying that I believe we shall be able to do so. In 1947 I supported the amendment for compulsory allocations, and I think we could have done an adequate job under it. I do not think we have done an adequate job under the present law; but it may be that we can stop up enough loopholes to make it adequate, so that rigid controls will not be necessary. But today as a committee we are not in position to recommend to the Senate that that be done.

I should like to call the attention of the able Senator from Minnesota to the fact that recently it was discovered that one iron fabricator was obtaining iron for use in the manufacture of warm-air heaters, but, instead, was using it for the manufacture of shoeshine stands. That question has been submitted to the Attorney General. We are not at all certain that this Republican measure of 1947 will permit the Attorney General to proceed against that man. Certainly if we can stop up loopholes such as that—and we do not know how many more there will be—we can increase the amount of iron that can be allocated to the processors and the fabricators all over the United States. It may be that we can work out a system whereby we can obtain assurance that the 26,000 miles of rural electrification lines can be supplied with the necessary conductors, so that 100,000 or more farm homes can be supplied with electricity. It may be that we can stop up enough loopholes to make the law workable. If we can, I assure the Senate that the Banking and Currency Committee will be glad to return with a recommendation that it be continued, not only for

1 year, but for 2 years. The Secretary of Commerce indicated in his testimony that that is what he was talking about.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I followed the statement of the Senator from Alabama with respect to what the other side hopes to accomplish in the way of providing more steel for more purposes for more people. However, I cannot understand how the extension of the voluntary agreements act for an additional 6 months beyond September could prejudice that program in the slightest. Will the Senator please address himself to that question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I spent perhaps 10 minutes or more in talking about that matter some little time ago. There was an exchange of suggestions between the able Senator from Maryland and myself with reference to it. Perhaps the Senator from Oregon was unfortunately detained from the floor of the Senate at that time.

However, with the indulgence of the other Senators, I do not mind restating very briefly what was said at that time. Under the law as it now stands, the power to enter into these agreements expires February 28. However, there is a 6-month extension within which the agreements made may be effective.

All we are doing in this bill is to bring the first date up to the latter date, so that the whole thing would be extended to September 30, 1949.

Mr. CORDON. I understand that perfectly. But what happens within another 6 months?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the Senator will keep in mind the fact that a part of this law is a waiver of the Antitrust Act with reference to these particular agreements. Suppose we extend the law to March 30, 1949, and suppose voluntary agreements are made before there is any change in the law, and assume that later a change is made. To my way of thinking—and I believe the Senator from Oregon will agree with me—every one of those agreements, voluntarily entered into, and approved by the Attorney General of the United States, would become a commitment. The Antitrust Act would be waived so far as those particular agreements were concerned.

Later on, after we have made the thorough study and have listened to the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and have taken their recommendations, even though we may decide that we want to stop up some of the loopholes, any proposals of that sort cannot be applied to the agreements which have been entered into prior to the enactment of the subsequent measure.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator know of any provision in the present law which requires the President to extend these agreements beyond any time which his pleasure and judgment dictate should be their limit? Let me call the attention of the Senator for a moment to the

law itself. I am reading from page 3, section 2, subparagraph (b) of the original law:

The President is authorized to approve any such agreement which he finds will carry out any of the purposes declared in section 1 of this joint resolution, except that he shall not approve any agreement unless such agreement specifically provides that it shall cease to be effective on or before March 1, 1949.

Does the Senator agree that that is authority for the President to make an agreement for the full period or one-half of the period or any other fraction of the period which in his judgment is proper?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I say to the Senator that that question has been submitted to the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. CORDON. Does not the Senator understand the plain language?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Attorney General has held that whereas no agreement could be entered into subsequent to February 28, 1949, nevertheless, once the agreement is made, deliveries could continue to be made under that agreement for 6 months.

Mr. CORDON. The bill now before the Senate, as amended, contains an amendment to the provision in the original act, and it is to be found at the bottom of the single sheet, which is Senate bill 547. That proposed amendment is:

(f) This section shall expire on September 30, 1949, and any requests made and voluntary plans adopted under this section shall have no force or effect thereafter.

The plain purpose of that is to require that the execution of all agreements be within the period of the maximum limitation, which here is set in September, and which some on this side prefer to extend until next March. If that be the case, is it not the Senator's opinion of this plain language that the President might well develop and properly make agreements to extend say from this or any immediate period to, let us say, the last of May, the last of June, or the first of July, the end of the year, or any other period, and thus maintain within himself the power not only to use any standby control which he may get, if he gets it, but also the power to make these agreements, which power will lapse at the time set in this amendment, or on the 1st of March, whichever date is taken? Would it not be better for the country if the President were given the power to use his judgment under, mind you, Mr. President, the approval of the Attorney General as to the wisdom and legality of his action, and let that power continue so that he may get voluntary agreements, if he can, with his reserved right, if he gets it, to use the whip?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the honorable Senator from Oregon, I think I was in error a few moments ago in saying that the Attorney General had given an official opinion to the effect that deliveries could be made until September 30, 1949, but it is my understanding that that is the opinion of the officials who are administering the act, and that the matter has been submitted to the Attorney General. But let me call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the

fact that on August 18, 1948, a letter went to Secretary Sawyer from the acting majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], in which he stated his interpretation of the law. At that time, the Senator from Nebraska was chairman, if I remember correctly, of the Special Senate Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, and he was writing in that capacity. He of course, as the able Senator knows, is now minority leader. He wrote to Secretary Sawyer, stating that his interpretation of the law had been checked with the Banking and Currency Committee—which, by the way, was under the control of the Republican majority and which had on it three members of the Small Business Committee—and his interpretation was that agreements made prior to March 1, 1949, could continue in existence for 6 months thereafter. He further stated, at the same time, that the Attorney General agreed with his view.

Secretary Sawyer, in reply to the Senator from Nebraska and the Small Business Committee, and the Republican Congress, said that he would abide by the interpretation, and would proceed on the assumption that agreements made prior to March 1, 1949, would continue to be in effect for 6 months thereafter, in accordance with the suggestion that came down to him from the Republican leadership of the Eightieth Congress.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very briefly. I want to conclude.

Mr. CORDON. I regret that I have taken so much of the Senator's time. I am deeply appreciative.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not complaining. I merely said I would like to yield briefly, because I do not want to prolong my own remarks.

Mr. CORDON. I assure the Senator that with the few remarks I have made I shall not interrupt him further. I am deeply appreciative of the Senator's courtesy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to prolong the discussion further. The one point I think we should keep in mind is that we, the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, considered the pending legislation and voted for it. As I recall, at the time the vote was taken, there were 10 members present, and the vote was 8 to 2. Eight Democrats to two Republicans voted to report the legislation favorably. We realized it was a stop-gap measure. We were not asking for anything else. All in the world we were asking was that the voluntary agreement law, accomplishing whatever good it was accomplishing, be continued until we had a chance to hear from other interested persons regarding it, and could make a recommendation as to whether it should be continued for a longer period of time; and, if so, with what amendments; or, if not, what substitute legislation should be offered.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BALDWIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there any testimony before the committee with respect to continuation of the emergency legislation beyond the 6 months' period?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There were a few questions, I think, put to Secretary Sawyer, which may be said to bear upon it, but no direct testimony. We did not go into that question at all.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the question whether it should be continued for 6 months or a year arose at the conclusion of all the testimony, did it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. And in executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. Those who are now seeking to continue it for 1 year failed to produce a single material witness before the committee in support of that being done?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Or even to cross-examine the witnesses who had come before the committee for the purpose of recommending the 6-month stopgap legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Did they ever give an excuse as to why they did not produce witnesses before the committee or present evidence bearing upon the continuation for a year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. None whatever.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to correct the Senator's statement that the bill was ordered reported to the Senate by a vote of 8 to 2. After the amendment was defeated by a vote, as I recall, of 8 to 2, the bill was then ordered reported favorably by the unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. I meant that the question of the extension of time was decided by a vote of 8 to 2. The committee was unanimous in favorably reporting the bill, which is before the Senate today.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Connecticut asking the Senator from Alabama to yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. No. I request the floor in my own right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I can see no harm in continuing the method of voluntary allocation, which apparently has worked so successfully, for a longer period than September 30. Of course, the reason which has been advanced by the proponents of the measure for continuing the law to September 30—and I may say I intend to vote for it—is that it is desired to continue in force and effect the present law until something better is found. Presumably, they think they can find something better. I say that in the face of the fact that all the testimony before the committee, even including the agencies downtown having charge of such matters, was to the effect that this had worked very successfully.

I assume that what may be proposed ultimately is a method whereby the President may impose some real controls. I submit that provision is already in the

act, and I call the attention of the chairman of the committee, and the attention of my distinguished friend from Alabama, to section 6, which sets up a procedure whereby the President can secure from the Congress legislation providing for the control of any specific commodity which he may find to be in short supply. It may be, Mr. President, that while the Congress was under the control of a Republican majority, the President or the administration may have anticipated that such approval would not be forthcoming.

But that is not now the situation. Under the provisions of section 6, a President who was elected as a Democrat could come to a Congress controlled by a majority of Democrats in both Houses and lay before them his program to establish compulsory controls and, I assume, secure very prompt action on it.

When we read section 6 of this act, which was passed by a Republican-controlled Congress, along with a provision for the extension of voluntary controls, there is a complete program to deal with the question. I take it that all of us would prefer to see private business and individual enterprise do the job. Many of us think that when it fails to do the job it should be prodded into doing it. Some of us may think that if private enterprise fails to do the job the Government should step in and supplement its controls.

I submit that the act as it presently stands is admirably designed to do that very thing. So, if we were to continue it for a period of years instead of for six months, there is still in the act a provision whereby the President could ask for the enforcement of specific controls on particular items.

So, Mr. President, I think that in order to have a well-rounded program we could well adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, continuing the provision for a year.

I close by saying, Mr. President, that I am happy indeed that the first step in the President's program to control inflation is the adoption and the continuance of a measure enacted by a Republican-controlled Congress more than a year ago.

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

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the subject has been rather fully debated, but it may be that not sufficient attention has been paid to the legal effect of the law as it now exists and of the powers which would continue if the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio should be adopted and an extension of the act thereby made.

There seems to be some misunderstanding as to exactly what the act means. It would appear to the Senator from Oregon to be perfectly clear. Perhaps it is not. The authority granted to the President to negotiate agreements in the public interest with private industry in the field of allocations is an added power granted to the President which would be, except for this act, nonexistent, because it permits agreements which, except for this authority, would be in con-

flict with and prohibited by the antitrust laws. When the act was drawn the language was made very specific, in that no agreement could be made until the President, as the Chief Executive of the United States, should find it in the public interest, and then only after clearance from the Attorney General. If both those protections were thrown around the power granted, even a Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress was willing to trust a Democratic President of the United States with that power, which no Congress had ever permitted except in an emergency, in time of war.

When that power was granted to the President, it was not in the form of a command. It was a power which the President might or might not exercise. That would depend on whether it was found by him to be in the public interest. It was a power that he might exercise for a short time or for any length of time up to the maximum limit provided in the act.

There is no requirement in the act that agreements made by the Chief Executive must extend for the full maximum period. That is a matter which is discretionary with the President. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio prevails and this power is extended until the end of March of next year, there is no requirement that the President shall use it at all. He may make agreements for 1, 2, 3, 7, or any other number of months that he feels will best serve the public interest, provided only that the agreement does not go beyond the last day of March.

The arguments we hear that if this extension be granted to March 31 of next year, the President may be administering another act and that private industry will not know where it stands, to me is twaddle. There is no basis for it in the law as it exists or in the extension which is suggested. If we grant the President this additional power he will simply be in the most enviable position in which any president of a republic could ever wish to be. He will have the power to negotiate a voluntary agreement. He will have the power to carry out agreements for a long period of time if he shall deem it necessary, or make no agreement unless, in his judgment, it should be made. In any case in which he may make an agreement which is not carried out he would be justified in using any other power he might have. On the other hand, if after such extension there be given stand-by control, there is nothing in the stand-by control that would in any way apply to any private industry which was already operating voluntarily under agreement.

Mr. President, I can see no reason under the shining sun why this extension should not be made. I cannot understand why Senators on the other side of the aisle would not gladly accept the amendment. It is certainly in line with all the ideas and ideals of self-government.

The very thought of stand-by controls is predicated upon the basic proposition that such controls are not now needed, but that they should be available some time in the future if they shall be need-

ed. Certainly if my friends on the other side of the aisle believe in that philosophy—and I believe in it—they should welcome the opportunity for the Chief Executive, who is also of their political faith, to have an opportunity to carry out this allocation on a voluntary basis, by voluntary agreement, rather than to establish all the intricate machinery necessary to force industry, as has been done in the sorry past.

There is no political aspect in this matter, so far as I am concerned. To me it would appear that my friends on the other side of the aisle should accept this amendment and be glad to do so. There can be no prejudice either to industry, the public, or the standing of the President in accepting this amendment for the period of time stated. On the other hand, Mr. President, if we do not extend it, what will happen? My friend from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], in his presentation a little while ago, said, in substance—I do not claim to quote him exactly—that we do not know that stand-by controls will be used or that it will be necessary to use them. I say to my friend from Alabama that if the bill passes according to the way in which it was reported on the floor, so that the voluntary-control provision expires on the 30th day of September of this year, all he will do is to guarantee that the controls must be put on under authority of that reserve stand-by power, because he will have taken from his own President the right to make such an agreement beyond the 30th day of September. Certainly it is not intended to do that. Certainly no one desires to set up all the intricate machinery of control and allocation if it be unnecessary.

There must be some other reason for this limitation as of September 30, when we realize that September 30 would represent the day in all the year upon which we could be almost morally certain that Congress would not be in session. If this act be continued only to September 30, we are taking a permissive authority from the President at a time when we cannot give it back to him. If we pass the bill but leave that date in the act, then we shall hear the argument made, "We must give the stand-by controls, or after the 30th day of September there will be no power of agreement and allocation." I hope, Mr. President, that that is not what is sought. That is not in the public interest.

There has been offered a sound and constructive amendment, to increase the period of time until the last of March of next year. That entire period of time can be utilized by the President, or not at all, as he sees fit. That time goes sufficiently far into the next session of the Congress to afford Congress an opportunity to determine whether the time for voluntary agreements should be extended even further. Any stand-by control that may be enacted can go side by side without any inconsistency whatever with that power, and we may, and I hope we will, find in that event that the record made of voluntary agreements, and the administration of those agreements, the keeping of those agreements by industry, will make unnecessary any

execution or use of any control power which may be vested as a mandatory authority in the President.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I question not in the slightest the excellent motives of the distinguished Senator from Ohio in offering his amendment, and I think I understand, from the able arguments made, that there are some reasons why such an amendment should be considered. But I think that the philosophy followed by the committee is a preferable one in this case, for a reason which I should like to state into the RECORD at this time.

Let me first, however, commend the committee for keeping this subject, in its report, on an entirely nonpolitical basis, and insofar as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, his debate will be confined to such a basis.

I commend particularly the wording of the report, which I read into the RECORD now:

The principal activities under this section, up to the present time, have been those carried on by the Office of Industry Cooperation of the Department of Commerce with respect to existing and proposed voluntary plans providing for the allocation of steel and pig iron to various programs of importance to the domestic economy, the national security, and the foreign policy of the United States. The committee finds that the existing voluntary plans have provided substantial benefits to the national interests.

There is no question there of depriving anyone of the credit, and I am glad that such is the approach.

The committee report continues, a little later:

The committee is advised that a broader stabilization program will be submitted to the Congress in the near future and that this program will include provisions for the allocation of scarce materials for essential purposes. Pending consideration of this more comprehensive program, it is the recommendation of your committee that the authority for the present activities under section 2, Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, should be extended, in order that the benefits of this program to the domestic economy, the national security, and the foreign policy should not be lost.

There is no claim at all that there have not been benefits under the act which is now in force, but a well-considered statement, in my view of the facts, that since a much more comprehensive program for stabilization of industry, critical supplies, and so forth, is on the way and will be here shortly, final action on that particular measure should preclude any great extension, in terms of many months, of the present law. Hence the recommendation for the limited extension of 6 months.

Mr. President, before coming to my principal point, I wish again to commend the completely nonpolitical approach made by the committee, by unanimous vote, as I now understand, and I think that is a sound approach to make in matters which do vitally affect the national economy. I think that the recommendation is based on good, sound

grounds, good business reasons, when a longer extension than 6 months is not recommended, because of the announced fact that in the early future this committee is expecting a more comprehensive program, and will expect to pass upon a program, so as to fit in any new enactment with the rather limited extension which is proposed under the bill now under consideration.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Not for a moment, if the Senator please. I should like to complete my statement; then I shall be glad to yield.

I may say, Mr. President, that my own concern in regard to the pending measure arises because of some experience which I had about the time of the enactment of the present law, when serving on a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee of the Senate, and in trying to discover what was wrong with the steel industry. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that that subcommittee made a report, which appears in Senate Document 825, Eightieth Congress, which was agreed to by all members of the subcommittee. In other words, it was a nonpolitical report, in which the effort was to bring to the attention of the Senate and of the country the fact that certain things had caused grave concern to the members of the subcommittee in connection with steel. Some of the things I should like to quote out of the report for the RECORD at this time, if I may. First, from page 8 of the report I read this paragraph:

In addition to some steel mills withdrawing their distribution from areas previously served and refusing to ship steel where it is needed, the subcommittee has investigated other evidences of disruption to normal channels of supply marked by growths in horizontal and vertical integrations in the steel-producing industry. There is no question but that smaller steel producers and users are being forced out of business and their facilities either scrapped or taken over by the larger integrated companies.

Then, continuing on the same subject, on pages 9 and 10 of the report, I quote again:

Many complaints received by the subcommittee indicate that some of the integrated steel companies, which constitute the principal source of supply for crude, semifinished, and finished steel in this country, have refused to continue to supply old customers on the grounds that the steel is needed by the producer to take care of the requirements of his own wholly owned or controlled fabricating or manufacturing units.

I digress from the quotation simply to state that the committee was alarmed to find to what a degree the manufacturing companies had taken over the erectors and the fabricators, or had themselves organized competing erectors and fabricators, which were driving the little folks out of business.

I continue to read:

The supply of basic materials to the smaller units of the steel industry is one of the vital points in the relations between the large integrated producers and the small business of the steel industry.

Then there are several other statements to like effect. Instead of reading

them at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my present remarks all of that portion of the report of the subcommittee beginning with the heading "Integrated operations reduce supplies to independents" on page 9 and continuing down to but not including the heading "Exports of steel" on page 10.

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

INTEGRATED OPERATIONS REDUCE SUPPLIES TO INDEPENDENTS

Many complaints received by the subcommittee indicate that some of the integrated steel companies, which constitute the principal source of supply for crude, semifinished, and finished steel in this country, have refused to continue to supply old customers on the grounds that the steel is needed by the producer to take care of the requirements of his own wholly owned or controlled fabricating or manufacturing units.

The supply of basic materials to the smaller units of the steel industry is one of the vital points in the relations between the large integrated producers and the small business of the steel industry.

Colonel Rockwell, of the Rockwell Manufacturing Co., in testimony referred to above, has outlined the logical consequences of the continued development of integration of steel-producing and manufacturing facilities. He speaks with the authority of an experienced and eminent industrialist, and his words quoted below should carry weight:

"It is obvious that, if the steel companies continue to enter into competition with their customers in the fabricating and in the steel-consuming manufacturing industries, we shall soon be competing with vertical trusts of the type which existed in Germany.

"When there is a slowing down of business, such steel companies will try to obtain business from the independent steel barrel manufacturers and other consumers [of steel]; but, when business is expanding rapidly, such customers will be faced with a refusal to supply steel at the very time when it is impossible to buy from other steel companies who are considerate enough to take care of their established customers.

"As far as we know, this is the first time in history that some steel companies have had a sustained demand, and, at the same time, have been in competition with their customers. They have, therefore, cut off some established customers in order to build up their own business in the steel-fabricating or steel-consuming manufacturing industries."

One of the first complaints laid before the subcommittee was that of an independent steel erector, the Karl Koch Erecting Co., of the Bronx, N. Y. (p. 1904, hearings). This company testified that they were unable to bid on the erection of Government hospitals in New York State because the steel bids tendered by the only bidders, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp. and Bethlehem Steel Corp., provided not only for the furnishing of the steel but its fabrication and erection as well. Under the limitations of the bidding form, the independent was unable to bid, due to the fact that he could not furnish the steel for the erection services he would perform. This method of bidding made a difference in the cost to the Government of \$151,800 in the building of a veterans' hospital in Brooklyn, N. Y. (p. 1915, hearings.)

Mr. C. A. Johnson, general manager of sales, fabricated steel construction, Bethlehem Steel Corp., stated (p. 1931, hearings) in response to questioning by the subcommittee that his company would not bid on steel for these Government hospitals unless they could secure the complete job, which would include fabrication and erection. He

also gave as his reason the need to keep the Bethlehem erection department busy.

As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee was able to secure for all the independent erectors a revision of the Government bid form which would enable them to bid on the separate services on Government construction, and require the integrated companies to bid, separately, on each service to be rendered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as one member of that subcommittee, it was crystal clear to me that many of the small erectors and fabricators had actually been driven out of business already, and that the course of operations was designed to eliminate more and more of them from business. It was my fear that the legislation in December of 1947 was too weak to cope with that particular situation.

The junior Senator from Florida supported the motion made by the then senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Barkley, but, having failed in its adoption, he supported the bill, taking what he could to deal effectively with this problem.

But now, Mr. President and Senators, I am not satisfied that that particular acute problem in this field which relates to small business has been solved, and my reason is that during the time of operation of the current law I have had not one, but repeated complaints from small-business operators in my own State and elsewhere, because they have not been able to get their supplies of steel from the manufacturers, and because the manufacturers are sending those supplies in undue quantities, so these small people believe, to the fabricators and erectors who belong to the manufacturers. And, Mr. President, because of my having received a large number of complaints of that kind during the operation of this existing law, I am glad that the committee confines itself in its recommendations to a limited extension of 6 months and gives notice and warning that it proposes during that period of time to take up a more comprehensive program, and of course to make report and recommendation for the enactment of legislation in that more comprehensive program.

And here is something that makes me even more fearful that the present law is not meeting the situation. I quote from the printed report of the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate on the subject of the bill to extend the voluntary controls agreement, on January 25, 1949. I quote from page 43 of those hearings. The sentence which I shall read comes out of the report of Secretary Sawyer. It is in response to questions during the course of the hearings as to how small business was affected by the operation of the present law. In candor I must say that the Secretary in his testimony stated that he felt that small business was being pretty well cared for. All I can say is that that feeling varies from the reports that have come to the junior Senator from Florida. But when he was asked to submit written recommendations and a written statement and a written report on its operation under this measure, he included this particular sentence, which I call to the attention of the Senate, and which, it seems to me, makes it wholly clear that the operation of the present

law, within the limited time that it has been afforded, has not been carried down the line to the point where it does serve to protect small users of steel and small business in the steel industry. I quote the sentence which appears as subsection (4) of section C on page 43:

All the present plans provide for shipments from producing mills, and it has not yet been possible to make arrangements for allocations for shipments by warehouse and other distributors. Therefore, the existing voluntary plans cannot take care of consumers who buy only from warehouses and other distributors.

That is the end of the quotation, Mr. President and Senators, and it would appear from the report of the Secretary of Commerce made to the committee but a few days ago, that he stated frankly to the committee that the operations of his Department, the operations of the Nation under the present law, had not been carried down to the consumers or to the small people, and that he made no pretense that such was the case.

Mr. President, in closing it seems to me that it would be very foolish for the Senate to create a problem such as that suggested by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], by extending the law for a greater period than the 6 months, and that, to the contrary, the proposed action should be regarded as a stopgap extension, and I, for one, in view of the wholly nonpolitical position taken by the committee will be looking with confidence to the committee to bring in a much-farther-reaching report based upon the comprehensive recommendations which the committee tells us it will be in position to receive and to study within a very short period.

I think that is the cautious, that is the prudent, that is the common-sense, that is the businesslike way to approach the problem, and so far as I am concerned, I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is not the proper way to approach the subject, and I hope it will be defeated.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has read excerpts from the report of the Committee on Small Business, indicating that the handling of steel allocation was not satisfactory to small business. Does the Senator know whether that condition resulted from a failure of the Secretary of Commerce properly to administer an agreement, or from a failure of the President to make the right kind of an agreement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make clear the statement I made. I thought it was clear before.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator had not touched that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. The report was made upon a study which was made by the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee just prior to the meeting of the special session of Congress in December, I believe it was, of 1947, and the report is dated in December of 1947, immediately after the enactment of the present law. Therefore the situation complained of in the report of the com-

mittee developed during the hiatus—during that time between the knocking out of all controls in the summer of 1946 and the time in December of 1947 when the new control measures were passed. But in addition to that definite knowledge which the Senator from Florida has as to the existence of that fact at that time, I also have ample showings from numerous small users that that condition has not been corrected. And then when I see in the report of Secretary Sawyer the statement which I read into the Record indicating that the program had not yet had time to be continued down to and to reach to the actual users of steel, it seems to me that there is a statement that should put me and should put the Senate on guard as to what has been done to small business under the operation of this particular law, and until we do know what has been done, after adequate studies have been made by the committee, which I think the Senator will agree has proceeded in a nonpolitical way—until we do know how small business now can say that it has been affected by the operations of this law, I think any approach to permanent or semipermanent legislation would be a mistake. That is the position I am taking here.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Ohio suggests that the extension of voluntary agreement be made to the 31st of March 1950 rather than the 30th of September 1949.

Is the Senator in agreement with the Senator from Oregon, that if that be not done, and the time limit be the 30th of September, as provided in the committee's bill, the Congress, in considering any legislation which may be presented, is faced with the proposition that it must take the administration bill or have nothing at all after the 30th of September? Is that the Senator's view?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is not the view of the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. CORDON. What situation would exist?

Mr. HOLLAND. On the contrary, if the Senator will allow me to make my own answer to his suggestion—

Mr. CORDON. I have not attempted to suggest an answer. I apologize for the second question.

Mr. HOLLAND. On the contrary, it is my view that this report, taken as a whole, makes it very clear that the committee proposes to study the question diligently and to make recommendations for legislation which can be passed while we are in session in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. I think the report makes it very clear that the committee is hoping that much more effective legislation can be enacted to operate after September 30, which will allow a little time to prepare all the multifarious details of such a program, and which will not allow this relatively uncontrolled situation to continue into next spring.

If I felt that the committee was not willing speedily to make a study and report, and that the committee was not anticipating the passage of more effective and more comprehensive legislation

while we are in session during the first session of this Congress, effective September 30, I would agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. But there has been nothing in the performance of the committee which indicates to my mind anything other than an intention to go ahead as rapidly as possible consistent with caution and the exercise of good judgment, and to come back with a comprehensive program for enactment before we get away from here, effective September 30.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] should be adopted, and the Voluntary Agreements Act should be extended to the last of March of next year, could not the President in his wisdom, having in mind as the Senator has, a comprehensive study of the whole problem, and the possible introduction of comprehensive legislation to meet whatever situation the committee should find exists—could not the President, under the extended terms of the act, the purpose of which is only to limit the time of his authority and not to require his exercise of it up to that time, go forward and make voluntary agreements extending only to September 30 of this year, or even a shorter time, if he thought it was in the public interest, and so keep more careful and complete control of the whole situation in his own hands pending enactment of other legislation, if it were to be enacted? Could not that be done?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course it could be done; but the Senator overlooks the fact that the President is not the only one concerned in this question, or in the enactment of further legislation to supplement this legislation. I apprehend that there would be factors in the steel industry, and there would be Members of this body and of the other body of Congress coming from the areas where those industries are very powerful industrial agencies, who, if machinery were created which would operate until March 30 next year, would be much more insistent in their objection to machinery which I might feel and the majority of the Senate might feel would be much more adequate to deal with this problem than is the present law. I for one would not want to put the Senate or the Congress in the position of having created a law which would encourage some to oppose the enactment of a better law because they would have this law operative as to their businesses until March 30 next year. I think much the sounder approach is that suggested by the committee, which I approve.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has suggested, if I correctly understand him, that he not only does not want to encourage Senators who may disagree with the legislation offered to vote against it, but, in effect, by placing the September 30 limit on the voluntary agreements, if those Senators feel that any kind of allocation is necessary, he is going to coerce them into voting for the legislation

which comes up later. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator uses the word "coerce." I would not use it. The word "influence" would be better.

Mr. CORDON. I will accept "influence."

Mr. HOLLAND. A limitation 8 months into the future could hardly be called close enough to this date to be at all coercive in its effect.

Mr. CORDON. Would the addition of 6 or 7 months seriously affect anybody?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer would be that it would bring the matter into the next Congress, and would encourage those who might be disposed to do so in this Congress to use all kinds of parliamentary procedure to hold onto what the majority might feel was a much less effective machinery, namely, the one under the present act, rather than to go to a much more effective machinery, which I hope will be suggested and recommended shortly by the able committee.

Mr. CORDON. If I follow the Senator, his view is that he would rather have permissive authority than no authority, but he does not want the permissive authority to go any further than September 30, solely because he wants an inducement to those who disagree with him to go along with the over-all legislation which may come forward, even though they do not believe in it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would rather state my position in this way: The Senator from Florida sees no point in extending the authority for 12 months when he thinks an extension of 6 months will allow not only ample time, but several times the ample amount of time necessary to give serious and deliberate consideration to the more effective legislation, which I confidently expect to come from the committee shortly.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator does not expect the Congress to be in session on September 30, does he?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida joins the Senator from Oregon in his hope that we shall not be in session at that time, and thinks that that has nothing to do with the situation, because under the law, as the Senator understands, we may be here until the end of July. It does not seem to me that there could be any possible question of there being adequate time, and much more than adequate time between now and the end of July, to give full consideration to this important question, and to adopting much sounder legislation in this field than that which now exists.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there has been considerable debate of this subject. As the Senate well knows, the committee voted, with only two dissenting votes, to report the bill favorably. It seems to me that about all that is involved is the point that the amendment is designed to foreclose a study by the committee of the proposals for additional controls which the administration is considering, but which have not yet been considered in the committee. Of

course the minority do intend to foreclose such a study. Regardless of how the House of Representatives and the Senate may in the long run decide on the question of additional controls, I think that at the very least the matter should be considered by the committee, and that is the purpose of the committee bill. So of course I intend to support the bill.

The Senator from Alabama in the course of his remarks made some reference to a difficulty that we are having in bringing into production part of the aluminum plant at Jones Mill, Ark. I wish to clarify that point for a moment, because at the hearings the other day I had considerable to say about that particular item. The fact is that the pipe to bring natural gas from the natural gas fields to that plant has been on order for some 2 years by the Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co. Intervening and subsequent to the ordering of that pipe by that gas company, the Atomic Energy Commission has decided that as a supplemental and an auxiliary source of gas, it would like to bring gas, by pipe line, to the Oak Ridge plant. The Department of Commerce has, I believe, at least tentatively—and I think it expects to do so permanently—made the allocation to the Oak Ridge plant.

My objection is simply that the Oak Ridge plant does not need pipe line in order to operate. It simply would give the Oak Ridge plant an additional or auxiliary source of fuel; but that is not as critical, from the point of view of national defense, as is the bringing into production of the two pot lines that are not now producing in the Jones Mill plant. In other words, it is a question of judgment as to which is the more important in the national interest, and there was a difference of opinion as between me and the persons who are interested in the production of aluminum and the Atomic Energy Commission. That was the point referred to by the Senator from Alabama. Regardless of my difference of judgment on that point, I still think this bill should be passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and it was signed by the Vice President.

A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, some time ago I thought there was a possibility of promptly obtaining a vote on the bill relating to voluntary agreements and plans for the allocation of scarce materials, and therefore I did not obtain the floor to speak on the matter to which I am about to address myself. Since that time I have understood that several other speeches on the subject are scheduled. Therefore I wish to say a few words about an action which I think is extremely important. It does not relate to the bill which has been under discussion during the day.

In March 1947, joined by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution which would have placed the Congress of the United States on record as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations.

This, I might add, was several months before the Secretary of State, General Marshall, made his Harvard speech on June 5, 1947, which resulted in the Marshall plan and the European recovery program. It was also several weeks before the then Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, made his Cleveland, Miss., speech, which has been said to be the forerunner of the Marshall plan.

On April 7, 1947, when aid to Greece and Turkey was being discussed, I spoke at some length on the subject of European federation, saying this:

I submit that unless we are able to create a different, a more sensible economic and political order in Europe, there is no hope for a prosperous or a peaceful solution to her difficulties. It is my belief that if all we are able to do is to recreate the prewar crazy quilt of jealous sovereignties, neither Europe nor the Near East is a good risk. If we persist in preserving an irrational and obsolete economic and political system in Europe, we can be sure that, for a third time, its internal frictions will supply the spark for world conflagration. No one can guarantee that a federation will absolutely prevent all sparks, but at least there will be a chance that it may.

Unless we are willing to write off Europe as a friend and supporter of democratic principles, it behooves us to use our economic power and our talents of persuasion to induce Europeans to create a free and democratic federation of states. Under such a union the world may again see a renaissance of culture, of freedom, and of spiritual power which once before led the world out of the confusion and tyranny of the dark ages.

Mr. President, on March 3, 1948, when the Senate was debating the Economic Cooperation Act, I offered an amendment to the preamble of that act, to express the hope that the participating countries would exert efforts to achieve political unification.

During the course of the debate it became clear that although the then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the present chairman, and other members of the committee approved the objective and purposes of the amendment, at the same time they objected to its inclusion in the bill.

I then said:

It is with reluctance that I withdraw the amendment; but in view of the opposition of the committee, and the probability that such a defeat would be interpreted as this Nation's disapproval of European unity, I feel compelled to follow this course. * * * I still feel that unless the CEEC countries can achieve political unification during the next few years, the ERP program not only will fail to bring peace and stability to Europe, but, on the contrary, if those countries succumb one by one to the Communists, it will actually result in a tremendous subsidy at our expense to the growth of Communist power.

Last June 11, when the Senate was considering the Vandenberg resolution, I asked the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee if, under paragraph 2

of that resolution, dealing with regional defense arrangements, a federation of the European countries might be contemplated.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] replied as follows:

Most emphatically, and I join the Senator from Arkansas in thinking that it would be one of the most hopeful possible evolutions that could be contemplated. * * * I think the emphasis in the present resolution upon the development of regional and other collective arrangements specifically includes the great idea of a United States of Europe, to which the Senator from Arkansas has been so devoted.

Upon this assurance, and the assurance of other members of the committee, that the concept of European federation was included in the language of the resolution, I did not press at that time for a more specific endorsement of the idea.

Mr. President, I give this background for the purpose of emphasizing that, although the Senate has not specifically recorded itself as favoring European federation, there is a great deal of legislative history on the subject, and there is reason to feel that many Senators believe in the necessity of European federation. I also wish to say I think that discussion is beginning to bear fruit.

In the New York Times of Saturday, January 29, 1949, there was a very interesting dispatch upon this subject, and I think it is perhaps the most significant move that has occurred in a long time with regard to progress under the ERP. Unfortunately the indication by Marshal Stalin of his willingness to talk things over has distracted the attention of most people from this action, which I feel has far greater significance. I wish to read only a selected paragraph or two, but at the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be included.

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

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is dated January 28:

The Western Union powers agreed today to create a Council of Europe and thus fulfill a dream of centuries of European statesmen.

There will be a committee composed of government Ministers meeting in secret and capable of making binding decisions, which means—

And I emphasize this sentence— which means the actual delegation of sovereign powers to a European body.

That is the crucial question which has been involved in the discussions of all international bodies since the creation of the League of Nations, and it is the very point upon which all of them have failed. In no previous case that I know of has any real delegation of sovereign power been given to any international body.

The next paragraph which I think is particularly important is:

These are not mere proposals; they are agreements made by the Foreign Ministers of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. The British Cabinet, for instance, held an emergency meeting this afternoon to approve these momentous deci-

sions, which now commit the Government of Great Britain.

When the Foreign Ministers, who had been meeting in the office of Foreign Secretary Bevin, came out this evening at the end of their 2-day conference, they were visibly elated. They knew they had made history.

They had taken the first important practical step toward a goal that has beckoned European statesmen from the seventeenth century "grand design" of the French statesman Sully to Briand's "United States of Europe."

I think this is by far the most significant move by the European nations since the war.

I also notice in the same edition of the New York Times in a dispatch from Oslo that the Scandinavian Foreign Ministers endorse the plan. It is true that with regard to the Atlantic Pact, due to the pressure from Russia, the Norwegians did not see fit to participate; but apparently Norway endorses the creation of a Council of Europe. It is also my understanding that other countries in Europe will be invited to join the Council of Europe. The article mentions that:

Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza (of Italy) said today, "Italy will be one of the founding states" of the new Council of Europe.

Only a short time ago, Mr. President, it was assumed by many persons that the idea for the creation of a real political federation or council of Europe, using the terms that were used by the Ministers on last Friday, was entirely beyond any realistic hope at this time. In fact there was an article in the New York Times magazine of last week—that is, January 23—by Mr. Callendar, one of their staff writers, entitled "We Expect Too Much From the Marshall Plan." The thesis of that article, less than a week preceding the action on the part of the foreign minister of the Brussels pact countries, is that some of us expected entirely too much; in other words, we had expected it would promote a political federation of Europe, and that expectation was entirely beyond all reasonable possibilities at this time. I would say this action on the part of the foreign ministers on Saturday completely negatives Mr. Callendar's whole thesis.

There was one paragraph in Mr. Callendar's article which I think was entirely uncalled for, reading as follows:

Since the United States has accepted western Europe as both a financial and a military responsibility or liability, certain Americans have insisted upon urging and prodding Europe into a union that presumably would stand on its own feet and relieve the United States of its present responsibility for this Continent. This may not be precisely an isolationist attitude, but it is one that displays dislike of the huge international responsibilities that have been assumed by the United States and a desire to be rid of them as soon as possible.

I certainly, for one, would like to be rid of some, if not all, of these responsibilities, and would like to diminish the impact of those responsibilities upon our own economy. But I would not admit that that is, in the words of Mr. Callendar, an isolationist attitude.

Mr. President, I think this action on the part of the Foreign Ministers of the Brussels Pact countries certainly deserves recognition by the Congress of the United States and by the people of the United States. Last fall, while I was in Europe, I stated that unless some progress were made toward political unification, unless they at least accept political unification as an objective of the present plan, I would find it extremely difficult to justify a continuation of the ERP program. The establishment of the Council of Europe, assuming the account which I have read from the Times is correct, I think is a justification for the continuation of the program. I might also call attention to the fact stated in an article in the New York Times of January 11, in which one of the prominent members of the British House of Commons stated that a United States of Europe would cut the Marshall plan costs by 66 percent.

That, of course, is a very extreme statement. I do not know how one would arrive at that exact percentage, but there is no doubt in my mind that it would certainly decrease the costs. That statement is from Mr. R. W. G. MacKay, who has written extensively on this subject.

Mr. President, I think the time has come when the Congress should specifically endorse the idea, particularly as we are about to consider the proposed North Atlantic Alliance and the renewal of the Economic Cooperation Act.

For this purpose, I have introduced today, together with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the following resolution:

In order to encourage a peaceful and prosperous order in Europe, but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, it is hereby

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the political federation of Europe.

I hope the Committee on Foreign Relations will give some consideration to this resolution when it holds hearings on the extension of the Economic Cooperation Act, and that it may give some expression of the belief that progress toward the goal of European federation should be accomplished with our assistance under the ECA.

At Harvard, Secretary Marshall said:

Any assistance that this Government may render should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative.

I believe that the revival of European economic prosperity alone, without some permanent form of political federation, is a mere palliative and not a cure. I do not believe that the relatively small and independent political sovereignties of Europe, as they now exist, can, under modern political and economic conditions, retain their independence or economic prosperity without aid for very long.

If the same old prewar Europe of many small, independent states is economically rehabilitated, I do not think we shall have achieved anything of lasting value, commensurate with the sacrifices that we

shall have made. Europe reconstructed can protect herself from neither alien domination nor internal quarrels. Standing alone none of the 16 nations can withstand the determined pressure of the Russians. While they may think they can take refuge in neutrality, the last war has proved how futile that is.

For centuries—from the grand design of Henry IV, in 1638, to Winston Churchill today—many of the greatest statesmen of Europe have called for European federation. It is no longer a philosophical longing or an idealistic dream. The ancient prejudices about sovereignty are beginning to dissolve, and a United States of Europe has actually become a matter of practical politics, as was demonstrated on last Friday.

I believe that we should promote the idea of European federation with all our powers of persuasion and, provided the Europeans are willing, with all our economic and industrial strength.

My efforts to obtain an expression of the Congress endorsing European federation have met with one consistent objection: that it is an unwarranted interference in the affairs of other countries. I think the announcement by the Brussels powers will do much to dispel this notion. I am not, by this resolution, attempting to force an alien notion upon the free governments of Europe. I am rather attempting to record this Nation's endorsement of a great movement, and to urge its further development before it is too late.

We have made, and probably will make, additional enormous loans and grants to the nations of Europe, and we are about to consider a program of military assistance and alliance. As a consequence we are faced with such a tremendous drain upon our national resources that we are forced to take stock of our wealth lest we impoverish ourselves in helping others. It would be strange if we did not take a selfish interest in the possibilities of a United States of Europe. But whatever malicious propaganda the Kremlin may spread to the contrary, the fact remains that the primary reason for our assistance is our wish to create a stable and orderly world in which we, and all peoples of the world, may live in peace. I am convinced that the federation of Europe is a fundamental pillar of a stable world order.

Our concern is not simply an idealistic dream of bringing relief to suffering Europe; nor is it the hard-shelled manipulations of economic imperialism. We have a deep and inescapable interest in the welfare of Europe—in its military, economic, and political strength. Twice in 25 years we have shed our blood and spent our treasure in world wars which grew out of European feuds and power politics. We know that our present well-being will be short-lived unless Europe recovers and carries on normal economic, social, and political relations with us. Rich as our country is, we cannot indefinitely subsidize an impoverished, dependent, Europe. That Continent must learn again under modern industrial and commercial conditions how to take care of itself.

Our interests are personal; they are immediate and they are real. But there is another very urgent reason for our interest. If western Europe were to succumb to the Russians, then the systems, institutions, and values which have made all North America great, would be imperiled. A healthy, prosperous, rehabilitated, and united Europe is one of the best guaranties that our country, that all free peoples, will remain free and strong.

We have today in Europe another interest and responsibility. As a result of the war, we are now for practical political purposes a sovereign nation on the European Continent. The United States actually governs a substantial and important part of western Europe. Where our troops are occupying parts of Germany, Austria, and Trieste, we must govern and protect Europeans. We have no intention of retaining these territories for our own, and, indeed, we are anxious to rid ourselves of their burden. But we cannot until we are certain that our withdrawal will not menace the peace of western Europe and hence the United States.

The German problem, and to a lesser degree, the problems of Austria and Trieste, cannot be settled irrespective of our desires and interests. Indeed it is our duty to promote settlements which in our judgment are in the best interests of Europe and America.

Now, as we have an interest in the military, economic, and political welfare of Europe, and as our interests are genuine, and our purposes are not imperialistic, do we not have the right even to express the hope that Europe may achieve political federation?

If the reason for our reluctance to express our desires is our fear of offending Russia, is it not absurd to think that military cooperation, joint maneuvers, advice, and even equipment are not equally offensive?

If our reasoning is that expression of our hope that federation may be brought about is an unwarranted interference in the affairs of other countries, how can we explain that our advice in military and economic affairs is not? No one yet has been able to determine successfully the line between the external and the internal affairs of nations, but as their federation involves internal affairs that is only incidental to its real purpose. If, as history proves, their external affairs are of vital consequence to us, are we not entitled to urge a remedy for the recurrent quarrels they create?

This criticism, that advocating a federation of Europe is officious intermeddling by Americans, is often made. At the same time, however, we are told that we have a responsibility to use our power, our knowledge, and our wealth to rehabilitate the stricken areas of the world. These views are inconsistent. If we grant that we have this obligation, then we must also be obliged to see that the rehabilitation is sensible and effective. There can be no obligation to reestablish the same old divided Europe, from which two world wars have emerged to afflict

us. Surely we have a legitimate interest in the purposes for which the products of our land and the work of our people are to be expended. As we govern and support much of Germany, are we not entitled to propose a solution to the problems of Germany's future in keeping with Europe's needs?

If we reason that federation is too remote, what can we possibly lose by encouraging and urging federation? Even if it is not to be achieved can we take the chance that but for our reluctance, or timidity, in promoting it, it might have come about?

Of course, we cannot force this goal of federation upon Europe. Yet we may have the power to make it a reality, by encouragement and assistance. We must use the power tactfully, but this is not to say we must not use it at all.

The final responsibility which I believe attaches to the United States is that, in opposing Soviet Russia's initiative, we must offer some alternative which will maintain order in Europe. Negation—even of Russian domination—is not enough for this aggressive and restless world. We shall continue to be negative at our own peril. In peace, as well as in war, victory will not come to the negative defensive strategy. A certain boldness, a positive resourcefulness, is essential to win any battle, in war or peace.

The Germans in 1914 and again in 1939 to 1941 did not believe that the democracies of the west would go to war over the neutrality of Belgium or the independence of Poland. We shall never know what course world events would have taken had they known, but we can be reasonably sure it would have been different and better. We were then given a period of months and years in which to make our decision and to prepare to follow it.

The world today wants to know where we stand. Many Europeans believe we may once again withdraw from Europe. The Russians believe it and are striving to bring it about in Berlin and Germany and all over Europe. They hope that we shall become so disgusted, disillusioned, and tired of the ever-intensified war of nerves that we shall give up and go home. We are trying to convince Russia and Europe now that we will stay.

I believe that we can, and will, stay—but only so long as we believe that by our defense and assistance we can accomplish something which gives hope of progress toward lasting peace. From our own experience we can, and do, believe in the principle of federation as a means of assuring domestic tranquillity, common defense, and general welfare. It is an idea which we have held to for 160 years, in which we have faith for the future, and which, I am convinced, the people of Europe can adapt to their own great security, prosperity, and happiness.

It is, I believe, of the greatest importance that the people of Europe be given a goal, a hope for the future. The unity of Europe, solid and permanent, is such a goal. It is a goal which I believe will inspire them to great creative acts and to great sacrifices, such as they have per-

formed in the past and which I am sure they can achieve again, to their own benefit and to the benefit of the world.

EXHIBIT A

COUNCIL OF EUROPE FORMED BY FIVE WESTERN UNION POWERS—TWO BODIES SET UP—SOVEREIGN RIGHTS GIVEN TO MINISTERIAL GROUP, WITH RULINGS BINDING—PUBLIC ASSEMBLY TO AID—OTHER COUNTRIES ARE INVITED TO JOIN—BRITISH CABINET QUICKLY APPROVES PLAN

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

LONDON, January 28.—The Western Union Powers agreed today to create a "Council of Europe" and thus fulfill a dream of centuries of European statesmen.

There will be a committee composed of government ministers meeting in secret and capable of making binding decisions, which means the actual delegation of sovereign powers to a European body.

Alongside this committee will be an advisory consultative body representing the national parliaments of Europe. This group will meet in public.

These are not mere proposals; they are agreements made by the Foreign Ministers of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. The British Cabinet, for instance, held an emergency meeting this afternoon to approve these momentous decisions, which now commit the Government of Great Britain.

ONLY DETAILS TO BE SETTLED

Only details remain to be settled. They are to be worked out by the Permanent Commission of the Brussels Pact Powers, which meets weekly in London. This commission is composed of the Ambassadors of the four continental countries plus Hubert Gladwyn Jebb, of the British Foreign Office.

When the Foreign Ministers, who had been meeting in the office of Foreign Secretary Bevin, came out this evening at the end of their two-day conference, they were visibly elated. They knew they had made history.

They had taken the first important practical step toward a goal that has beckoned European statesmen from the seventeenth century "grand design" of the French statesman Sully to Briand's "United States of Europe." Here is a relevant passage of the communiqué they issued after their meeting:

"After considering the most valuable preparatory work accomplished in Paris by the Committee for the Study of European Unity, the Council [the Consultative Council of Brussels Powers] agreed that there should be established a Council of Europe consisting of a ministerial committee meeting in private and a consultative body meeting in public."

OTHERS INVITED TO JOIN

"The Permanent Commission was instructed to study the detailed application of the decisions of principle taken by the Council. The Council decided to invite other European countries to take part in the negotiations for the establishment of the Council of Europe."

Although many of the proposed details remain secret and others are still to be worked out, it is possible to add some flesh to these bare bones.

It was agreed that the appointment of delegates to the consultative body and their voting powers should be left to the discretion of each country, which can satisfy its own constitutional practices.

France, for example, can elect her delegates by a majority vote of her National Assembly and thus exclude Communists. Britain could appoint delegates from the Labor Party or all three parties.

This is one of the compromises reached during the past 2 days because the French

wanted delegates to the European assembly to be elected and Britain wanted them nominated by the Governments.

Britain originally wanted voting in the assembly, or consultative body as it is now called, to be compulsory bloc voting by nations. Mr. Bevin, as expected, yielded on this point and the decisions will be made by a majority vote of all delegates voting individually, not as national groups.

A British compromise proposal whereby the ministerial committee would control the agenda of the consultative body was accepted. Subjects for discussion by the consultative body can be determined on the initiative of either organization but the ultimate control of the agenda, which is to say the power of veto, will rest with the ministerial committee.

The principle on which voting will take place in both organizations has been decided but it is being kept secret. Guessing is that it will be by two-thirds vote in the ministerial committee and a majority in the consultative body. This would reflect the fact that the latter body is merely advisory whereas the former has executive powers.

Nothing is being said either about the weighting of representation, but it is presumed that the greater powers will have a proportionately heavy vote in the ministerial committee while each individual delegate will have equal weight in the consultative body.

NAMES WILL BE CHANGED

Incidentally the clumsy names used in tonight's communiqué—consultative body and ministerial committee—are only makeshift. In preliminary discussions they were called the European Assembly and the European Council, but as the combined organization is now called the Council of Europe, other names must be found.

The invitation to other European nations to join is what carries the new Council beyond the concept of the Western Union of the Brussels Pact Powers. The conference had hardly ended when Duke Tommaso Gallarati Scotti, Italian Ambassador, was called to the Foreign Office and informed that his Government would be invited to join the Council of Europe.

Portugal and the Scandinavian countries are doubtless being invited in on the ground floor. However, it was denied that all 19 European countries of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation would be invited or expected to take part from the beginning.

That is a goal to be achieved and western Germany will be a member in time, but the Brussels Pact Powers decided to start with a relatively small manageable council and expand it as time passed.

The permanent center of the Council of Europe will almost certainly be Strasbourg. It is centrally located and has a properly cosmopolitan European atmosphere.

For the time being the Western Union will remain in being. On its defense side it will soon merge into the projected north Atlantic defense pact. In other respects it will gradually expand into the Council of Europe. That Council, in its turn, will be integrated into the United Nations as a regional arrangement.

The Western Union also has important cultural and social relations now, which were discussed in a special communiqué. It was agreed, for instance, to hold courses for teachers on the Western Union, to hold exhibitions and issue pamphlets and films.

On the social side emphasis was placed on an exchange of views and information on public health, as well as exchanges of medical personnel, workers, and student employees.

Enterprises of this sort will not be abandoned for the Council of Europe cannot be

formed overnight. The Permanent Commission should be able to work out most of the details by the time the Foreign Ministers of the Brussels Pact Powers meet again in April.

Four other governments will have to sanction today's agreement as the British Cabinet already has done. French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman, who alone might be expected to find difficulties, was confident tonight that he had won enough points from Mr. Bevin to get support in Paris.

The European movement, which Winston Churchill sponsored and which is headed by his son-in-law, Duncan Sandys, issued a statement enthusiastically welcoming the decision to set up the Council of Europe. It looks as if Mr. Bevin at home and Britain on the Continent have set many doubts at rest.

SFORZA SAYS ITALY WILL JOIN

ROME, January 28.—Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza said today, "Italy will be one of the founding states" of the new Council of Europe.

His brief statement, released by ANSA, semi-official Italian news agency, indicated Italy already had been invited to take part in setting up the Council.

"European union is born," Count Sforza said, "and Italy will be one of the founding states. Italy will give all her efforts with full loyalty to the creation of the Council of Europe."

JUDGE KNOX'S METHOD OF SELECTING JURIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on Thursday, I called to the attention of this body the statement made by Federal Judge John C. Knox that he hand-picks the jurors in his district, and intends to keep on doing so. I expressed at that time my aversion to having jurors hand-picked by judges, or, for that matter, by anybody else, and I pointed out how historically miscarriages of justice have resulted from jury packing.

Since then I have taken a little time to look into the way Judge Knox hand-picks jurors, and what the consequences of his selection are. As Senators know, Judge Knox is senior judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, which is our biggest and busiest Federal court. I felt that making this investigation was my simple duty as a United States Senator, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and as a plain American citizen who happens to feel, along with the framers of our Constitution, that a fair and impartial administration of justice calls for juries selected, without hand picking, from a representative cross section of the people.

I was personally shocked by the facts that I learned in the course of this investigation. But beyond this, these facts are of such great concern to the integrity and reputation of our judicial system, and thus to our democracy itself, that it is time they were fully revealed to the Senate and to the American people.

But let me first disclose where the record of these facts can be found. Judge Knox's jury selection system is described in a memorandum of January 2, 1941, written for the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, by Leland L. Tolman, Assistant

Chief, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics. On February 5, 1941, Henry P. Chandler, the Director of that Office, sent copies of this memorandum to all United States circuit and district judges, and I have one of them in my hand, over the signature of Mr. Chandler.

In addition to this, a statistical analysis has been made of this system in operation, verified by affidavit, in a petition filed recently in the United States Supreme Court by the attorneys for the 12 Communist leaders who are now on trial in New York.

Just so that there shall be no mistake, I repeat now what I said on Thursday, that I care not who a defendant may be, and what the offense alleged, whether it is murder, arson, or robbery, whether he be Democrat or Republican or Communist, he is entitled in a United States court to a jury that is impartially and honestly picked. If some think differently, remember that Judge Knox's hand-picked juries serve in all jury cases in his district, civil and criminal, whether the parties are radical or conservative, or whatever you please, in their political and economic beliefs.

But to get back to Judge Knox's jury-selection system. It seems that about 10 years ago Judge Knox decided that the jurors serving in the southern district of New York were an inferior lot. The jury rolls, it seems, included a lot of relief workers and housewives. Of course, this is hardly cause for amazement. In those days there were many relief workers in New York City, and there were then and still are plenty of housewives. But to Judge Knox, apparently, relief workers and housewives, no matter how big a part of the population they are, are not suitable for jury service. Why, I do not know. Perhaps he thinks that poor people and housewives are just naturally inferior, or perhaps they did not convict enough defendants to suit him. Anyway, Judge Knox decided to get jurors of "better quality."

The first thing Judge Knox did to serve this purpose, says Mr. Tolman's memorandum, was to appoint as jury commissioner an attorney who "has good business and social connections." Then, says the memorandum, which I have here, "he also arranged for the appointment, as deputy jury clerk, of an energetic young man of pleasing manner, who is a good judge of character, and has a thorough practical knowledge of the social, racial, and economic groups of New York City and their geographic distribution."

These, then, were the men who were to carry out Judge Knox's endeavors to get quality jurors, and I call attention to what their assets for this job were—"good business and social connections" and knowing the geographic distribution of the "social, racial, and economic groups of New York City."

Judge Knox now had the right kind of people to do the picking. Now he had to see that they had the right kind of people to pick from.

Until then, in the southern district of New York, the names of jurors had been picked primarily from the registry list of voters. But to Judge Knox this was an unsatisfactory list. They are just the

people who decide who shall be our President and who shall be our Senators and who shall be our mayors and our governors. They are just the people who pick the persons who pick our Federal judges. They are the people who pay our salaries, and Judge Knox's, too. They are the people the Government is supposed to represent. In short, they are the American people. But the people are not good enough for Judge Knox. He has to have the better quality for jury service in his district.

According to Mr. Tolman's memorandum, therefore, the voters' registry list was supplemented by drawing from more select materials. What were these? Who's Who in New York, Poor's Directory of Directors, the Engineers' Directory, the Social Register, and various college and university alumni directories. Note the various. Mr. Tolman does not tell us, but we can guess, that to Judge Knox the alumni directories of Princeton or Dartmouth are better source material than those of the City College of New York or New York University.

Even more important than these books of the aristocracy is the subscription edition of the New York City telephone directory, which is arranged by street numbers and location rather than alphabetically by names. This directory permits the deputy jury clerk—you remember, Judge Knox' energetic young man of pleasing manner—to use his thorough knowledge of the geographic distribution of the social, racial, and economic groups of New York City to pick out the names of those who live in higher-class residential neighborhoods. In addition, this young man adds names of citizens who are personally known or introduced to him as good potential jurors. Relief workers and women were simply eliminated as volunteer jurors. If anyone has any doubt about it, I have a copy of the original memorandum here in my hand.

Now of course this so-called system of supplementing the registry list of voters does not really supplement the list at all. Those residents of New York who are in Who's Who, the Directory of Directors, and even the Social Register, are, by and large, also on the voters' registry list. The fact is, then, that these names are not added to the list; they are selected for preferential attention.

But just to make sure that no unsuitable people slip through, the jury clerk calls in and interviews each person whose name he puts on the list of prospective jurors. Only those people whom he is satisfied with following the interview are finally qualified as jurors. At the same time the jury commissioner—the man with the good connections—persuades personnel officers of large corporations to allow their employees to perform jury duty without financial loss. In other words, Judge Knox is willing to have on his juries lesser employees than executives, provided they know they are being paid by their big corporate employers during their service.

The consequence of all this is that the selection of the juries in the southern district of New York represents a deliberate and systematic exclusion of all but a token few of the lower income groups and of those persons who are without

social graces valued by Judge Knox, in favor of an elite class.

According to a verified petition filed with the Supreme Court, an analysis of the jury lists in the district over a period of 9 years shows that 54 percent of the jury panel were executives, although they represent only 9 percent of the population. Twenty percent of the panel were professionals or semiprofessionals, although they were only 11 percent of the population. Clerical and sales employees, largely drawn from a few big corporations, made up 30 percent of the panels; they were 25 percent of the population. Manual workers made up only 5 percent of the panels, although they were 55 percent of the population.

I quote from the document sent out through the Administrative Office, from the Supreme Court Building in Washington. What do we find? This document is dated the 5th day of February 1941. We find about 2 percent of the names in the wheel are unemployed or retired. Eighty-eight percent are business or professional men. Ten percent are women.

The same verified petition also shows that the juries were loaded with persons who resided in the most exclusive neighborhoods. The so-called "silk-stocking" district, the Seventeenth Congressional District in Manhattan, supplied 56 percent of the members of six panels which were studied, although the district cast less than 20 percent of the vote in Manhattan alone in the 1948 elections. These same panels drew only 10.2 percent of their membership from the Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twenty-second, Twenty-third, and Twenty-fourth Congressional Districts taken together, although these districts accounted for 42 percent of the vote from both Manhattan and the Bronx. These latter districts contain mostly working-class people, including Negroes, Jews, citizens of Italian descent, and Puerto Ricans.

Mr. President, this system is not only offensive because of its snobbishness. It is a conscious selection of jurors on class and racial bases, and the result is that the so-called justice which is handed out in that district may be characterized as class and racial justice.

It is only natural that jurors tend to place greater credence in the testimony of people of their own kind. The whole purpose of the constitutional guaranty of a fair and impartial jury, representative of the community, is to offset the prejudices or predilections of particular groups. Only a fair cross section of the community will assure a fair and impartial trial in which evidence will be weighed according to the common judgment of the people, on its merits alone. It is perfectly clear that the system prevailing in the southern district of New York, and perhaps in many other places, is calculated to avoid juries which are truly representative.

To the people of the world, Mr. President, we boast of the superiorities of our government. We claim we are a democracy in which all people are free and equal. We profess equal justice for all, regardless of race or creed or economic status. How can we reconcile these assertions with the fact that in our

largest Federal district, and perhaps elsewhere as well, our judiciary so blandly dispenses justice through hand-picked juries heavily weighted with the wealthy or well-to-do.

This situation is our problem and our responsibility. It is in the power of Congress to enact legislation which will guarantee the selection of fair and impartial juries in our Federal courts. It is fitting that the Senate should take the lead in this respect, since it is the Senate which confirmed the appointment of Judge Knox and all other Federal judges, and which therefore has some responsibility for their actions.

Hand-picked juries have no place in our democracy. They are a stench and are a disgrace to honest law enforcement. They result in there being no fair play either in criminal or civil cases.

THE CONFIRMATION OF MR. ACHESON'S NOMINATION

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator how long he expects to speak?

Mr. BRIDGES. Only a very few minutes I will say, on a very interesting subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 18, the Senate confirmed the President's nomination of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. I was one of only six Senators to vote against that nomination. Once again I found myself among a small minority of Senators opposing a Presidential appointment for a high position in our Government. On previous occasions I have voted with the few against appointees to important Government posts later to have my minority opposition completely justified.

I made no statement when Mr. Acheson's nomination was before the Senate. But since the confirmation of that nomination, in reply to inquiries, I have defined my position.

In this uncertain time the post of Secretary of State is vitally important to the security of America and the peace of the world. I believe the eligibility of the man who occupies that post should be beyond any doubt. In my opinion, Mr. Acheson did not meet that test.

I have reasonable doubts about Mr. Acheson. The hearings conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not remove those doubts. My mind persisted in its severe questioning of Mr. Acheson's previous associations and expressed attitudes. My doubts became more profound.

Throughout my service in the Senate I have made it a policy to resolve such doubts in favor of my country rather than to gamble with my country's future. That is what I did with reference to the Acheson appointment. I have told others and I tell the Senate today that I hope my doubts regarding Mr. Acheson will not be justified by the events of passing time.

Yet I feel I should call to the attention of the Senate a news report which ap-

peared in the New York Times of Friday, January 28.

The headline reads:

United States aid seen lost in China, Greece—Prof. E. C. Acheson also doubts money expended on Germany ever will bring results.

First of all, who is Prof. E. C. Acheson? He is the brother of Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States. The New York Times article says that during the war Professor Acheson served in the United States Embassy in China. The Times says further that Professor Acheson was President Truman's personal representative on an economic mission to Germany last year. He is now professor of foreign relations at George Washington University. The New York Times article about which I am talking and from which I shall quote says that Professor Acheson was expressing his foreign-policy views at a meeting in Washington on January 27.

Let me read from the Times article:

WASHINGTON, January 27.—Prof. Edward C. Acheson, brother of the new Secretary of State, has declared here that the United States has written off as practically a total loss its huge expenditures in Greece and China. He predicted that substantially the same thing would happen in the recovery program of western Germany.

I want the Senate to note the New York Times report of Professor Acheson's remarks interprets them as almost a statement of fact. The question arises, then, whether the professor's comments are based upon his own speculation or upon information which may have been given to him by his brother, the new Secretary of State. Can it be that the professor is voicing the opinions of the administration which have not yet been announced by the new Secretary of State to the Congress and the people? Can it be that the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan to try to halt the spread of communism in the world are to be abandoned? Just what connection is there, if any, between the firmly expressed views of the professor and the views of his brother, the new Secretary of State? I, for one, should like to know.

I realize that no man is his brother's keeper, but I say very frankly, Mr. President, that the minds of Senators were plagued only a few days ago by perplexing questions regarding Dean Acheson's attitude toward Russia, the stubborn roadblock in the way of peace. Most Senators found his statements to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee convincingly firm as regards Russia. But on January 28 we read in the New York Times that the new Secretary's professor brother—who at least implies some authority to his statements—"took an optimistic view regarding future relations with Russia." I ask the Senate whether such an optimistic view could be based upon some particular information available to the brother of the new Secretary of State but not to the Congress or the people? Or could it be based upon some special representations made to Professor Acheson which would lead him to believe that the American attitude toward Rus-

sia is to soften and our relations with Russia thereby made more smooth? It is natural that such questions should arise from profound statements of a man who has been close to the President and is the brother of our Secretary of State. Spread abroad, as the remarks of the brother of the new Secretary of State will be, they could well create grave suspicion in the nations which have joined us in the effort to stop the spread of communism, that we are about to abandon that fight, or in some way alter our major policies.

As another example of the potential danger to the position of the United States that the remarks of Professor Acheson constitute, let me quote further from the New York Times article:

If the Russians get into China, which I doubt, they will have the same miserable experience they had when they sent Michael Borodin there in the 1920's. Borodin got nowhere then, and I see little prospect of the Russians getting anywhere now. The basic conditions and factors in China remain unchanged.

Those are the remarks of a former State Department official, a confidant of the President of the United States, and the brother of the new Secretary of State at the very moment when the world is witnessing the forces of communism taking over control of much of China.

That is one of the very tragic things that is happening in the world, and which has happened in our day. The fact that we in this country have turned our backs upon China, our friend, who stood by us in the days of trouble, will some day come back to haunt the administration in Washington which has made such a thing possible, by reason of our policy in virtually selling China down the river to the Communists.

Again I ask the Senate, is there any connection between the profound opinions of Professor Acheson—implying authority as he seems to do—and the opinions of his brother, the new Secretary of State?

In the same article, the New York Times quotes Professor Acheson as accusing General Clay of employing Nazi-like methods in Germany, which is the same as accusing the United States Government of retaining nazism abroad. Couple this with the friendly attitude Professor Acheson seems to express toward our future relations with Russia, and what questions arise in Senators' minds?

Again I refer to the fact that it was the doubt regarding Dean Acheson's attitude toward Russia, and our program against communism in general, which led to the hearing on his appointment to be Secretary of State. To say the least, it is unfortunate that his brother should speak now as he did in Washington, with the authority he seemed to imply. It is particularly unfortunate because of the publicity it will receive all over the world.

I consider it appropriate, under the circumstances, to call upon Dean Acheson, the new Secretary of State, to speak out and give the people of our country the opportunity to hear his opinions with reference to the statements his

brother has already made. Will the Secretary of State tell the country whether there is any connection between his own views and those expressed by Professor Acheson? I feel that he should recognize the responsibility to reassure us all that there is no present intention or future possibility of any further compromise of American principles in Russia's favor. I urge the new Secretary of State to reemphasize firmly, with the influence of his high office, the American intention to promote peace on earth within the standards of American freedoms and the high level of American justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article of January 28, 1949, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES AID SEEN LOST IN CHINA, GREECE—PROF. E. C. ACHESON ALSO DOUBTS MONEY EXPENDED ON GERMANY EVER WILL BRING RESULTS

WASHINGTON, January 27.—Prof. Edward C. Acheson, brother of the new Secretary of State, has declared here that the United States has written off as practically a total loss its huge expenditures in Greece and China. He predicted that substantially the same thing would happen in the recovery program of western Germany.

Mr. Acheson voiced these views at a meeting of Williams College alumni of the District of Columbia. Now a professor of foreign relations at George Washington University, he served in the United States Embassy in China during the war, and last year was President Truman's personal representative on an economic mission to Germany.

"In a few weeks we will have to write off China as a 100-percent loss," Mr. Acheson declared, "and it is only a matter of time when we will have to do the same regarding Greece. In Germany, our military will continue their occupation duties, but we will find it necessary to abandon the inferior Nazi-type controlled economy which General Clay has been operating there.

"We cannot expect the world to believe we are spreading democratic concepts when we employ in Germany the same kind of system the Nazis used with far more efficiency than we have demonstrated. If we are going to keep on with that kind of system, which I doubt, we might as well restore Hjalmar Schacht to power and let him run it. He originated the system of differential currencies now operating in Germany."

Mr. Acheson cited a personal experience to illustrate his condemnation of United States economic policies in Germany.

"I was sent to Europe by President Truman to negotiate for \$75,000,000 in Danish foodstuffs for the Allied zones in Germany," he related. "We had a treaty with the Danes on how we would pay for these supplies. We were to pay for them in pounds sterling, because Denmark is in the sterling area. But General Clay rescinded this treaty, in effect, the day before I was to begin my negotiations with the Danish Ministers. He ruled that all purchases in Germany would have to be paid for in dollars. That cut the ground out from under me. The Danes wanted German coal, but paying for it in dollars would have made it too costly for them."

Professor Acheson took an optimistic view regarding future relations with Russia.

"How the Russians feel about the inevitability of war and what they will do to wage war are two different things," he declared. "If the Russians get into China, which I doubt, they will have the same miserable ex-

perience they had when they sent Michael Borodin there in the 1920's. Borodin got nowhere then, and I see little prospect of the Russians getting anywhere now. The basic conditions and factors in China remain unchanged.

"The Chinese people are 95 percent agricultural and 90 percent illiterate. No ideology can cope with that. Even the Kuomintang, which has been running China for many years, has failed to make any inroads against this situation. I do not think that the Chinese Communists are Moscow Communists. Even if they were, they will still have their hands full administering the vast territories they have overrun. As the Russian empire keeps spreading out in Europe and Asia, it is beginning to rattle at the edges. Yugoslavia is a graphic instance of this. That's why I feel there is a definite possibility of better relations with the Soviets."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I listened with interest, of course, to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire about the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and his brother. I do not know his brother. I have never seen him. I have never heard of him, and did not know that Dean Acheson had a brother until the information imparted by the Senator from New Hampshire.

When the nomination of Mr. Acheson was before the Committee on Foreign Relations we held a public hearing, which is unusual in the case of Cabinet officers. The hearing was held not in the committee room, but in the caucus room, where everyone had an opportunity to come and look and listen, and speak if he wished to do so.

The Senator from New Hampshire did not ask to appear as a witness. I do not know what information he may have had at that time. But every witness except two who appeared was permitted to testify. The two who did not testify were persons who knew nothing about the case, but were permitted to file statements. Their statements are now in the files of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In addition to holding a public hearing we held a secret hearing, because the subject touched a great many intimate, high level, confidential international matters. In that hearing, before every member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Acheson made a complete and full reply to all questions which were propounded to him. The Senator from New Hampshire says he thinks he ought to make a statement now showing that his attitude is different from that of his brother. The statement of Mr. Acheson was quoted in the Senate when his nomination was confirmed, making his position as to communism and totalitarianism clear beyond any question of doubt. His record in the Department and his record as a public officer bear witness to the fact that he has no sympathy with the evil doctrine of communism.

So, Mr. President, I do not think the Secretary of State is to be held responsible for what his professor brother may have said.

Was he in China when he said it, or was he here?

Mr. BRIDGES. He was here, close at hand, so that he had easy access to his brother.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator ever see him with his brother?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did he have access to his brother?

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand he had very close and intimate access.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that if he had any contacts, they were of a brotherly or kinship nature. Certainly he did not undertake to tell his brother how to conduct his affairs. He was a brother, and brothers seem to tend to have independent views on various questions—not similar views, but independent views.

He does not say he was a Communist; does he?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator draw the inference that he is somewhat sympathetic to communism?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not draw the inference that he is sympathetic to communism, but I do draw the inference that he is certainly for a "soft" policy and for scuttling a good deal of the work this Government has been doing against communism in the world. When he says we must "write off" Greece, and then makes the same statements about China, and then makes very pointed remarks about the administration of General Clay in Germany, I say that at least, regardless of what the Secretary of State may have to say on this matter, it is unfortunate that he has a brother who at this time is making such remarks which will be so widely publicized all over the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. With the aid of the able Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely desired to clear up the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, many persons will read what the Senator from New Hampshire says. They will not pay much attention to what Professor Acheson has to say; but the Senator from New Hampshire from his place in the Senate will give the statements widespread publicity which will carry a degree of conviction which Professor Acheson in his own right never could convey.

Mr. President, we have made various appropriations of money for China. I do not recall the exact amounts. It seems to me there was one appropriation of \$680,000,000 and another appropriation of \$125,000,000, which the Chinese could use for arms and equipment. We sold China millions upon millions of dollars' worth of war matériel for only a fraction, a small percentage, of what it cost—1 percent or 2 percent in some cases—amounting practically to a gift. The Senator from New Hampshire has been chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the past 2 years. If those appropriations were not adequate, why did not the Senator from New Hampshire make them adequate?

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Texas may not recall it, but the Senate of the United States did appropriate, on the 1st of last April, \$125,000,000 which might be used for military supplies for the Chinese. However, up to the time, perhaps within 2

or 3 weeks ago, when the critical situation in China became so acute, only two shiploads of those materials had arrived in the Pacific waters; and up to that time none of the actual materials had reached the fighting forces of China. In other words, regardless of the intent of the Congress and the appropriations made by the Congress, the supplies did not reach the Chinese Nationalist armies.

Prior to that, for a period of almost 2 years, in spite of their dire need for small arms and cartridges and other munitions in order to be able to continue to fight, we turned our back upon Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Nationalists, and we virtually turned them over to the mercies of the Chinese Communists.

One of the things Mr. Acheson said in the article, if the Senator will read it, is that the Chinese Communists are not Moscow Communists. I wish the Senator would read the article carefully before he takes issue with me, because I think probably he would share some of the views I have expressed regarding it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire refers to an appropriation of \$125,000,000. Let me say that appropriation was so framed as to give the Chinese the right to do anything they wanted with it. That was done in order to enable them to spend the money for arms, ammunition, and other supplies of a military character.

But the Senator from New Hampshire omits to state that prior to that time we had, on the islands in the Pacific, great masses of military equipment, which we diverted to the Chinese, and the Chinese used it. The information coming to us was that hundreds of thousands of cartridges which supposedly were reaching the Chinese Nationalist armies, actually were turned over to the Communists, either by the Nationalists or by some other Chinese officials. The Communists thus were using material, including arms and ammunition, which the United States had supplied.

Let me refer for a moment to Secretary Marshall. The Senator from New Hampshire is acquainted with him, of course.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am.

Mr. CONNALLY. Before he became Secretary of State, General Marshall spent 13 months in China, trying to give aid to the Chinese.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will permit me to interrupt him for a moment, let me say I do not think it is appropriate or correct to state that General Marshall spent 13 months in China attempting to give aid to the Chinese. I think he spent 13 months there in a rather futile effort to bring the Communists and the Nationalists together in a sort of coalition movement. But he accomplished nothing, and he returned very embittered. The result has been that China, to all intents and purposes, has been scuttled.

I have a very high opinion of General Marshall as Chief of Staff.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think he did a wonderful job during the war. But as an emissary of this Government to China,

I think his efforts were of questionable value.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from New Hampshire has so much confidence in Mr. Marshall as a general, it seems to me he might trust Mr. Marshall after he had 13 months' experience in China, with close contact with the situation there. Certainly under those circumstances, it seems to me, the Senator from New Hampshire might trust Mr. Marshall as well as he might trust some person who remained here in the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me, I should like to say to the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that I do not know whether his committee has yet had a chance to examine the directive under which Mr. Marshall went to China. Both on behalf of the Senate and on behalf of the people of the United States I certainly hope the Foreign Relations Committee will examine the directive under which Mr. Marshall went to China. They should determine whether that directive grew out of the discussions at Yalta, where the Chinese, our historic friends and our allies in a great war, were "sold down the river."

Certainly the results of what happened at Yalta are now being made clear in China today, where it looks as if the Communists will be able to overcome our historic friends and allies in China.

I know the able Senator from Texas will not lose sight of the fact that sitting in with the high Government officials, including the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and our high naval and military authorities, was a State Department official by the name of Alger Hiss.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, well, Alger Hiss. Every time something comes up here they get out a Communist and chase him all around.

Mr. President, I do not sympathize with the Communists. However, it seems that the only argument some persons can present is to holler about Alger Hiss, and then refer to Yalta. They seem to have to dig up something about the dead President of the United States, and they go back to Yalta. The trouble started with the first conference we had on Europe. I heard Secretary Marshall when he came back from his first journey. We heard him testify before the committee. He told us what the troubles in China were, and I shall refer to some of them. He made no charges against the personal character of Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang was surrounded, he said, by many Chinese officials who had been with him since he first emerged as a leader, but who had lost the confidence of their people. Chiang did not have the courage to dismiss them, because they were his old friends and supporters. I do not know whether it was true, but they were charged with graft and corruption, and it was claimed a large part of the funds we were appropriating never got to the people of China themselves. General Marshall endeavored to bring about a coalition government, which he thought was the best way out. He endeavored to have the—

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Let me finish a sentence. I have yielded to the Senator several times. I shall yield again.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would like to ask the Senator a question, in a word, at that point.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me finish one little sentence, before the Senator interrupts. If the Senator will please bear with me—

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. General Marshall undertook to bring about a coalition government. We heard him report about it. We heard him tell how he had flown from one place to another, with little groups assigned to that area, and he thought when he first came back that progress was being made. He thought that a coalition government would be the best solution of the situation. Otherwise, armed operations would have to continue. General Marshall went to China a second time. He was not able to bring about what he desired. He came away with sadness, and with disappointment, but not with bitterness. He did not come back with bitterness toward the Chinese people. He did come back with disappointment and bitterness toward those officials in the nationalist government who were untrue to their trust and who had lost the confidence of the people of China. I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Those were the people who refused to join the Communists.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I do not know that that is true at all. The Senator may know. If he does, if the Senator will assert—

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely want to point out—

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will assert on his responsibility as a Senator that that is true, I will accept it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe it to be true.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator believes. I want him to assert it as a fact. I do not want any belief. Some persons even believe in ghosts.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assert most things as facts, but I believe a good many things I do not know to be facts, but of which I may have a reasonably accurate knowledge. However, the Senator says that General Marshall's object was to bring the Communists together in a coalition government with the nationalists. I should like to ask the Senator if he can name any country in the world where the Communists have been brought into a coalition government, where within a reasonable time they have not undermined the government and taken over the country?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas is not going to undertake a historical research and lay before the Senator from New Hampshire all the scholarship of the past. The Senator comes from New England, where scholarship is just hanging around in gobs. The Senator should know his history, without referring to one who like myself comes from a bucolic area such as the State of Texas. Of course, the Communists are working at their job, just as every other cult and ideology is undertaking to advance its views—almost as vigorously as

the Senator from New Hampshire tried in the recent election and is trying at present to put forward his views and his ideology. We cannot all succeed. In China there was a realistic condition. General Marshall had to face conditions. He had to make the best of what was there. He could not wave a magic wand and convert all the Communists north of the Yangtze River. He could not wave another wand and bring all the Nationalists into a love feast with the Communists, or the Communists with the Nationalists. No, Mr. President, he could not do that. But in closing I simply want to say that I think the attack by the Senator from New Hampshire on the Secretary of State is wholly unjustified.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I made no attack on the Secretary of State. I merely referred to the remarks of his brother, and as to the new Secretary of State, raised the question whether it would not be very proper for him to reveal to the Congress and to the country whether his brother's views, so forcibly expressed, represented his own. It was not an attack on the Secretary himself.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it was no attack at all—it was merely kicking him in the ribs, punching him in the nose, and pummeling him. It was no attack at all. Of course, it was an attack; not such an attack as a witness might make under oath in court. It was not an attack like that of a witness who must produce facts. But it is an attack by way of insinuation. "His brother thinks so and so, and therefore, if his brother thinks so and so, he is bound to think so and so. His brother's mind is reflected in his mind."

I do not doubt that the characters of the two men differ considerably. I know nothing about the man of whom the Senator speaks, but I do know Mr. Dean Acheson. I know that he appeared before our committee and that every Senator was invited to come before the committee in secret hearing to interrogate him. Senators did not come. When the vote came, every Senator who was at the hearing voted unanimously to report the nomination favorably. The committee held a public hearing, at which everybody was invited to be present, and it was attended by a large audience. So, Mr. President, I hope the Senator—

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, I yield. I hope, not much further.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and no doubt he is familiar with the incident. Can he tell us why General Marshall, as Secretary of State, and other responsible Government officials suppressed the Wedemeyer report on China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I know nothing about the Wedemeyer report. I have never seen it.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator knows about it, does he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand there is such a document as the Wedemeyer report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why does the Senator suppose we sent to China an outstanding general like General Wedemeyer, who spent much time in studying conditions and preparing a report, only to have the report treated as such a secret document that the whole power of the United States Government has been used to suppress it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I suppose one reason was, the report was not made to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. Had it been, it would have been published.

Mr. CONNALLY. Another reason was, it was not made to the Senate of the United States. I assume the report was made to the Chief Executive of the United States, under whom General Wedemeyer was serving. I do not know why it was not made public. I suppose it served its purpose. I suppose it advised the President of the United States of the things General Wedemeyer wanted to impart to him, and it probably was not deemed necessary or advisable or wise to publish the report. That is my answer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, feel that was very vital, a very important report, and that it would have been only courtesy to him to show him that report?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was not chairman of the committee when the report came in.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator not think that as ranking minority member, he was entitled to see it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have been chairman only a very short time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator not think it would be a very nice thing if the Senator would call for it now?

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does the Senator not call for it? The Senator can offer a resolution. Let him submit a resolution calling upon the President to dig it up. Let him say in the resolution, "Cough up, Mr. President, the report of General Wedemeyer's." The Senator has his recourse. I was not chairman, and I was not responsible for the report, or for its publication. I know nothing of what is in the report.

There is a great deal of suspicion. It is as though someone were saying, "Let us find out something here, if we can, that we have not seen. Let us find something wrong here. I can smell it. Something wrong."

Mr. President, I do not want to indulge in such procedure.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Inasmuch as the Senator has suggested that a resolution be introduced to call for the Wedemeyer report, and has recommended that be done—

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I have not recommended anything of the kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assumed that.

Mr. CONNALLY. No. The Senator makes too many assumptions. I said the Senator had his remedy, if he wanted

to follow it. I have not recommended it. I have not suggested it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. Anyone who suggests anything to the Senator from New Hampshire acts upon a great presumption.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Texas, who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, if I should offer such a resolution and it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, will the Senator assure me that it will be reported favorably?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator from Texas will not assure the Senator from New Hampshire anything of the kind. The Senator from Texas is only a member of the committee. The resolution might contain anything.

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Baldwin	Hunt	Myers
Brewster	Ives	Neely
Bricker	Jenner	O'Connor
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Broughton	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Calhoun	Kefauver	Russell
Chapman	Kem	Saitonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Schoepel
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Eaton	Lodge	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Flanders	Lucas	Taylor
Frear	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
George	McFarland	Thye
Gillette	McKellar	Tydings
Green	Magnuson	Watkins
Hayden	Martin	Wiley
Hendrickson	Maybank	Williams
Hickenlooper	Miller	Withers
Hill	Millikin	
Hoey	Morse	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, which the Clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK (Emery L. Frazier). On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "September 30, 1949" and to insert "March 31, 1950"; and on the same page, line 9, to strike out "September 30, 1949" and to insert "March 31, 1950."

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this amendment the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. If present, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay" and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business and is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate, and is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—31

Alken	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Brewster	Ives	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Kem	Taft
Butler	Knowland	Thye
Cain	Lodge	Watkins
Cordon	McCarthy	Wiley
Donnell	Martin	Williams
Eaton	Millikin	
Flanders	Mundt	

NAYS—48

Anderson	Hunt	Morse
Broughton	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Connally	Kefauver	O'Connor
Ellender	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kilgore	Pepper
Fulbright	Langer	Robertson
George	Long	Russell
Gillette	Lucas	Sparkman
Green	McClellan	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	Taylor
Hill	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Holland	Maybank	Tydings
Humphrey	Miller	Withers

NOT VOTING—17

Byrd	Gurney	Tobey
Capehart	McCarran	Vandenberg
Douglas	McGrath	Wagner
Downey	McMahon	Wherry
Eastland	Malone	Young
Ferguson	Reed	

So Mr. BRICKER's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR A COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be authorized to report during the adjournment following today's session Joint Resolution 31, providing for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THRIFT IN THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Treasury has recently undertaken to establish among the school children of the Nation what is called thrift week in connection with the sale of bonds. I have in my hand a letter from a friend of mine in Mason City, Iowa, the writer being Mr. F. C. Heneman, who sends me a news story from the Mason City Globe Gazette which indicates, at least, I believe, the expression of one portion of public sentiment with

regard to the whole philosophy involved. I wish to read a few excerpts from this news story:

The request to Mason City's pastors to help with the observance of thrift week failed of a wholehearted response.

"Our National Government today is trying to solve the problem of having an unprecedented deficit by having the Nation's school children practice thrift while the Nation's political leaders waste with an arrogance and contempt that no story book ever presumed to portray," Dr. Roy C. Helfenstein, of the First Congregational Church stated.

"Somebody always has to pay the fiddler. In this case it is the taxpayers who have nothing to take the place of money when taxes take all the money they have.

"It would all come nearer making sense if the leaders in Washington, from the President on down, would set the example of thrift which our Nation and the world at large so sorely needs.

"It all sounds hypocritical, if not silly, for the National Government to ask all the children of the Nation who are in our public schools to practice thrift for 1 week while our Nation's political leaders go merrily on throwing the people's money to the four winds without thought for a single minute about the importance of thrift in high places as well as low."

Asking four billion additional taxes at this time is ridiculous, the pastor pointed out, adding that:

"Asking the people to practice thrift in order that the leaders in Washington may be able to spend with an abandon and prodigality which, if practiced by the citizenry of the Nation, would soon put the entire populace on the relief list—in the light of this—the request for their observance is absolutely out of place and grossly and unpardonably inconsistent," he said.

"The best observance that the public school could make of thrift week would be for the superintendents, principals, and teachers to persuade every pupil or student to write a letter to the Federal thrift committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C., asking that the Nation's leaders set a good example before the school children of the Nation by practicing the principles of thrift."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from Mr. Heneman and the entire news story be printed immediately following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF MASON CITY,
Mason City, Iowa, January 28, 1949.
The Honorable BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HICKENLOOPER: As you probably know, the Treasury Department in connection with the sale of United States savings bonds, has been endeavoring to have a thrift week program put on through the school system of the country. At the same time they have asked the ministerial association to make thrift the topic of a Sunday morning service. I think you would be interested in some reactions that we have noticed in this town of a little more than 30,000 people. I am enclosing a clipping taken from the Mason City Globe Gazette of January 26, 1949, which represents a brief summary of points made by one of our leading ministers at his morning service.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter from our superintendent of schools, who is a man of high standing in this community, in which he sets forth very clearly the ideas he has in

connection with this type of move. I am sending these to you because I believe they are signs of our times and that you will find them of interest.

Sincerely yours,
F. C. HENEMAN, *President.*

[From the Mason City Globe-Gazette of January 26, 1949]

SAYS REQUEST FOR THRIFT IS HYPOCRITICAL

The request to Mason City pastors to help in the observance of thrift week failed of a wholehearted response.

"Our National Government today is trying to solve the problem of having an unprecedented deficit by having the Nation's school children practice thrift while the Nation's political leaders waste with an arrogance and contempt that no storybook ever presumed to portray," Dr. Roy C. Helfenstein, of the First Congregational Church, stated.

"Somebody always has to pay the fiddler. In this case it is the taxpayers who have nothing to take the place of money when taxes take all the money they have."

SHOULD SET EXAMPLE

"It would all come nearer making sense if the leaders in Washington, from the President on down, would set the example of thrift which our Nation and the world at large so sorely need.

"It all sounds hypocritical, if not silly, for the National Government to ask all the children of the Nation who are in our public schools to practice thrift for 1 week while our Nation's political leaders go merrily on throwing the people's money to the four winds without thought for a single minute about the importance of thrift in high places as well as low."

Asking four billion additional taxes at this time is ridiculous, the pastor pointed out, adding that:

IS INCONSISTENT

"Asking the people to practice thrift in order that the leaders in Washington may be able to spend with an abandon and prodigality which, if practiced by the citizenry of the Nation, would soon put the entire populace on the relief list—in the light of this—the request for their observance is absolutely out of place and grossly and unpardonably inconsistent," he said.

"The best observance that the public school could make of thrift week would be for the superintendents, principals, and teachers to persuade every pupil or student to write a letter to the Federal thrift committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C., asking that the Nation's leaders set a good example before the school children of the Nation by practicing the principles of thrift."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa asked unanimous consent, I understand, and I was on my feet addressing the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The consent was granted, the Chair understood.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was on my feet addressing the Chair, because I desired to make a statement to be placed in the RECORD immediately following the article which has been read by the Senator from Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming reserve the right to object?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I reserve the right to object because I think the article is an extremely good illustration of the complete misconception which a great many

people have of the expenditures of the Federal Government.

The Eightieth Congress, which went out of existence at the beginning of this year, made appropriations for the fiscal year 1949. Those appropriations were made after due consideration of the President's budget. Many members of the majority in the Eightieth Congress asserted over and over again that the expenditures of the Federal Government were wasteful, that they should be reduced, and while they were making the protestations that the President's budget was wasteful, they were themselves approving recommendations of the Budget Bureau and passing the appropriation bills. The reductions which were put into effect made very little difference in the total budget, and frequently were followed by deficiency appropriations.

Now the fact of the matter is that the expenditures of the Federal Government have been made very high because from 75 to 80 percent of them are for war-connected expenses which cannot be avoided. So I want the author of the statement, when he reads it in the RECORD, to read also the statement of at least one Member of the Senate that his criticisms are utterly without foundation.

The President of the United States, in submitting his budgets to the Congress of the United States ever since he assumed that high executive responsibility, has endeavored—and I think successfully—to cut expenditures to the bone. He has been faced, however, with the necessity of providing funds to take care of veterans' services, to maintain the Army and the Navy and the United States Air Force, to carry on international obligations, and to pay the interest upon the national debt, which amounts to \$5,000,000,000 annually—an interest which must be paid if the national debt is to be serviced. All of what is expressed in the statement is based upon an entire misconception of the responsibility of the Government.

I may say that the Senate only last week passed unanimously an appropriation bill adding \$500,000 to the disaster fund of the President of the United States, although in a previous Congress the President's disaster fund was seriously cut. This same Congress, without any dissent at all, passed a bill which was introduced by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] on behalf of the Senator from six Western States, authorizing the appropriation of some \$3,000,000 for relief from the unprecedented blizzard which affects the entire West, from western Nebraska and western South Dakota to the Pacific coast. These expenditures of government are made on the recommendation of the President and on the approval of the Congress only because they have to be made to provide for unavoidable expenses devolving upon the Government of the United States.

CONSTRUCTION OF LOW-RENT HOUSES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to introduce, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself, a bill dealing with

housing. I also ask to have the bill printed in the RECORD, and to be permitted to make an explanatory statement with respect to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD. And without objection, the Senator may proceed with his statement.

The bill (S. 757) to provide an effective method for the construction of low-rent homes for low-income families with a minimum of Federal control and expenditure, introduced by Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That this act may be cited as "The Mutual Low-Rent Homes Construction Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Because a shortage of housing is contrary to the national interest, and because increased home ownership will promote the national welfare, it is the policy of the United States to assist in relieving housing shortages, and to foster and promote the increase of home ownership among the people of the Nation. Because the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families of low income is a matter of national concern and a prerequisite to the achievement of the freedom from want and freedom from fear which are among our national objectives, it is the policy of the United States to join with States and municipalities in providing a subsidy to make possible the construction of low-rent homes wherever they may be needed in any State. It is the policy of the United States to provide this assistance to home construction without doing violence to the traditional American preference for private enterprise under local rather than Federal control and supervision, and without unjustifiably increasing the size or powers of the Federal agencies. It is the purpose and intent of this act to carry out these policies.

LOCAL LOW-RENT MUTUALS

SEC. 3. A local low-rent mutual, to qualify under this act, shall have (1) not less than 5 nor more than 7 trustees, each named for a term of 5 years, and each of whom shall have been individually appointed as such trustee by the local municipal or county government before the issuance of a State charter to the mutual, (2) a membership committee, appointed by unanimous vote of the trustees, which shall establish rules and procedure for the membership, and (3) members selected by the membership committee from families having family incomes in the lowest one-fifth of family incomes in the community.

GRANTS TO LOCAL LOW-RENT MUTUALS

SEC. 4. (a) The Administrator of the Federal Works Administration is authorized to make grants to local low-rent mutuals to assist in the construction of homes projects undertaken by such mutuals. The amount of any such grant shall be equal to 25 percent of the estimated total development cost of the homes project involved. The aggregate amount of all such grants shall not exceed \$1,750,000,000.

(b) A local low-rent mutual shall be eligible for a grant as provided in this section when (1) the municipality within which such mutual was formed shall have approved, by referendum, or appropriate action of the local governing authority, establishment of a fund to be used for making grants equal to 12½ percent of the estimated total development cost of low-rent homes projects within such municipality, (2) such a grant from such

fund shall have been made to such mutual, (3) the plans for the mutual low-rent homes project and the site for such project shall have been approved by the local governing authority for the community within which such site is located, and (4) the State within which such site is located, or some appropriate agency thereof, shall have made a grant to such mutual equal to 12½ percent of the estimated total development cost of such projects.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 5. The Administrator of the Federal Works Administration is authorized to make necessary rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this act.

AUTHORITY FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including funds for making the grants provided in section 4. Not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available for low-rent homes projects in any one State.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 7. As used in this act—

- (1) "Community" means a municipality;
- (2) "Mutual homes project" means a project for the development and construction of low-rent homes sponsored by a local low-rent mutual pursuant to the terms of this act, and occupancy of which is limited to members of the local low-rent mutual;
- (3) "Family" means a group of not less than 2 persons related to one another by blood or marriage and living within the same dwelling unit;
- (4) "Family income" means the total of the combined annual incomes of the members of a family;
- (5) "Local low-rent mutual" means a mutual association or non-stock corporation formed and chartered under State law and qualifying under section 3;
- (6) "Local municipal or county government" means the mayor, city manager, town or city council, village board, board of aldermen, board of county commissioners, or other responsible administrative authority of a municipality, having appropriate jurisdiction under applicable local law;
- (7) "Local law" means the currently existing law of a State or municipality;
- (8) "Low-rent home" means a family dwelling unit for which total development cost is between \$3,000 and \$7,000;
- (9) "Municipality" means a county, parish, city, town, village, or other municipal subdivision of a State, having an organized municipal government;
- (10) "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, or Alaska;
- (11) "Total development cost" means the aggregate cost of development, including actual or allocable expenditures for land, planning, site preparation, roads, streets, and utilities not normally a municipal responsibility, and all construction costs;
- (12) "Low-rent homes project" means a mutual homes project sponsored by a local low-rent mutual.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is my privilege, on behalf of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself, to submit for the consideration of the Congress and the Nation a bill which will provide 1,000,000 housing units, if they be needed, which will rent for \$30 per month or less, at a cost to our Federal Government not to exceed \$1,750,000,000.

I should like to point out to the Senators that when compared with S. 133, which is designed to provide for 1,000,000 public housing units, our bill would mean

a savings of \$16,050,000,000 to the taxpayers of the Nation. In addition, our bill would provide for eventual home ownership for the occupants of the low-rent housing units so provided.

Mr. President, since coming to the Congress 2 years ago the junior Senator from Washington has been more perplexed and concerned by the Nation's low-rent question than by any other. I have been among those who have strongly resisted the efforts of the administration, and many Members of the Congress, to have the Federal Government create and administer a large-scale subsidized low-rent program throughout the Nation. I have willingly agreed with those who wish to foster such a program that there is a real need to create a substantial housing for a segment of our society which is economically unable to secure present-day housing at a price they can afford to pay, but I have vigorously opposed their belief that this objective can best or only be achieved through management, supervision, and almost complete subsidy by the Federal Government. My thought has been that management and supervision are proper prerogatives of local government, and that required subsidies must be jointly shared by local, State, and Federal levels of government.

Those who have shared my point of view, and there are a number on both side of the aisle, have likewise shared my conspicuous opposition weakness. We have up to this time been opposing something we thought to be wrong, with nothing. We have had nothing constructive to offer as an approach to the subsidized low-rent question. We have merely been against what we did not like. This negative position has brought us distress, and it has been often misunderstood by many who considered us to be obstructionists.

The bill which the Senator from Ohio and I have just sent to the desk is conceived by us to be a solid, reasonable, and constructive approach to the subsidized low-rent problem. All we hope is that serious students of the housing question, both in and out of Congress, will critically examine this new approach, for it has not previously been publicly considered. The Senator from Ohio and I have absolutely no pride of authorship. The idea we advance is not original with us. It has come partly from America and partly from abroad—certainly from Sweden. If others, after study, think it as good as we do we want to join with them in doing something about it.

From some points of view the bill has three surface weaknesses, none of which I conceive to be valid. When compared to every other present proposal before the Congress, the Cain-Bricker proposal does not cost enough. The bill is so simple in concept and words that it can be understood by everybody, and there are those who think that legislation must be complicated to be good. The proposal, if adopted, would return the low-rent problem to the American city and county, where it belongs. That many will fight the idea for this reason is clearly obvious. All the sponsors ask, Mr. President, is that the legislation be examined against the standard of writing legislation which

serves the best interests of our citizens everywhere.

I should like to outline briefly what our bill proposes. It is designed to organize mutual low-rent-housing societies at the local level by providing grants-in-aid by local, State, and Federal Governments equal to 50 percent of the total development cost of the housing projects.

We feel that local influence and control must prevail if a project is to be successful. We provide for initiating the grants-in-aid by the local government through the medium of a local referendum which will assure 12½ percent of the total development cost of the project by the municipality. After the local community has voted upon the subject and pledged 12½ percent of the cost, the State in which the project is located would provide 12½ percent of the cost. Then the Federal Government would match these two grants-in-aid by local and State governments in the amount of 25 percent of the total development cost. Thus, with local, State, and Federal grants-in-aid, 50 percent of the cost would be assured.

The remaining 50 percent for the development would be secured from private first-mortgage sources with a long-term mortgage regularly amortized and with the lowest possible interest rate.

Mr. President, I mentioned a few moments ago that our bill, for comparison purposes, would provide the same number of low-rent housing units, namely 1,000,000, at a maximum cost of \$7,000 per unit. That totals \$7,000,000,000 for the total cost of 1,000,000 units. However, the Federal Government is obligated only to the extent of one-fourth of this total cost, or \$1,750,000,000. I should like to point out that S. 133 provides for an annual subsidy of \$445,000,000 for a 40-year period, which amount totals \$17,800,000,000, and which, presumably, is to supply 1,000,000 public-housing units. Therefore, the difference, Mr. President, between the cost to the Federal Government in form of subsidy for 1,000,000 units under S. 133 and the Cain-Bricker proposal is \$16,050,000,000.

Every Senator has heard much, Mr. President, about Federal aid to education, Federal aid to medicine, Federal aid for this, and Federal aid for that. The saving which could be realized in this one piece of legislation alone would more than pay for all of the other proposals—assuming, of course, Mr. President, that the Senate would approve those proposals.

Whereas a substantially large agency is necessary to administer the administration's legislation, our bill would require nothing but local administration. This is made possible by the fact that the bill provides for only one payment in the form of grants-in-aid and no Federal or State administrative agency, while the administration bill provides for a continuity of 40 years' administration through a Federal agency during the time provided for payment of the subsidy.

The maximum cost limit under this Cain-Bricker bill is \$7,000 per house, including the land, while the administration bill limits the cost to \$2,500 per room.

Taking the average two bedroom, five-room house, the maximum cost per house to the taxpayer under S. 138 would be \$12,500 exclusive of land and other facilities. Mr. President, practically every city in this Nation has tax land already owned by the city. This could well be the nucleus for the start of a project as proposed in our bill.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this bill provides that only one-fourth of the total cost of the development of these projects be assumed by the Government. Under S. 138, the administration bill, a minimum of 90 percent of the total cost is borne by the Federal Government.

Home ownership is the eventual goal of our bill. The tenants who are participants in these mutual housing developments would eventually become owners of their own homes in which they live. This is impossible under the administration's housing bill, because it is set up to be rental housing at all times.

Although the administration bill refers to local public-housing agencies as the governing agencies, I know from my own personal experience that this is not true, because the plans, sites, tenants, and procedures are all screened and finally passed upon by Washington. Under the Cain-Bricker bill, full and complete control would be vested in the local community and local authorities. Neither Federal nor State Government would have any controlling influence.

Qualifications for admission to these mutual housing projects proposed in our bill are specifically limited to those families having an income in the lowest one-fifth of the family incomes in the community, as determined by the trustees who are appointed by the municipal or county government. Under S. 138 the local public housing agency must show the Washington office that a gap—and I quote from the bill, Mr. President—

A gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing (through new construction and available existing structures) a substantial supply of . . . housing toward meeting the need of an adequate volume thereof.

The only assurance that the lowest income groups can get into the housing provided for by the administration bill is that there shall be no discrimination against them.

The Cain-Bricker bill provides that the mutual housing projects to be constructed shall pay local ad valorem taxes to lessen the tax burden of the local community. The administration bill, however, specifically exempts the public housing units from paying local real-estate taxes, thereby adding to the burden of the community which must provide sewerage, water, police, and fire protection with no income from the project to assist in payment for these services. However, a token payment may be made in lieu of taxes.

The rents being paid in public housing projects today admittedly average over \$30 per month. Rentals under the Cain-Bricker bill could be kept within a \$13-\$30 per month range. This would be

possible because administration costs are confined to the local project and are not part of a superstructure of Federal agencies.

Mr. President, our bill recognizes States' rights. Under this proposal action must first be taken by the local community through local referendum before a project can be considered. In other words, the voters in every community in the Nation would have an opportunity to choose for themselves whether or not they want a mutual low-rent project in their community, as well as determine the extent of their need. Under the administration bill the local public housing agency deals directly with the Federal Government, bypassing the State. The extent of local determination is merely a request for assistance. The final decision rests in Washington. I have always contended, Mr. President, that Washington cannot foresee the requirements and needs of every community of this Nation. It must be a community-controlled-and-operated project to succeed.

While under this proposed bill the local community would participate in 12½ percent of the construction cost, the administration bill requires the community to pay 10 percent of the construction cost. But, Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senators that the community would recover, under the Cain-Bricker bill, its portion of the grant-in-aid in the form of real-estate taxes in 7 to 12 years. Under the administration bill no real-estate taxes are paid, except the possible token payments in lieu of taxes.

I should like to point out now that because of economic rents being paid today in public-housing projects surpluses have been accumulated, and these surpluses, under the administration bill, would accrue to the benefit of the Federal Government. Under the Cain-Bricker bill, however, any profits by reason of good management go to the tenants in lower rents.

I want to state here that we used the one million units figure only as a basis for comparison with S. 138, the administration bill. There is no specific number of units that may be constructed under our proposed bill, because, of course, that number must be determined by the local communities. And there is no number picked out of a hat based upon economic theories. This bill will provide incentive for home ownership and will give the tenant an opportunity to help himself by sharing responsibilities that are rightfully his and the community's.

Aside from the fact that this bill would save the taxpayers \$14,300,000,000—which is quite a sizable sum—it does not set up a Federal bureau which, by reason of the legislation, would be continued for at least 40 years. It will provide better housing for the people for whom it is intended—those in the lowest income groups of their respective communities. And, finally, full and complete authority always is vested in the local community.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a detailed explanation of the bill which, because I think it will be of thought-provoking interest to every Senator, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

LOCAL LOW-RENT MUTUAL HOUSING SOCIETIES

Five to seven trustees, 5-year terms.
Municipal or county government to appoint trustees.

State grants corporate charter.
Membership committee appointed by trustees.

Members selected by membership committee from lowest one-fifth family incomes in community.

Municipal referendum on establishment of fund to be used for making grants of 12½ percent of total development cost of various welfare homes projects.

Mayor or county commissioners approve plans and site, making project eligible for State and Federal grants.

State government makes grant equal to 12½ percent of total cost.

Federal Government makes grant equal to 25 percent of total cost.

Private lender makes long-term, low-interest, first-mortgage loan equal to 50 percent of total.

RESULTS

Secure long-term tenancy leading to home ownership. Monthly charges: Basic (principal and interest, common maintenance, taxes, and insurance), \$13 to \$30; plus charges for management and reserves established by trustees for units costing \$3,000 to \$7,000.

No local tax exemption.
Large element of self-help by lowest income families.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Edward H. Foley, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of A. Lee M. Wiggins, resigned;

John S. Graham, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Edward H. Foley, Jr.;

George B. Gillin, of California, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy;

Gilroy Roberts, of Pennsylvania, to be engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., to fill an existing vacancy;
Daniel A. Bolich, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Stewart Berkshire, resigned;

Ralph W. Cripe, of South Bend, Ind., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana, to fill an existing vacancy;

John J. Fitzpatrick, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut, to fill an existing vacancy;

John H. Alsmiller, of Kentucky, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky., in place of Harry M. Brennan, deceased; William H. Burke, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (reappointment);

Charles F. Murphy, of Massachusetts, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (reappointment); and

George McGill, of Kansas, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for a term expiring June 16, 1954 (reappointment).

By Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. Byrd), from the Committee on Finance:

Stuart L. Crenshaw, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Virginia.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Finance:

Tully Garner, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district numbered 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex., vice Harry P. Hornby, deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maurice J. Tobin to be Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ralph Wright to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Willett to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, the nomination by President Truman of Mr. William Edward Willett, of Maryland, as a Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is one which seeks to retain in the service of the Government a thoroughly competent public servant who has proven his competence both in private industry and as an official and director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Willett was for a number of years active in banking and the purchase and sale of securities before assuming his position with the Federal Government. It was because of his demonstrated capacity as assistant loan manager of the RFC and in other capacities that President Truman first appointed him a Director of the Corporation on June 19, 1948.

To say that he is eminently qualified for the position is encompassing in a few brief words the highest recommendation that I could give him. I sincerely trust that he will be confirmed promptly by this honorable body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Preston Delano to be Comptroller of the Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank P. Douglass to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James M. Mitchell to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. F. Ryan Duffy to be circuit judge, Seventh Circuit, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Paul P. Rao to be a judge of the United States Customs Court.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William T. McCarthy to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Patrick Thornton to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Roy W. Harper to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James T. Foley to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Wilson Warlick to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Angel R. de Jesus to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luis Negron Fernandez to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph F. Deeb to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cleon A. Summers to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerald A. Gleeson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick Elliott Biermann to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin D. Bolger to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold K. Claypool to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl H. Fleckenstine to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I inquire what business will be considered next, and when will the Senate meet again?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate will adjourn until Thursday next. At that time the only business coming before the Senate will be the bill reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dealing with the continuation of the Freedom Train. That is a nonpartisan measure, and I anticipate that it will take only a short time.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 3, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean Rusk, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Jesse M. Donaldson, of Illinois, to be Postmaster General.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Walter Lee Dunham, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a portion of the term expiring June 30, 1950.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John B. Dunlap, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Lt. Col. Walter J. Renfroe, Jr., as professor of modern languages, United States Military Academy, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 28, 1946, and section 520 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

NOTE.—This officer was given recess appointment on December 2, 1948.

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Maj. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, O8096, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and for appointment as major general in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 11, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CHIEF OF FINANCE

Brig. Gen. Eugene M. Foster, O6228, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army, and for appointment as major general in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 9a, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Billy J. Baggett
Robert A. Westropp

John E. Parsons, Jr. (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Robert S. Blake	Thomas A. Kamm
William J. D. Bradford	Adair Miller
3d	Joseph J. Packo
William W. Davenport	Kenneth F. Pedersen
Benjamin Dillahunt	Neil A. Swartz
Edward J. Francois	Stanford J. Watson

Lek K. Von Kaesborg (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct date of rank.

James H. Greene (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officer).

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, to rank from date indicated after each name:

Erwin L. Aufdenkamp, June 3, 1949.
James H. Breunlin, June 4, 1948.

George L. Moreman (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated, to correct date of rank.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Ferris G. Hodge
Frederick S. Welham

LIEUTENANT

Eldon O. Schnoebelen

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

June V. Alvis	Martha J. Hennessee
Eileen M. Bartels	Laura M. Hoff
Violet E. Bors	Eva M. Jacobsen
Wanda C. Bowman	Louise F. Jakshe
Reba M. Bradford	Marie A. Johncola
Marjorie J. Brumit	Mary-Jeanne Lagano
Edith M. Cadman	Clara J. Leoni
Mary G. Cain	Leslie E. McBratney
Jacqueline M. Camp	Mary P. McCarthy
Mary Cerrato	Betty L. McDonald
Eleanor M. Chapman	Kathleen M. Malloy
Patricia E. Cresap	Marcella A. Mickiewicz
Nancy J. Crosby	Constance A. Miller
Dorothy K. Cummings	Doris M. Mortimer
Martha K. Daugherty	Geraldine L. Newstrom
Mary I. Dekenys	Regina M. Olko
Helen M. DeWitt	Celia Olshefski
Vivian M. M. Dicke	Angie L. Pettit
Catherine R. Dupuis	Joan E. Pollick
Virginia C. Faeth	Evelyn F. Przybylek
Mary J. Franco	Muriel E. Ramage
Maurine G. Frederick	Madeleine J. Ruppert
Dorothy L. French	Carolyn J. Shearer
Ina A. Gibson	Katherine Vagenas
Dorothy F. Giorgio	Florence H. Volkering
Rebecca Gomez	Genevieve E. Wagasky

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Richard B. Phillips

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Alexander A. Bolton, Jr.	Carl W. DeOnier
William McG. Craft	William W. Manson

LIEUTENANTS

Sidney D. Bond, Jr.
John A. McAfoos
Carl E. Pruett

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert H. Lemmon	Eugene C. Stone, Jr.
John L. Reed	Roger K. Wallace
Anthony P. Rush	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Willard J. Goldring

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Allen L. McInturff
Syrus E. Tande

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Frederick E. Batterson	Ralph A. Sennott
Robert S. Leopold	Carroll M. White

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William B. Hull
Willard J. Goldring

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Ethel J. MacNaughton
Mary J. Wolfe
Otto A. Fennig to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification engineering, in lieu of lieutenant in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Engineering, as previously nominated, to correct spelling of name.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Franklin A. Hart

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

John T. Walker

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Lawson H. M. Sanderson

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Walter W. Wensinger

The below-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Wayne H. Adams	Albert J. Keller
Elliott E. Bard	Ralph M. King
Nelson K. Brown	August Larson
Austin R. Brunelli	Harry S. Leon
Edward B. Carney	Richard C. Mangrum
John H. Cook, Jr.	Francis J. McQuillen
Harlan C. Cooper	Luther S. Moore
Edward J. Dillon	Ben Z. Redfield
Robert E. Foft	Charles D. Roberts
Edward H. Forney	Charles J. Schlapkohl
Harry G. Fortune	Walter T. Short
Edmund B. Games	Clifford H. Shuey
Bankson T. Holcomb, Jr.	William B. Steiner
Lewis C. Hudson	Samuel G. Taxis
	Luther S. Moore
	John A. White
	Frederic L. Wieseman

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Thomas J. Ahern	Arthur A. Poindexter
Darrell L. Cool	Bennet G. Powers
George E. Dooley	Charles O. Rogers
Carl V. Larsen	Eugene N. Thompson
David E. Marshall	Vernon O. Ullman
Arba L. Norton	Harry A. Waldorf
Edward L. Peoples	

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Olin L. Beall	August F. Schonefeld
Robert E. McCook	Rupert E. Stone

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve:

Donald R. Nugent

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Anthony A. Akstin	Robert I. Bryan
William E. Baird	Lyle E. Buck
William J. Barnatt	Roscoe E. Cole
John H. Blumenstein	Francis P. Dayton
Richard L. Braun	Frederic F. Draper
Joseph A. Bruder	Cecil D. Ferguson

Herbert Gomes
Robert H. Hammond
Charles H. Horn
Roy N. Johnston
Bolish J. Kozak
George E. Leppig
Truman K. Lyford
Charles L. McIndoe
Carl A. Nielsen
Glenn E. Norris
William R. Ourand, Jr.

Albert L. Pope
Kenneth L. Reusser
Thomas H. Rogers, Jr.
John E. Shepherd, Jr.
Clyde T. Suttle
Edward C. Thoemmes
Harold Wallace
Warren E. Whipple
James S. Williams
Russell L. Young
John W. Zuber

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of major in the Marine Corps:

George K. Acker
Emory L. Anderson
Max Berueffy, Jr.
Richard Burgess
Charles W. Case
Zadik Collier
Phillip J. Costello
George R. Eargle
John H. Faggart
Thomas G. Fields
Harry D. Hargrave
Johnny Jennings
Samuel A. Johnstone, Jr.
Arthur L. Kent
Harry E. Kipp
Wilfred S. LeFrancis
Stephen Lesko

James D. Ludvigson
John W. Mace
Gilbert McConville
Doyle A. New
Frederick O'Connor
Fulton L. Oglesby
Harry C. Parsons
George S. Plantier
Lee E. Roberts
Charles Seiler
Frederick M. Steinhauer
Reuben S. Stoner
Vernon A. Tuson
John W. Webber
Lloyd O. Williams
William L. Williams
William L. Woodruff

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Arthur H. Ackerman
Howard K. Alberts
Phillip R. Anderson
Stanislaus A. Antos
Wade W. Atkins
James P. Aynes
Billy H. Barber
Irvin "J" Barney
George F. Bauman
Herbert L. Beckington
Louis W. Benjamin, Jr.
William C. Benton
James L. Berard
Albert J. Bibee
Richard L. Bland
James D. Boldman
Raymond N. Bowman
Lawrence H. Brandon
William B. Buckner, Jr.
Robert H. Buettner
Clarence J. Busick
Warren A. Butcher
Raymond J. Butters
Robert O. Carlock
Nicholas Chernock
Richard W. Cline
Frank R. Colten
Ralph D. Coplan
Charles E. Crew
Calvin K. Currens
Eldon E. Davidson
Stanley Davis
William E. Deeds
Charles F. DeKeyser
Gerald T. Dixon
John J. Doherty
Charles E. Dole
James W. Donnell
William R. Duncan
Richard A. Flanagan
James G. Fox
Burnette R. Gallagher
Baylor P. Gibson, Jr.
George "M" Golleher
David T. Gooden
James B. Graves
Joe R. Greene
Harold K. Hall
Curtis F. Hamlin, Jr.
Merlin L. Hasley
Paul B. Henley
Thomas R. Hickey, Jr.
Robert W. Hoffman
Marvin K. Hollenbeck
Howard G. Holt

Odia "E" Howe, Jr.
James O. Huston
Joseph N. Irick
William C. James, Jr.
George E. Jenkins
Charles D. Jones
States R. Jones, Jr.
Joseph R. Kapsch
Theodore A. Kelley
George C. Knapp
Alexander Kositch
George A. Krumm
Eugene F. Langan
Stewart R. Lauer
George E. Lawrence
Harry Lee
Claude H. Lewis, Jr.
William R. Lobell
Edwin B. Long
Edward "H" Mackel
John H. Maher
Norbert C. Manley, Jr.
Kenneth L. Mann
William S. McCarsion
James D. McGough
Oscar "J" Morel
Robert J. Morrison
Victor E. Myers
James R. O'Moore
Will S. Patee, Jr.
Uel D. Peters
Franklin N. Pippin
Eugene J. Pope
John G. Prestridge
Joseph Pultorak
Richard H. Rainforth
Raymond J. Rightmyer, Jr.
David Riley
John J. Rollins
Carroll D. Rowe
Leonard L. Schultz
Robert R. Scott
William A. Shepherd
Robert C. Shipp
Frank "A" Shook, Jr.
Almond H. Sollom
Ira E. Spieker
Parks J. Stallings
Elmo J. Stingley
Harold H. Stirling, Jr.
Marvin R. Stout
John B. Sullivan
Walter E. Sullivan, Jr.
Wilson "C" Terry
Nicholas G. W. Thorne

Eddie C. Torbett
Johnnie V. Townsend
Thomas B. Trammell
Marion G. Truesdale
Herman L. Ubbins
Eugene "A" Wallis
Herbert R. Waltz
Stephen G. Warren
Warren C. Watson
Robert J. Weaver

Warren E. Weinberg
Robert M. Wetzel
James L. Whitaker
Patrick E. Wildman
Frank E. Wilson
James E. Wilson, Jr.
Ray Woods
Robert P. Wray
Frank R. Young

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

George J. Batson, Jr.
Hersel D. C. Blasingame
Walter E. G. Godenus
Harry D. Hutchcroft

Francis L. Miller
James B. Seaton
Howard B. Smith
Ben W. White
Ellis R. Wright

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

James C. Allison
Eugene J. Ambrosia
Henry G. Ammer
William E. Androsko
Frederick L. J. Ashworth
Guy O. Badger
Lonnie P. Baites
John H. Barclay
Paul W. Barcus
Wallace C. Barrett
Raleigh E. Barton, Jr.
Richard Bell
George H. Benskin, Jr.
Joe R. Bibby
George G. Blair II
Donald M. Blomgren
Dorsie H. Booker, Jr.
James T. Breckinridge
John C. Breckinridge
Fitzhugh L. Buchanan, Jr.
Edwin E. Bucholz
Lyle W. Bullard
Edwin "A" Burns
Harrison M. Butler
John C. Butner III
Robert W. Calvert
Ira T. Carr
Michael P. Carroll
Frank A. Cassiano
Franklin R. Chambers
William E. Clark
David A. Clement
Stanford Cluggish
Thomas B. Collins
James G. Costigan
Robert E. Cox
Theodore T. Culppepper
Asa B. Culver, Jr.
William J. Cupelo
Clarence G. Dahl
Charles M. Darracott
John G. Demas
Edmund G. Darning, Jr.
Jack N. Dillard
Jack W. Dindinger
Thomas S. Dlugos
Donald W. Dorn
Robert E. Downen
Earl C. Dresbach, Jr.
LeRoy M. Duffy
William F. Dyroff
Edward W. Dzialo
Edward V. Easter
Paul M. Edwards
Harry D. Elms
Donald E. Estes
James D. Feltman
Henry Fischer, Jr.
Joseph R. Fisher
Thomas R. Freeman
Homer D. Frison
Robert W. Frye
Edward D. Gelzer, Jr.
Nolan R. Gibbons
Gerald W. Gibson
Hobson J. Gifford
Ronald L. Glendinning

Melvin K. Green
Richard P. Grey
Leo Gumleny
Arnold J. Hammons
Autrey B. Hammon
Frank W. Harris III
Howard H. Harris
Robert G. Harris
Lester Heinz, Jr.
Clayton V. Hendricks
Russell S. Hibbs
Norman W. Hicks
Joseph J. Holicky
Louis S. Hollier, Jr.
Thomas J. Holt
Frank H. Horn
Kenneth C. Ives
Curtis A. James, Jr.
Robert E. Jochums
Tracy N. Johnson
David G. Jones
Edward H. Jones
George F. Jones
Robert A. Jones
Robert W. Jorn
Timothy J. Keane, Jr.
Jack R. Kearney
John H. Keith, Jr.
Gene S. Keller
James P. Kelly
Edward B. Keyes, Jr.
Edwin W. Killian
Lee A. Kirstein
Harrol Kiser
Herbert J. Korstange
Orin D. Krone
Fred D. Kuhlmann
Robert J. Larsen
Harold V. Larson
Fred Lawton, Jr.
Thaddeus F. Lewandowski
Elmer "M" Lewis, Jr.
Harry M. Lindberg
James E. Machin
Fletcher B. Maddox
Reginald G. Martin
Jan Mason
Donald L. May
John R. McGuigan
Frederick C. McLaughlin
Clare R. McMahon
George C. McNaughton
Robert L. McNeely
Merrill J. Melton
John B. Melvin
George A. Merrill
Jack L. Miles
Frank N. Mitchell
Arthur B. Montagne
Clarence G. Moody, Jr.
Gail A. Newkirk
William J. Nietschmann
Richard F. Noble
Robert G. Parrish
Harold L. Parsons
William H. Peck

Jack B. Phillips
Brockman L. Plauche
Ray D. Pineo
Arthur J. Poillon
Linus F. Pottebaum
Robert G. Price
Elmore F. Ravensberg
James H. Reid, Jr.
Lester F. Reid
Knowlton P. Rice
Alvin R. Rieder
Glenn W. Rodney
Harold E. Roland, Jr.
John J. Roothoff
Maurice Rose
Ted J. Ryder
James R. Schoen
Gerald F. Schultz
Benjamin B. Selvitelle, Jr.
James F. Shea, Jr.
Donald A. Silva
John B. Sims
Frederick D. Singer
Perry T. Smith
Richard E. Smith
Harry A. Spaight, Jr.
Donald E. Spencer
Raymond B. Spicer
Clarence R. Stanley
Richard E. Stansberry
Thomas J. Stevens
Howard D. Stewart II
Hugh W. Stewart
Howard E. Stidham

Charles H. Sullivan
Theodore Summers
William Swanson
William E. Sweeney
Warren G. Tanzler
Alfred C. Taves
David S. Taylor
Jay "J" Thomas, Jr.
Robert J. Thomas
William L. Tipton, Jr.
Charles A. Turpin
Robert A. Underwood
Rollin F. VanCantfort
Robert N. Vance
Jo M. Van Meter
Floyd L. Vuillemot
John A. Wachter
Denzil E. Walden
Charles M. Wallace, Jr.
Henry M. Walter, Jr.
Ralph L. Walz
Alan J. Warshawer
Charles T. Westcott
Howard A. Westphall
Jack D. White
William A. Whitesell
Edward A. Wilcox
Loren K. Wildermuth
Wallace L. Williamson
Ralph C. Wood
Kermit M. Worley
John R. Wyatt, Jr.
Robert F. Young, Jr.
Vance L. Yount, Jr.

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

George M. Best
Jack F. Boles
Johnny L. Carter
Robert E. Follendorf
Russell T. Gorter
William J. Hamilton
James M. Haney
Raymond E. Logan

John F. McCarthy, Jr.
Kenneth R. Porter
Cluese T. Powell
James A. Tootle
Frank C. Trumble
Wilmon Varnado
Andrew M. Young

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps:

Oscar W. Cargile
Thomas J. Chandler
Claude N. Harris

Paul H. Mikkelsen
John F. Pezdark

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Walter E. Anderson
Wilbur R. Barnes
Kennard F. Bubier
Ira Brock
James E. Buckle
Hall V. Cartmell
Harry E. Detwiler
Thomas H. Dougan
Frederick Dykstra
Grammer G. Edwards
Frank W. Ferguson

Wallace Henry
Harold R. Jordan
Norman D. Kent
Clyde H. Long
Francis J. Lutz
Edward J. McCabe
Lee Moberly
Eero Nori
Joseph F. Stepka
Samuel M. Trippe
Herman A. Zehngebot

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Herman T. Barbee
Leonard I. Beatty
Paul F. Brandenburg
Richard P. Brezinski
Willie W. Brock
James E. Brown
Good Burleson
Theodore R. Cathey
Frank J. Cermak
Francis L. Churchville
Robert J. Corbett
Thomas H. Cutler
Robert L. Dickey
Walter H. Eastham
Edward E. Elder
James W. Eldridge
Irvin H. Elrod
James P. Evans
Joseph R. Foster
Howard C. Frazer
Elwood E. Gebhart

Cletus K. Gibson
Walter R. Giles
Raymond F. Gotko
John P. Grando
Robert C. Gunsalus
James K. Harris
Milligan G. Hereford
Ralph H. Hobbs
Michael J. Hogan
Arthur L. Jackson
Boyd J. Jackson
George Jones
Albert H. Keith
Beldon Lidyard
Raymond L. Luckel
Floyd M. McCorkle
Thomas W. McNeely
Charles E. McPartlin
Arthur J. Noonan
Ronald J. Nourse
Frederick V. Osborn
Thomas C. Palmer, Jr.

Paul R. Paquin
Howard H. Parker
Frank G. Paul
George T. Perschau
Fred R. Philpot
Paul J. Preston
Caryll A. Price
Joseph J. Reardon
John F. Ricard
William B. Richards
Joseph C. Schwalke
William A. Searight
Frank C. Sheppard

Michael J. Sisul
Samuel L. Slocum
Robert A. Smith
Allen F. Stockdale
Robert G. Straine
James D. Swinson
Max C. Taylor
Harold M. Tupper
Robert E. Wall
William F. Watson
George L. Williams
Adolph Ziegler

Frederick W. Hopkins
John W. Hutchinson
Edwin G. Javor
Austin C. Jensen
James E. Johnson
Nicholas Kavakich
David D. Kelley, Jr.
Damon J. Larson
"R" Michael McCarthy
Joseph Mordente
Francis W. Muetzel
Edward S. Murphy
Earle W. Pye, Jr.
Robert O. Risinger

Alexander S. Ruggiero
Stanley J. Seward
Carl F. Shifflette
Emmett B. Sigmom, Jr.
Joseph V. Slawta
Robert H. Starek
Vaughn R. Stuart
Warren H. Taylor
Roy R. VanCleve
Wayne D. Walton
John O. Williams, Jr.
Leslie C. Williams
Henry S. Zdankowski

Richard P. Wells
Robert F. Werner
William W. Westphall
Kenneth C. Williams
Goode D. Wilson, Jr.
LeRoy K. Wirth

The following-named officers (civilian college graduates) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Nate L. Adams II, a citizen of Virginia.
Stanley "G" Alexander, a citizen of California.

Wendell O. Beard, a citizen of California.
Howard G. Blank, a citizen of Maryland.
John S. Carson, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

James L. Crutchfield, a citizen of New York.

Brian J. Cummings, a citizen of New Jersey.

Bruce F. Cunliffe, a citizen of New York.
Jack H. Davis, a citizen of Illinois.
Thomas J. Deen, Jr., a citizen of Florida.
Joseph K. Gastrock III, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

John N. Guild, a citizen of Colorado.
Gordon S. Hosmer, a citizen of New York.
George J. Kleess, a citizen of New York.
Donald J. Krabbe, a citizen of Missouri.
Donald E. Marchette, a citizen of South Carolina.

Donald V. McCloskey, a citizen of California.

Francis E. McDonald, a citizen of Missouri.
Phillip T. O'Hara, a citizen of New York.
Joseph R. Owen, a citizen of New York.

Laurence M. Phelps, Jr., a citizen of Florida.
Charles B. Quinn, a citizen of New Jersey.
John A. Reames, a citizen of South Carolina.

Thomas C. Redfern, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.

Allan L. Reid, a citizen of California.
Edward W. Snelling, a citizen of South Carolina.

William A. Speer, a citizen of South Carolina.

Robert G. Staffney, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

John J. Swards, a citizen of New York.
Phillip F. Thomas, a citizen of Tennessee.
Francis W. Tlef, a citizen of New York.
Robert G. Topp, a citizen of Mississippi.
John M. Walker, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Robert M. Winter, a citizen of California.
Cullen C. Zimmerman, a citizen of North Carolina.

The following-named officers (former contract NROTC students) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Mayhlon L. Degernes, Jr., a citizen of Minnesota.

Edwin W. Hakala, a citizen of Michigan.
Lawrence W. Hetrick, a citizen of Ohio.

The following-named officer (former midshipman) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Thomas H. Johnston

The following-named officers (former Regular officers) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Allan G. Copp
Raymond C. Damm
Billy C. Marks
Wesley E. Strauley
William P. Yerger

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Maurice J. Tobin to be Secretary of Labor.
Ralph Wright to be Assistant Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Oscar A. Bosma
Woodrow W. Brown
Alfred T. Coon
Felix L. Ferranto
Henry G. Goare
Bill E. Grimes
Dudley J. Hagen
Adolph J. Kutilek
Walter P. Landis
Lornie Leslie
Virgil E. Martin
William D. Mears

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Raymond L. Amos
Everett L. Anderson
John T. Bates
Daniel M. Blue, Jr.
Louis J. Caminiti
Robert B. Dowdy
William A. Flander
Allison G. Folsom, Jr.
Thomas F. Ford
Hollis W. Glass
Frank L. Howard
Stevan Iungerich
Lawrence W. Keenan
Homer King
Frederick J. Knack
Richard C. Laubach
Frank Lisi
Michael M. Marks
George M. Mathis

The following-named woman officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Katherine A. Towle

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Julia E. Hamblet
Pauline E. Perate

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Pauline B. Beckley
Barbara J. Bishop
Margaret M. Henderson
Emma H. Hendrickson
Elsie E. Hill
Helen J. McGraw

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Kathleen J. Arney
Eunyce L. Brink
Ben A. Day
Frances A. Denbo
Mary J. Fischer
Jeanne Fleming
Mary J. Hale
Margaret S. Ordemann
Pauline F. Riley
Margaret L. Stevenson
Jeanette I. Sustad

The following-named officers (former enlisted men) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Hugh S. Aitken
Ralph M. Anderson
John R. Bigler
Joseph A. Borowski
Travis D. Brown
George Caridakis
Oliver W. Christianson
Harold L. Coffman
Wallace E. Crowder
Rodger I. Eddy
Robert P. Edgar
Wendall C. Endsley
John C. Fite
Jerry D. Fly
Clarence W. Friesen
John "J" Gates
Tom L. Gibson
Harvey A. Goss
Edward C. Hall, Jr.
Edmund W. Hanlon
Ray Heck
John J. Hess

The following-named officers (former enlisted men) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Walter G. Ackerman
Harry L. Alderman
Merle W. Allen
Roscoe W. Anderson
Nickolas D. Arkadis
George L. Armitage
Milton S. Ashcraft
Dean C. Baker
John E. Baker
Harvey W. Baron
Donald F. Bays
Elbert "T" Bell
William J. Berlinguette

Frank W. Boules
Donald E. Bradley
Donald R. Brimmer
Dale L. Brown
Douglas L. Brown
Clayton O. Bush
Arnold F. Bynum
John J. H. Cahill
Richard E. Carey
Ray N. Carter
Dana B. Cashion
Charles A. Christian-
sen

John N. Christolos
William R. Clifton
Edward E. Collins
Orville D. Cooney
Manley H. Cosper, Jr.
John D. Counselman
Bert "R" Covert, Jr.
David R. Cowling
Richard J. Coyne
Lamar G. Crawford, Jr.
Ronald N. Davis
Paul E. Denny
Edwin A. Deptula
Richard M. Doezeema
William K. Duryea
Raymond S. Eason
William S. Edler
David J. Ellington
Billy J. Elliott
Edward T. Emmelman
Tyler D. Evans
Richard G. Eykyn
Paul R. Fields
Bert Fisher
Basil L. Flannagan
Harry A. Florence, Jr.
Howard O. Foor
William C. Foster
Marvin D. Gardner
Joseph M. Glasgow
Raymond J. Glodowski
Frederic W. Golles, Jr.
Daniel J. Griffin, Jr.
James E. Hannan
Dale M. Henz
Jack M. Hermes
Roy E. Hess
Wallace A. Heyer
Willis T. Howland
John M. Jackson
Spencer H. Jarnagin
Richard M. Johnson
Donald R. Jones
Joris F. Kenyon
Ethmer W. King
John W. Kostnik

Jack L. Nolan
Arthur A. Oakley
James P. O'Connell
Marion R. Ozburn, Jr.
Eugene J. Paradis
John M. Patrick
Peter M. Payne
Edward C. Post
Robert J. Post
Frederick K. Purdum
Wallace J. Reid
Patrick C. Roe
Raymond E. Roeder, Jr.
Paul J. G. Roosen
Victor A. Salvo, Jr.
Robert P. Scheuermann
Harold G. Schmidt, Jr.
Hugh C. Schryver, Jr.
Kenneth M. Scott
Donald W. Sharon
Stewart A. Shaw
George E. Shepherd
Michael J. Shinka
Van J. Simmons, Jr.
Frederick L. Simonson
Donald D. Sisson
Patrick G. Sivert
Louie J. Smith
Robert J. Smith
Taylor B. Smith
James W. Stemple
Gerald H. Stewart
Charles R. Stiles
Ralph E. Sullivan
Russell G. Swift, Jr.
Harold A. Thomas
Carl B. Thompson, Jr.
Robert P. Thomson
Ralph J. Tuley
Leon N. Utter
Edgar W. Wagner, Jr.
Wayne F. Wallace
Joseph A. Ward
Lars R. Wargin
Andrew T. Watt
Joseph R. Wayerski, Jr.

Roy E. Krieger
William A. Kronberg, Jr.
Thomas P. Lennon
Clarence W. Littleton
Frank J. Mackin
William H. Marlowe
James H. Marshall
Ronald A. Mason
William J. Masterpool
Charles H. Mattox
George E. McAlee
Eugene A. McGuire
Floyd H. McKay
Edmund C. McPoland
Joseph P. Mitchell, Jr.
Arthur R. Mooney
Edward C. Morris
Joseph E. Muir
Richard L. Musselman
Joseph Namesnik
Bud F. Nelson
Joseph A. Nevin
Rollie D. Newsom
Minard P. Newton, Jr.
Jack L. Nolan
Arthur A. Oakley
James P. O'Connell
Marion R. Ozburn, Jr.
Eugene J. Paradis
John M. Patrick
Peter M. Payne
Edward C. Post
Robert J. Post
Frederick K. Purdum
Wallace J. Reid
Patrick C. Roe
Raymond E. Roeder, Jr.
Paul J. G. Roosen
Victor A. Salvo, Jr.
Robert P. Scheuermann
Harold G. Schmidt, Jr.
Hugh C. Schryver, Jr.
Kenneth M. Scott
Donald W. Sharon
Stewart A. Shaw
George E. Shepherd
Michael J. Shinka
Van J. Simmons, Jr.
Frederick L. Simonson
Donald D. Sisson
Patrick G. Sivert
Louie J. Smith
Robert J. Smith
Taylor B. Smith
James W. Stemple
Gerald H. Stewart
Charles R. Stiles
Ralph E. Sullivan
Russell G. Swift, Jr.
Harold A. Thomas
Carl B. Thompson, Jr.
Robert P. Thomson
Ralph J. Tuley
Leon N. Utter
Edgar W. Wagner, Jr.
Wayne F. Wallace
Joseph A. Ward
Lars R. Wargin
Andrew T. Watt
Joseph R. Wayerski, Jr.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Preston Delano to be Comptroller of the Currency.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Frank P. Douglass to be a member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring February 1, 1952.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1948.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. E. Ryan Duffy to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Hon. Paul P. Rao to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

William T. McCarthy to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

Thomas Patrick Thornton to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

Hon. Roy W. Harper to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

James T. Foley to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

Hon. Wilson Warlick to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina.

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Hon. Angel R. de Jesus to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

Luis Negrón Fernandez to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph F. Deeb to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan.

John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

Cleon A. Summers to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

Gerald A. Gleeson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Frederick Elliott Biermann to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

Edwin D. Bolger to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan. (Now serving under an appointment which expired March 31, 1948.)

Harold K. Claypool to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

Carl H. Fleckenstein to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the regular corps of the Public Health Service:

SENIOR ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Abraham Wolfthal
William E. Dudley
Robert L. Capehart

ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Jean M. Lynch
Joseph J. Hackett

JUNIOR ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF SECOND LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Edward J. Vesey
Lowell R. Pfau
Adelbert E. Briggs

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Isaac M. Zigler
J. Howard Beard

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Charles M. Gillikin Edward B. Lehmann
Robert F. Wettingfield Alan F. Thometz
Harry R. H. Nicholas Daniel M. Emerson
III James V. Woodworth

SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Edmond G. Vanden Bosche
Tyler C. Folsom, Jr.

SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Charles L. Newberry, October 20, 1948.
Hildrus A. Poindexter, November 5, 1948.
Richard F. Boyd, December 29, 1948.

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Harold Heller, June 30, 1948.
Frederick G. Gillick, July 16, 1948.
Michael J. Clarke, November 20, 1948.
James G. Teifer, December 14, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN) EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Calvin W. Applewhite, June 29, 1948.
James B. Gilbert, June 29, 1948.
J. Carter Wright, June 29, 1948.
Frederick E. Phillips, June 30, 1948.
J. D. Leggett, June 30, 1948.
Eldis M. Christensen, July 1, 1948.
Ted E. Becker, July 1, 1948.

Allen N. Koplín, July 1, 1948.
Roland H. Corbet, July 1, 1948.
John H. Tuohy, July 1, 1948.

P. Councilman Morgan, July 1, 1948.
Edwin B. Thomas, July 1, 1948.
David M. Dumville, July 1, 1948.

R. Raymond Green, July 1, 1948.
Donald J. Ottenberg, July 2, 1948.
Harold H. Davidson, July 2, 1948.
Jules Glenn, July 2, 1948.

John J. Johnson, July 2, 1948.
Eugene V. Nínlinger, July 3, 1948.
William H. Gutstein, July 3, 1948.

Frederick A. Thompson, Jr., July 5, 1948.
Richard A. Reiss, July 6, 1948.
Gerald Gíges, July 6, 1948.

Robert W. Mowry, July 8, 1948.
Reed M. Broadbent, July 14, 1948.
Andrew G. Morrow, July 15, 1948.

Paul W. Rogers, July 15, 1948.
Robert O. Scow, July 22, 1948.
John F. Montroy, July 24, 1948.

Victor A. McKusick, October 1, 1948.
Charles H. Fish, October 1, 1948.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Victor A. McKusick, July 1, 1948.
John M. Vogel, July 1, 1948.
R. Guy Lewis, July 1, 1948.

David S. Wilder, July 1, 1948.
Glenn M. Gordon, July 1, 1948.
Robert L. Price, July 1, 1948.

Stewart M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
McClain Johnston, July 1, 1948.
Richard A. Saavedra, July 2, 1948.

Arnold W. Pratt, July 2, 1948.
Edward A. Rogers, Jr., July 3, 1948.
Gordon L. Farrell, July 8, 1948.

Albert L. Patrick, July 9, 1948.
Milton Sheinbein, July 16, 1948.
John F. Lowney, July 23, 1948.

DENTAL SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED

Harry G. Trautman, June 28, 1948.

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Hugh R. McCall, October 27, 1948.
Alfred H. Wieters, October 29, 1948.

SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

M. Allen Pond, August 25, 1948.
Duncan A. Holaday, September 9, 1948.
Hayse H. Black, December 27, 1948.
Paul D. Haney, December 30, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Bernard B. Berger, October 7, 1948.
Frederick S. Kent, October 8, 1948.
Donald J. Schliessmann, October 9, 1948.
Samuel R. Weibel, October 11, 1948.
Ernest P. Dubuque, November 23, 1948.
Ralph J. Johnson, November 24, 1948.
Sheldon L. Lang, November 24, 1948.
Lawrence B. Hall, November 24, 1948.

ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Irwin P. Sander, October 1, 1948.
Robert L. Stenberg, October 7, 1948.
Ronald E. Bales, November 15, 1948.
Gerald N. McDermott, November 30, 1948.

JUNIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF SECOND LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Albert L. Platz, September 29, 1948.
Mary E. Rydberg, September 30, 1948.
Howard E. Ayer, October 1, 1948.
Frederick Nevins, October 1, 1948.
John G. Morris, October 2, 1948.
Leo Weaver, October 2, 1948.
Charles E. Sponagle, October 3, 1948.
Leland J. McCabe, Jr., October 3, 1948.
George W. Burke, Jr., October 7, 1948.
Dade W. Moeller, October 8, 1948.
John V. Miner, Jr., October 8, 1948.
George R. Shultz, October 23, 1948.
Robert A. Gerber, November 12, 1948.
James P. Sheehy, November 12, 1948.

PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Guy H. Trimble, November 1, 1948.

J. Solon Mordell, November 10, 1948.

SCIENTIST DIRECTORS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Lyndon F. Small, November 12, 1948.

Helmuth H. Schrenk, November 13, 1948.

SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Clarence M. Tarzwell, June 29, 1948.
Leon Jacobs, December 30, 1948.

VETERINARIANS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

William T. S. Thorp, July 1, 1948.

Robert T. Habermann, December 30, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Mary E. O'Connor, October 29, 1948.
Marie D. Grant, December 27, 1948.

ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Mary E. Allen, November 2, 1948.
Albina A. Bozym, November 19, 1948.
Joyce B. Beveridge, December 13, 1948.
Mildred E. Barnett, December 27, 1948.
Ruth E. Anderson, December 27, 1948.

JUNIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF SECOND LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Florence A. Canada, November 2, 1948.
Marion E. O'Neil, November 15, 1948.
Frances R. Donoghue, November 28, 1948.

SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Fortunat A. Trole, July 1, 1948.
Oswald F. Hedley, July 1, 1948.
Paul A. Neal, July 1, 1948.
Erwin W. Blatter, July 1, 1948.
George G. Van Dyke, July 1, 1948.
Waldemar J. A. Wickman, July 1, 1948.

Donald W. Patrick, July 1, 1948.
 Calvin B. Spencer, July 1, 1948.
 Victor H. Haas, July 1, 1948.
 Bert R. Boone, July 1, 1948.
 Carroll E. Palmer, July 1, 1948.
 W. Palmer Dearing, July 10, 1948.
 Alexander G. Gilliam, July 10, 1948.
 Leonard A. Scheele, July 10, 1948.
 Frederick J. Brady, August 20, 1948.
 Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr., August 22, 1948.
 John R. Heller, Jr., October 15, 1948.
 Henry A. Holle, November 1, 1948.
 Arthur B. Price, November 3, 1948.
 Paul E. Walker, December 1, 1948.
 Theodore J. Bauer, December 1, 1948.
 Thorburn S. McGowan, December 1, 1948.
 Wilson T. Sowder, December 1, 1948.
 John W. Hornbrook, December 1, 1948.
 Seward E. Miller, December 1, 1948.
 John E. Dunn, December 1, 1948.
 Eugene A. Gillis, December 15, 1948.
 Anthony Donovan, December 20, 1948.
 John W. Cronin, December 29, 1948.
 Havelock F. Fraser, December 29, 1948.
 Jonathan B. Peebles, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 Edgar W. Moreland, December 29, 1948.
 Harry Heimann, December 29, 1948.
 John B. Alsever, December 29, 1948.
 Alexander A. Doerner, December 29, 1948.
 Russell E. Teague, December 29, 1948.
 Abraham Wikler, December 29, 1948.
 Mabel Ross, December 29, 1948.
 Lydia B. Edwards, December 29, 1948.
 Ira Lewis, December 29, 1948.
 Carl M. Eklund, December 29, 1948.
 Ladislav J. Zbrank, December 29, 1948.
 Erwin C. Drescher, December 29, 1948.
 Marion B. Noyes, December 29, 1948.
 John B. Hozier, December 29, 1948.
 Virgil J. Dorset, December 29, 1948.
 Curtis R. Chaffin, December 29, 1948.
 Paul T. Erickson, December 29, 1948.
 Eugene W. Green, December 29, 1948.
 Hugh L. C. Wilkerson, December 29, 1948.
 Robert L. Cherry, December 29, 1948.
 Charles F. Blankenship, December 29, 1948.
 Frederick J. Krueger, December 29, 1948.
 Frank S. French, December 29, 1948.
 Harold M. Janney, December 29, 1948.
 Russell O. Settle, December 29, 1948.
 Robert F. Martin, December 29, 1948.
 Herman E. Hilleboe, December 29, 1948.
 John R. McGibony, December 29, 1948.
 Theodore L. Perrin, December 29, 1948.
 Harris Isbell, December 29, 1948.
 David J. Zaugg, December 29, 1948.
 Howard D. Fishburn, December 29, 1948.
 Rolla R. Wolcott, December 29, 1948.
 James F. Lane, December 29, 1948.
 John N. Bowden, December 29, 1948.
 Ralph B. Hogan, December 29, 1948.
 Waldo B. Edwards, December 29, 1948.
 Henry W. Kassel, December 29, 1948.
 Vernon B. Link, December 29, 1948.
 Norman H. Topping, December 29, 1948.
 James A. Grider, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 Byron J. Olson, December 29, 1948.
 Harold R. Sandstead, December 29, 1948.

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES AS INDICATED

Samuel C. Ingraham II, July 7, 1948.
 David M. Gould, July 7, 1948.
 Robert E. Miller, July 11, 1948.
 Donald J. Birmingham, July 14, 1948.
 Roland K. Iverson, December 18, 1948.
 Bernard D. Davis, December 29, 1948.
 Raymond Hofstra, December 29, 1948.
 Will H. Aufranc, December 29, 1948.
 James A. Hunter, December 29, 1948.
 Burnet M. Davis, December 29, 1948.
 Paul V. Joliet, December 29, 1948.
 Gilcin F. Meadors, December 29, 1948.
 William L. Hewitt, December 29, 1948.
 George A. Shipman, December 29, 1948.
 John C. Cutler, December 29, 1948.
 David S. Ruhe, December 29, 1948.
 Carruth J. Wagner, December 29, 1948.
 George W. Comstock, December 29, 1948.
 H. Charles Franklin, December 29, 1948.
 William C. Jenkins, Jr., December 29, 1948.

Randolph P. Grimm, December 29, 1948.
 Elmer L. Hill, December 29, 1948.
 Robert M. Foote, December 29, 1948.
 James F. Maddux, December 29, 1948.
 Eugene J. Gillespie, December 29, 1948.
 Bertrand E. Bennison, December 29, 1948.
 I. Ray Howard, December 29, 1948.
 Robert H. English, December 29, 1948.
 Edward T. Blomquist, December 29, 1948.
 John B. Spriggs, December 29, 1948.
 William H. Errgong, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 James L. Elliott, December 29, 1948.
 Willys M. Monroe, December 29, 1948.
 John J. Davies, December 29, 1948.
 Leon A. Heppel, December 29, 1948.
 Arthur Kornberg, December 29, 1948.
 Andrew P. Sackett, December 29, 1948.
 Fred W. Thyng, December 29, 1948.
 Leroy R. Allen, December 29, 1948.
 Theodore E. Hynson, December 29, 1948.
 Glenn H. Algire, December 29, 1948.
 Mary Walton, December 29, 1948.
 John C. Hume, December 29, 1948.
 Elton S. Osborne, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 Robert W. Razor, December 29, 1948.
 William W. Richards, December 29, 1948.
 Lewis C. Robbins, December 29, 1948.
 Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr., December 29, 1948.

James A. Salmons, December 29, 1948.
 Frederic C. Bartter, December 29, 1948.
 Herbert Tabor, December 29, 1948.
 Milton I. Roemer, December 29, 1948.
 Carl R. Kunstling, December 29, 1948.
 Griffith E. Quinby, December 29, 1948.
 Robert J. Huebner, December 29, 1948.
 Jacob C. Wagner, December 29, 1948.
 Fred W. Harb, December 29, 1948.
 Arthur L. Koven, December 29, 1948.
 Leo P. Krall, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 William G. Hollister, December 29, 1948.
 George J. Cooper, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 Joseph Kovacs, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 J. Frederick Bell, December 29, 1948.
 William Roemich, December 29, 1948.
 Paulo do A. Pamplona, December 29, 1948.
 James O. Davis, December 29, 1948.
 Richard B. Stephenson, December 29, 1948.
 Maurice L. Brodsky, December 29, 1948.
 Raymond F. Corpe, December 29, 1948.
 George Adams, December 29, 1948.
 James T. Hearin, December 29, 1948.
 Robert Guthrie, December 29, 1948.
 Robert L. Faucett, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

Raymond W. Herrmann, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL) EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Oscar Mikkelsen, July 1, 1948.
 Ralph S. Lloyd, July 2, 1948.
 John W. Knutson, July 2, 1948.
 George E. Jones, July 2, 1948.
 William P. Kroschel, July 2, 1948.
 Bruce D. Forsyth, July 2, 1948.
 Henry F. Canby, November 16, 1948.
 Norman F. Gerrie, December 29, 1948.
 Robert M. Stephan, December 29, 1948.
 Herbert A. Spencer, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 Charles H. Wright, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 Howard J. Woodbridge, December 29, 1948.
 Francis A. Arnold, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 William W. Calhoun, Jr., December 29, 1948.

George E. Waterman, December 29, 1948.

DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Edward J. Driscoll, December 29, 1948.
 George A. Nevitt, December 29, 1948.
 Eugene H. Hess, December 29, 1948.
 Howard K. Wyatt, December 29, 1948.
 Dennis E. Singleton, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 John C. Heckel, December 29, 1948.
 Earl C. Hewitt, December 29, 1948.
 Maurice S. Rodgers, December 29, 1948.
 Carl E. Johnson, December 29, 1948.
 John W. Holt, December 29, 1948.
 David B. Scott, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED

Frank W. Nelson, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Elmer J. Herringer, October 1, 1948.
 Walter N. Dashiell, December 29, 1948.

SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Russell W. Hart, August 1, 1948.
 Malcolm C. Hope, September 19, 1948.
 Frederick C. Roberts, Jr., December 29, 1948.

Harry G. Hanson, December 29, 1948.
 Wesley E. Gilbertson, December 29, 1948.
 Callis H. Atkins, December 29, 1948.
 Edmund C. Garthe, December 29, 1948.
 Chris A. Hansen, December 29, 1948.
 Frank Tetzlaff, December 29, 1948.
 Albert H. Stevenson, December 29, 1948.
 Ralph C. Palange, December 29, 1948.
 Richard S. Green, December 29, 1948.
 Richard S. Mark, December 29, 1948.
 Arthur H. Nell, December 29, 1948.
 George D. Clayton, December 29, 1948.
 Richard F. Poston, December 29, 1948.
 Charles D. Spangler, December 29, 1948.
 Hershel Engler, December 29, 1948.
 Leonard M. Board, December 29, 1948.
 Kaarlo W. Nasi, December 29, 1948.
 Richard L. Woodward, December 29, 1948.
 Elroy K. Day, December 29, 1948.
 Gerald W. Ferguson, December 29, 1948.
 Conrad P. Straub, December 29, 1948.
 Henry L. Roahrig, December 29, 1948.
 Ernest C. Anderson, December 29, 1948.
 George L. Carley, Jr., December 29, 1948.
 Donald L. Snow, December 29, 1948.
 Roscoe H. Goeke, December 29, 1948.
 Graham Walton, December 29, 1948.
 Ralph C. Graber, December 29, 1948.
 Herbert W. Haas, December 29, 1948.
 William W. Payne, December 29, 1948.
 Howard W. Chapman, December 29, 1948.
 William E. Holy, December 29, 1948.
 Richard Hammerstrom, December 29, 1948.
 Henry N. Doyle, December 29, 1948.
 Leonard B. Dworsky, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Howard L. Andrews, July 1, 1948.
 Joseph M. Bobbitt, December 29, 1948.
 Samuel W. Simmons, December 29, 1948.
 Sidney H. Newman, December 29, 1948.
 Harry J. Bennett, December 29, 1948.
 John C. Keresztesy, December 29, 1948.

SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Lewis J. Cralley, December 6, 1948.
 Pope A. Lawrence, December 29, 1948.
 Harry D. Pratt, December 29, 1948.
 Roy F. Fritz, December 29, 1948.
 Ralph C. Barnes, December 29, 1948.
 H. Page Nicholson, December 29, 1948.
 John A. Rowe, December 29, 1948.
 Francis M. Middleton, December 29, 1948.
 Don E. Eyles, December 29, 1948.
 Raymond Fagan, December 29, 1948.
 George A. Hottle, December 29, 1948.
 William J. Bowen, December 29, 1948.
 Falconer Smith, December 29, 1948.
 Samuel B. Salvin, December 29, 1948.
 William C. Frohne, December 29, 1948.
 Harold B. Robinson, December 29, 1948.
 Dohrman H. Byers, December 29, 1948.
 Dale R. Lindsay, December 29, 1948.
 Oliver R. Placak, December 29, 1948.
 Marion M. Brooke, December 29, 1948.
 William W. Smith, December 29, 1948.
 David B. Lackman, December 29, 1948.
 Howard W. Bond, December 29, 1948.
 Elmer G. Berry, December 29, 1948.
 John H. Hughes, December 29, 1948.

VETERINARIAN (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED
James H. Steele, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Loretta C. Parsons, July 1, 1948.
Viola E. Matheson, July 1, 1948.
Madge M. Neill, July 1, 1948.
Ruth N. Crawford, July 1, 1948.
Florence T. Thiemann, July 1, 1948.
Mary A. Brimberry, July 1, 1948.
Mary A. Rice, July 1, 1948.
Irma C. Thomsen, July 1, 1948.
Magdalene E. Roller, July 1, 1948.
Elizabeth C. Laczko, July 1, 1948.
Hazel E. Owen, July 1, 1948.
Katherine L. Tucker, July 1, 1948.
Mary Matthews, July 1, 1948.
Beatrice Zingle, July 1, 1948.
Adele L. Henderson, July 1, 1948.
Gertrude L. Anderson, July 1, 1948.
M. Lois McMinn, July 1, 1948.
Gertrude I. Miller, July 1, 1948.
Myra I. Johnson, July 1, 1948.
Helen Gertz, July 1, 1948.
M. Estelle Hunt, July 1, 1948.
Jean C. Feely, July 1, 1948.
H. Jean McIver, July 1, 1948.
Irma M. Lamberti, July 1, 1948.
Arne L. Bulkeley, July 1, 1948.
Dorothy G. Erickson, July 1, 1948.
Henrietta Smellow, July 1, 1948.
Stella M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
Winifred M. Mendez, July 1, 1948.
Sally Wladis, July 1, 1948.
Flora Jacobs, July 1, 1948.
Henrietta Rust, July 1, 1948.
M. Elizabeth McBride, July 1, 1948.
Sylvia Simon, July 1, 1948.
Helen E. Enright, July 1, 1948.
Mary E. Ingle, July 1, 1948.
Marie F. Henzel, July 1, 1948.
Edna L. Easterday, December 29, 1948.
Anne J. Lello, December 29, 1948.
Genevieve T. Plette, December 29, 1948.
Helen A. Gentilman, December 29, 1948.
Latis M. Campbell, December 29, 1948.
Anne K. Buck, December 29, 1948.
Mary F. Callan, December 29, 1948.
Dorothy L. Connors, December 29, 1948.
Vivian L. Gibson, December 29, 1948.
Mary B. Krause, December 29, 1948.
Emilie S. Wilson, December 29, 1948.
Florence J. Ullman, December 29, 1948.
Jennie Rakich, December 29, 1948.

JUNIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS TO BE ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Joan M. Norkunas, July 13, 1948.
Norma G. Russell, August 1, 1948.
Margaret M. Sweeney, October 20, 1948.

ASSISTANT DIETITIANS TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT DIETITIANS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Myrtle M. Morris, July 1, 1948.
E. Grace Gibson, July 1, 1948.
Engla J. Anderson, July 1, 1948.

SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Reuben F. Reider
Clarence A. Smith
Richard H. Smith

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Norman B. McCullough	Clinton C. Powell
Harold S. Barrett	J. Russell Mitchell
Wade H. Etheridge	Pasquale J. Pesare
Marvin O. Lewis	George A. Spendlove
Elijah M. Nadel	Rheim M. Jones
Birdsall N. Carle	Weldon C. White
	R. Carl Millican

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

Robert M. Paine
Charles O. Metzmaker
Laurence Finberg
Keith H. Frankhauser

Gordon L. Farrell
John F. Lowbey
Ralph S. Pfaffenbarger, Jr.
Arthur D. Fisher
Glenn M. Gordon
John P. Utz
Delmo A. Paris
Wendell L. Pierce
Milton Sheinbein
Carlyle F. Stout

SENIOR DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Harry G. Trautman
Arthur G. Malucky

DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Thomas J. Riley, Jr.
Maurice Costello

SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

William J. Braye
Robert W. Anderson

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Mark D. Hollis

SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Howard W. Spence
Floyd B. Taylor

PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Ronald G. Esson	Robarts L. Proper
Reid M. Hovey	Arnold H. Dodge
Francis R. Ellis	

SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Milton Silverman	Richard P. Dow
Louis J. Olivier	James E. Birren
Alan W. Donaldson	Morris B. Ettinger
Joseph Greenberg	George R. Weber
Liberio Ajello	Julius S. Youngner
Isadore Zipkin	Herbert A. Sober

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

Anne Woudema	Enid L. Taylor
Mary M. Bouser	C. Vistula Lancaster

Sidney Shindell
Richard A. Saavedra
Leonard J. Ganser
Norman G. Hepper
William H. Baker
Stewart M. Williams
Robert A. Sammons
Russell G. Lewis
John W. Cashman
Robert L. Price
David S. Wilder

resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to authorize the United States to break through snow-bound areas in western range States, to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms in such States, and to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 31, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority heretofore granted, the Clerk of the House received from the Secretary of the Senate on January 27, 1949, the engrossed resolution (H. J. Res. 112) entitled "Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes," attested by the Secretary as having been passed by the Senate on January 27, 1949.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on January 27, 1949, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that following authority granted the Chair on January 27, 1949, he did on January 28, 1949, sign the following enrolled joint resolution: House Joint Resolution 112, a joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

GEN. COURTNEY HODGES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. As there is no legislative program for today, without objection that may be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, today a great soldier will retire from the United States Army after more than 43 years of continuous service. I speak of Gen. Courtney Hodges, who rose from the enlisted ranks to become a four-star general and the great wartime commander of our mighty First Army.

He was born in Perry, Ga., on January 5, 1887. He was the son of John Hicks

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Thou Eternal One, from whom all blessings flow, our times are in Thine hands. We implore Thee to help us to be diligent, lest we fail ere the setting of the sun. Give us a sane and reasonable faith, lest our fears conquer us; give us a sympathy that includes all suffering and distressed humanity; give us a religion that will stand every test, and a large measure of health, wisdom, and deep consideration for all men. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 27, 1949, 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 January 28, 1949, the President approved and signed a joint

Hodges and Katherine Norwood Hodges. His father was a newspaper publisher.

Ever since his boyhood, he was filled with an ambition to become a soldier. And so in 1904, at the age of 17, he entered the United States Military Academy at West Point. But misfortune overtook him in his first year as a result of his difficulties in geometry and he was forced to leave the Academy.

Undaunted and determined upon a soldier's career, he promptly enlisted as a private in the Seventeenth Infantry, United States Army, at Fort McPherson, Ga. He served 3 years as an enlisted man and then won a competitive examination for a commission as a second lieutenant of infantry. This was in 1909, when he was 22 years old. After 7 years of service at Army posts in the southwest United States and in the Philippines, he was promoted to the rank of first lieutenant in 1916. From March of that year until the following February he served in Mexico under General Pershing.

In 1918, now a captain, he was sent to France with the Sixth United States Infantry Regiment, Fifth Division. During World War I he received promotions through temporary grades to lieutenant colonel and fought as a battalion commander and later as a regimental commander in the Lorraine, Argonne, and St. Mihiel offensives. He rendered service with such distinction in these actions that he won the Distinguished Service Cross and the Silver Star.

During the long peacetime years after World War I, he devoted himself assiduously to the task of increasing his professional knowledge and abilities. He attended the Field Artillery School at Fort Sill, Okla., in 1920, and was promoted to the permanent grade of major in that year. Shortly thereafter he served as an instructor in the department of tactics at West Point. Tours of duty at the highest level service schools followed with his assignment to the Command and General Staff School at Leavenworth in 1925 and with later duties at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., and the Air Corps Tactical School at Langley Field. Finally, in 1934 he completed the course at the War College in Washington, D. C., thus completing his formal military education.

Following his promotion to lieutenant colonel in October of 1934, he served for 2 years on the general staff of the Philippine department, from 1936 to 1938. Thereafter he returned to the United States and was assigned as assistant commandant and later as commandant of the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga. There he laid the foundations for modern infantry training and the instruction of officers and men which later made possible the rapid wartime expansion of that important school. His work in this respect alone should earn him the undying gratitude of all Americans. But however important, it has been completely eclipsed by his later more illustrious accomplishments as a field commander in World War II.

With the expansion of the Army immediately prior to World War II, he was rapidly promoted to the rank of colonel and brigadier general. In March of 1941 he was assigned to the Office of the Chief

of Infantry in Washington, D. C., and soon thereafter he himself became in succession Acting Chief of Infantry and then Chief of Infantry. He was promoted to the rank of major general in May 1941. Because of General Hodges' recognized abilities as an able and experienced field commander, it was not long after the commencement of World War II before he was ordered to Texas to activate the X Corps, which was then a part of the Third Army, under Gen. Walter Krueger. In February 1943, after promotion to the rank of lieutenant general, he succeeded General Krueger. A year later he was ordered overseas as deputy commander of the First United States Army, under Gen. Omar N. Bradley, commanding general. From his headquarters in Bristol, England, he took up the task of directing the training and coordination of the various corps, divisions, and other units attached to the First Army in preparation for the coming assault on Fortress Europe.

On June 6, 1944, D-day, General Hodges landed in Normandy. A few weeks later, when General Bradley assumed command of the Twelfth Army Group, General Hodges took command of the First Army. That was in August of 1944, and under his leadership the First Army punched a hole through the German defenses at Avranches and Mortain, thus enabling Gen. George S. Patton's armor to make the famous breakthrough at St. Lo. General Hodges threw back a strong counter attack by five Panzer divisions at Mortain and rushed forward to meet the British Second Army, coming up from the west, thus creating the Falaise-Argentan pocket, where some 100,000 Germans were surrounded and captured, thus eliminating the German Seventh Army as a combat force.

General Hodges' First Army not only made the first landings on the Normandy Beach, and the first breakthrough at St. Lo, but was also the first to enter Paris on August 25, 1944. Following the capitulation of the French capital, General Hodges drove on to the Aisne and the Marne, reaching the Belgian frontier on September 2. He liberated Liège on the 8th of September, crossed Luxembourg, and on September 11 the First Army again checked off another first by being the first American troops to enter Germany.

The capture of Aachen and the battle of the Huertgen Forest followed in October and November. The stage was now set for the capture of the Roer River dams, the strategic key to any further advance across the Roer River to the Cologne plain. However, this planned operation was suddenly interrupted by the ferocious counterattack of Von Rundstedt, known as the Battle of the Bulge.

In 2 weeks of the bitterest fighting in fog, rain, snow, and freezing weather, the combat divisions of General Hodges' First Army halted Von Rundstedt's attack and resumed their own offensive on January 3, 1945.

Exploiting Von Rundstedt's failure, General Hodges took off again to the east early in January of 1945 and a few weeks later, on March 7, he reached the Rhine through the ruins of Cologne. At

this point one of the most dramatic incidents of the war occurred, the crossing of the Ludendorff Bridge at Remagen before the Germans had time to destroy it. This opportunity was immediately exploited to its fullest extent as armor and infantry poured rapidly across the damaged bridge and established a firm bridgehead across the Rhine before the damaged structure finally collapsed.

Two and one-half weeks later, the First Army broke out of its Remagen bridgehead and raced on across Germany in its final drive to destroy the German forces. Some elements pushed on toward Frankfurt-am-Main and others sped forward to make contact with the United States Ninth Army, which by now had also crossed the Rhine and was driving eastward.

Finally at Torgau, on the Elbe, on April 25, 1945, 10 days after General Hodges had been promoted to the four-star rank of full general, First Army divisions were the first American troops to contact the Russian armies at the Elbe-Mulde River line. Thus the First Army was first on the Normandy beaches, first to break through at St. Lo, first to liberate Paris, first into Germany, first across the Rhine, and first to make contact with the Russians. The First United States Army had lived up to its name and its great accomplishments were due in no small measure to the leadership and ability of General Hodges, a soldier's soldier, whom Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower has referred to as sturdy and steady Hodges. Sturdy and steady he was, indeed, and at the same time a man so modest and self-effacing that, in spite of his gigantic accomplishments in World War II, he has not received the same public attention as some of our more widely proclaimed heroes. He is one of those quiet men of extraordinary competence whose very steadiness itself has kept him out of the spotlight of glamor. But history will recognize him among the ranks of our greatest soldiers.

It is sad, indeed, that this energetic man, whose blue eyes and vigor of movement belie his 62 years of age, must now enter upon retirement. May we wish him continued good health and a long and happy life and may we express to him the profound gratitude of all Americans.

MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the anniversary of the death by assassination of Mahatma Gandhi, one of those rare ones who lived his belief in every hour of his days and nights, whose influence encircles the earth.

It was my privilege to be included among those invited by the Ambassador of India to the impressive and deeply moving memorial services held in the auditorium of the Department of the Interior. With great understanding the Indian Embassy recognized that here in Washington are many who revere this

great spirit that chose to serve mankind in this moment of universal need in the frail form of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, known to us as the Mahatma, to many of his followers as Babu—an untranslatable name of love.

No one who was present could fail to have been deeply moved by the simplicity of the service. For myself I was lifted up as I have not been in many long moons. The reality of spiritual force pervaded me, the universality of truth enveloped me, and I came away renewed in body and soul. It is with deep appreciation that I take this method of thanking the Ambassador from India and Lady Rama Rau for this uplifting experience that has given me new courage and certain hope that one day all the people of the world will live together in complete understanding and demonstration of the nonviolence for which Mahatma Gandhi gave his life.

That there may be in the RECORD a less personal word of this memorial hour I am inserting a clipping of this morning from the Washington Post:

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR GANDHI ATTRACT MORE THAN 700 HERE—INDIAN AMBASSADOR CONDUCTS RITES IN INTERIOR AUDITORIUM

An impressive memorial service to Mahatma Gandhi, featured by prayers chanted and spoken by the Indian leader's personal physician, was held here yesterday on the first anniversary of Gandhi's assassination.

Conducted by Sir Benegal Rama Rau, Ambassador of India to the United States, the service was held at the Department of the Interior auditorium and was attended by more than 700 persons, including ambassadors and other high-ranking Washington representatives of many nations.

Gandhi's physician, Dr. Sushila Nayar, was attended in the prayer service by 11 ladies of the Indian Embassy, attired in flowing saris of white, as a symbol of the simplicity which was one of the spiritual leader's characteristics.

Explaining that Mahatma Gandhi respected all true religions, she opened the service by chanting a Buddhist prayer, and, after 2 minutes of silence, sang verses from the Hindu scriptures. Then followed excerpts from the Mohammedan Koran, from the Bhagavad-Gita, supreme scripture of Hindu India, from scriptures of the Sikh sect, and from the Sermon on the Mount, Gandhi's favorite part of the Bible.

Dr. Nayar, who is in this country for post-graduate work at Johns Hopkins and Columbia Universities, said the United Nations is not respected in some places because the big nations have violated one of Gandhi's principles, that of nonaccumulation of great material possessions. Accumulation of material power has made everyone want to be big, just as Gandhi insisted it always did, with individuals or with nations, she said.

Dr. Paul Douglass, president of American University, reviewed the high points of Gandhi's life, while Lady Rama Rau in a brief talk spoke of him as a great spiritual leader from the historical point of view, but a "man whom we loved" to "the humble Indians."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a newspaper editorial in each.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the chairman of the board of directors of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a bill he is today introducing.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Expansion Estimates to 1960 for Pacific Northwest Industries." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$266.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

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

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement with respect to William McKinley and the annexation of Hawaii.

PERMITTING UNINCORPORATED BUSINESSES TO BE TAXED LIKE CORPORATIONS

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, I am introducing today a bill which will permit unincorporated businesses to be taxed like corporations. The bill will permit the business enterprise, if the owners so elect, to be treated as if it were a corporation, and amounts received from such business enterprise by the individual owners will be regarded as dividends. By treating such business enterprise as a corporation, it will be permitted to accumulate earnings for expansion and increased production purposes without being subject to any higher rate than the rate applicable to corporations.

At the present time, an individual in business is compelled to pay the full normal and surtax on any earnings left in his business. Of course, if the earnings are accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the business enterprise, the provisions of section 102, relating to unreasonable accumulation of earnings for the purpose of avoiding individual surtaxes, will be applicable. Because of administrative difficulties, the relief is necessarily granted to businesses owned by not more than 10 individuals.

My bill becomes effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949. It is introduced at this time so that it can receive full study and analysis by all persons interested in such a proposal.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has had a death in his family necessitating his return to Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that he be granted a leave of absence for 6 days.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk House Resolution 68 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on District of Columbia: JAMES WADSWORTH, New York.

Committee on Un-American Activities: J. PARNELL THOMAS, New Jersey; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OIL OPERATORS

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a telegram.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, the independent oil operators of our country are rapidly being squeezed out of business through two forces that our Government should do its utmost to correct.

These independent oil operators are composed of the real type of American pioneers that have made this country of ours great.

Men who go forth to risk their all in the discovery of new horizons and new wealth for the benefit and good of all and for the hoped-for reward and gain that their efforts and risks sometimes provide them.

During the recent war in which our country was engaged it was these men, the independent oilmen of America, that concentrated their energies and their means, their ability, and techniques to keep apace with our great increase in demand for petroleum and its products that played such a huge and all-important part in winning the war.

Since the cessation of hostilities these same men have found it increasingly difficult to pursue their business.

First, the black market and extreme scarcity of well pipe due to a large extent

to the export of great tonnage of this necessary commodity to the foreign fields of Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia.

Now, following the exportation of this tremendous quantity of pipe the resultant production of foreign oil is reaching our shores to create a surplus and discourage, if not stop, further exploration drilling, discoveries, and production in our own country.

Are we to encourage and condone this procedure to the end that this vital industry shall further suffer and be killed?

I offer a telegram from my good friend, R. L. Wood, as one of the many expressions of protest received from representatives and members of the great fraternity of pioneers:

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., January 28, 1949.
Congressman KEN REGAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Statement by the executive committee and State vice presidents of the Independent Petroleum Association of America at Wichita Falls, Tex., January 28, 1949:

"An increasing flood of foreign oil is jeopardizing our national economy, our national security, and resulting in the unemployment of American labor.

"Two world wars have proved that America cannot depend on foreign oil in an emergency. Foreign oil, thousands of miles away in troubled areas and under the insecure control of a combination of a few importing companies, is a slender thread on which to hang the security of the American people.

"Domestic oil producers since the war have increased the production of crude oil in the United States until they are now more than able to supply every need of the American consumer. The output of domestic oil can be further increased. It will not be increased if this market is absorbed by foreign oil, thus depriving the independent oil producer of the funds necessary to discover and develop adequate reserves in the United States.

"The few large importing companies, through short-sightedness, indifference, or selfish interest, are endangering the national security in their rush to produce and sell their foreign oil in the markets of this country. Most of their foreign reserves are in the Middle East. Less than 2 hours' bombing time from Russia.

"This revival of international cartels, which owe allegiance to no country, should not be permitted to monopolize or destroy American life.

"The Independent Petroleum Association of America insists that the Congress should protect the welfare and security of the American people by enacting such legislation as is necessary to restrict petroleum imports to only such quantities as may be needed to supplement domestic production."

BOB WOOD.

MIDLAND.

OUR PRESIDENTS' HEALTH

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues that they read a recent book, by Dr. Carl Wold, on the physical health of our Presidents. Dr. Wold has spent years on this research and tells how the health of our Presidents has affected great decisions of this country and the world. Look magazine for this week publishes one

of the chapters of this book on the health of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His paralysis, later illnesses, and unusually lengthy term of service, during an era of great national strain, focused more than usual attention on the state of the President's health.

Our Presidents carry a tremendous burden that at times seems more than the strongest man might be able to bear. Our Presidents, because of their tremendous responsibilities, need to divide these responsibilities so that part of them could be carried by a so-called Assistant President, and by a strong Cabinet.

I am certain that if the people had been properly informed of Franklin Roosevelt's health by competent, unbiased physicians, he, himself, never would have made the sacrifice of running for a fourth term, and indeed might be alive today. It seems to me that often selfish, greedy politicians, officeholders, and leeches on our political body use undue force and persuasion to keep their political advantages.

The world now knows that Franklin Roosevelt was an ill man at the end of his third term. His condition became worse when he was a candidate for a fourth term. In the early part of his fourth term he had important conferences with world leaders. He and his advisers made agreements with Joe Stalin that have cost this country billions of dollars and perhaps even a third world war. He gave his best and perhaps came to an untimely death because of the crushing burdens forced upon an ill man.

I have often recommended that Presidents be examined periodically by unbiased, well qualified medical men and that a report be given to the proper committee of Congress. I am also just as certain that no President should ever serve more than two terms. This Nation ought to profit by past mistakes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include three speeches that I made in this House in the last two Congresses.

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

There was no objection.

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 22, Rept. No. 9), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 10 Mem-

bers of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the normal operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government or Government owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the need for a sound program for the solution of the postwar problems of small business.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nine."

Page 3, at the end of line 6, after the period, insert the following: "The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file another privileged report, and possibly one other in addition thereto. One is a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency on which there has been a unanimous report. A request will be made for a rule at 2 o'clock on another bill, which also has the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what committee does that bill come from?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will deal with that matter in a moment.

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

There was no objection.

COCKTAIL PARTIES

Mr. KEEFE. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I have read numerous reports in the press recently from individuals placed in high position by the electorate to the effect that the rounds of cocktail parties and the drinking in Washington have become so great that they cannot attend to their public business.

I am afraid that the publication of those statements in the press would be a reflection upon the hard-working Members of Congress of the United States who have the ability to withstand the invitations of those society climbers who would have the Members of Congress attend cocktail parties every day. But I want it said that as a result of 10 years' experience of my own here in this body it has been my observation that the hard-working Members of this body, and most of them are, are able to resist the temptation, if such a thing exists. I can say to those who are complaining that all they have to do is simply say "No." Let them not attend those cocktail parties that are interfering with their activities, and quit drinking cocktails if it interferes with doing business. The overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress have done so and are able to do so today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 50) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is requested to transmit to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable time the following information, namely:

1. What does the Department know about whether Egypt and Transjordan, or either of them, has invoked its mutual assistance treaty with Great Britain?

2. Has the United States asked Great Britain for an explanation of the recent presence of its military aircraft over the battle zone between the Israeli and Egyptian forces on the border of Palestine and Egypt?

3. Has the United States asked Great Britain for an explanation of the recent shipment or proposed shipment of troops to the port of Aqaba in Transjordan, and the purposes for which said troops are proposed to be employed?

4. In the opinion of the Department, did the presence of British military aircraft over the Israeli-Egyptian fighting zone, or the arrival of British troops at Aqaba, infringe upon the resolutions of the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations adopted in 1948 with respect to Palestine?

5. What information does the Department have regarding British sales or shipments,

if any, directly or indirectly, of arms or implements of war since April 17, 1948, to Transjordan, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, or Yemen?

6. If the sales or shipments referred to in question 5 have taken place, did such sales or shipments constitute, in the opinion of the Department, infringements upon the resolutions of the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations adopted in 1948 with respect to Palestine?

7. What is the present policy of the Department regarding the continuance or lifting of the embargo, announced on December 5, 1947, on the shipment of arms or implements of war to Israel and the other Middle Eastern countries?

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk the adverse report of the committee, together with a memorandum report from the Secretary of State. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee, together with the memorandum report, be read, but that the excerpts accompanying the report from the records of the United Nations not be read, due to their length and in order to conserve the time of the House, but that such excerpts be printed in the RECORD, together with the other documents.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is not asking for the passage of this resolution now, is he? He is not attempting to bring the resolution up, is he?

Mr. KEE. Of course, the resolution is before the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly am not willing to join in this war on Great Britain. The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Mississippi will be patient, the Chair understands that a motion will be offered which will dispose of that question.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand; but I am not willing to join in this war on the British people. This Palestine proposition has developed into a satellite state of Soviet Russia. We need not kid ourselves any further. I am not willing for the Congress of the United States to join in making war on Great Britain or aiding Russia by financing or feeding or supplying her satellite state.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 50) to obtain information from the Secretary of State on the Palestine situation, having considered the same, reports unfavorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the resolution do not pass.

The recommendation of the committee is based on a communication received from the Department of State, the text of which is included in this report for the information of the House.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 26, 1949.

The Honorable SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLOOM: Pursuant to our conversation this morning, I enclose a memorandum report on House Resolution 50, together with copies of the General Assembly's resolutions of May 15, 1947, and December 11, 1948, as well as the resolutions of the Security Council dated May 29 and July 15, 1948.

If I can be of further assistance to you, do not hesitate to make known your desires.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT MCCLINTOCK,
Special Assistant to the Director,
Office of United Nations Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE MEMORANDUM ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 50, JANUARY 26, 1949

House Resolution 50, calling for information on the Palestine situation, comes at a time when very delicate and important conversations are in progress between the representatives of the Provisional Government of Israel and several of the Arab governments, looking toward the establishment of peace in Palestine. It would be unfortunate if information furnished pursuant to House Resolution 50 should become public during these negotiations. Furthermore, the United States Government is a member of the Palestine Conciliation Commission appointed pursuant to the General Assembly's resolution of December 11, 1948. This Government must use its utmost endeavor to preserve its position of strict impartiality as a member of the Palestine Conciliation Commission in order that its best efforts may be used on the Commission in an endeavor to assist the parties to the Palestine dispute to reach a peaceful and permanent solution of their problem.

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION OF MAY 15, 1947

The General Assembly calls upon all governments and peoples, and particularly upon the inhabitants of Palestine, to refrain, pending action by the General Assembly on the report of the Special Committee on Palestine, from the threat or use of force or any other action which might create an atmosphere prejudicial to an early settlement of the question of Palestine.

Seventy-ninth plenary meeting, May 15, 1947.

PALESTINE: PROGRESS REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS MEDIATOR

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING, DECEMBER 11, 1948

The General Assembly having considered further the situation in Palestine—

1. Expresses its deep appreciation of the progress achieved through the good offices of the late United Nations mediator in promoting a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine, for which cause he sacrificed his life; and

Extends its thanks to the acting mediator and his staff for their continued efforts and devotion to duty in Palestine;

2. Establishes a Conciliation Commission consisting of three states members of the United Nations which shall have the following functions:

(a) To assume, insofar as it considers necessary in existing circumstances, the functions given to the United Nations mediator on Palestine by the resolution of the General Assembly of May 14, 1948;

(b) To carry out the specific functions and directives given to it by the present resolution and such additional functions and directives as may be given to it by the General Assembly or by the Security Council;

(c) To undertake, upon the request of the Security Council, any of the functions now assigned to the United Nations mediator on Palestine or to the United Nations Truce Commission by resolutions of the Security Council; upon such request to the Conciliation Commission by the Security Council with respect to all the remaining functions of the United Nations mediator on Palestine under Security Council resolutions, the office of the mediator shall be terminated;

3. Decides that a committee of the Assembly, consisting of China, France, the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, shall present, before the end of the first part of the present session of the General Assembly, for the approval of the Assembly, a proposal concerning the names of the three states which will constitute the Conciliation Commission;

4. Requests the Commission to begin its functions at once, with a view to the establishment of contact between the parties themselves and the Commission at the earliest possible date;

5. Calls upon the governments and authorities concerned to extend the scope of the negotiations provided for in the Security Council's resolution of November 16, 1948, and to seek agreement by negotiations conducted either with the Conciliation Commission or directly with a view to the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them;

6. Instructs the Conciliation Commission to take steps to assist the governments and authorities concerned to achieve a final settlement of all questions outstanding between them;

7. Resolves that the holy places—including Nazareth—religious buildings, and sites in Palestine should be protected and free access to them assured, in accordance with existing rights and historical practice; that arrangements to this end should be under effective United Nations supervision; that the United Nations Conciliation Commission, in presenting to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly its detailed proposal for a permanent international regime for the territory of Jerusalem, should include recommendations concerning the holy places in that territory; that with regard to the holy places in the rest of Palestine the Commission should call upon the political authorities of the areas concerned to give appropriate formal guarantees as to the protection of the holy places and access to them; and that these undertakings should be presented to the General Assembly for approval;

8. Resolves that, in view of its association with three world religions, the Jerusalem area, including the present municipality of Jerusalem plus the surrounding villages and towns, the most eastern of which shall be Avu Dis; the most southern, Bethlehem; the most western, Ein Karim (including also the built-up area of Motsa); and the most northern, Shufat, should be accorded special and separate treatment from the rest of Palestine and should be placed under effective United Nations control;

Requests the Security Council to take further steps to insure the demilitarization of Jerusalem at the earliest possible date;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to present to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly detailed proposals for a permanent international regime for the Jerusalem area which will provide for the maximum local autonomy for distinctive groups consistent with the special international status of the Jerusalem area;

The Conciliation Commission is authorized to appoint a United Nations representative who shall cooperate with the local authorities with respect to the interim administration of the Jerusalem area;

9. Resolves that, pending agreement on more detailed arrangements among the governments and authorities concerned, the freest possible access to Jerusalem by road, rail, or air should be accorded to all inhabitants of Palestine;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to report immediately to the Security Council, for appropriate action by that organ, any attempt by any party to impede such access;

10. Instructs the Conciliation Commission to seek arrangements among the governments and authorities concerned which will facilitate the economic development of the area, including arrangements for access to ports and airfields and the use of transportation and communication facilities;

11. Resolves that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the governments or authorities responsible;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement, and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation, and to maintain close relations with the director of the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees and, through him, with the appropriate organs and agencies of the United Nations;

12. Authorizes the Conciliation Commission to appoint such subsidiary bodies and to employ such technical experts, acting under its authority, as it may find necessary for the effective discharge of its functions and responsibilities under the present resolution;

The Conciliation Commission will have its official headquarters at Jerusalem. The authorities responsible for maintaining order in Jerusalem will be responsible for taking all measures necessary to insure the security of the Commission. The Secretary-General will provide a limited number of guards for the protection of the staff and premises of the Commission;

13. Instructs the Conciliation Commission to render progress reports periodically to the Secretary-General for transmission to the Security Council and to the members of the United Nations;

14. Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to cooperate with the Conciliation Commission and to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of the present resolution;

15. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the necessary staff and facilities and to make appropriate arrangements to provide the necessary funds required in carrying out the terms of the present resolution.

**RESOLUTION ON THE PALESTINIAN QUESTION
ADOPTED AT THE THREE HUNDRED AND TENTH
MEETING OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL, MAY 29,
1948**

The Security Council, desiring to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Palestine without prejudice to the rights, claims, and position of either Arabs or Jews—

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to order a cessation of all acts of armed force for a period of 4 weeks;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to undertake that they will not introduce fighting personnel into Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Transjordan, and Yemen during the cease fire;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned, should men of military age be introduced into countries or territories under their control, to undertake not to mobilize or submit them to military training during the cease fire;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to refrain from importing or exporting war material into or to Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Transjordan, and Yemen during the cease fire;

Urges all governments and authorities concerned to take every possible precaution for the protection of the holy places and of the city of Jerusalem, including access to all shrines and sanctuaries for the purpose of worship by those who have an established right to visit and worship at them;

Instructs the United Nations mediator for Palestine in concert with the Truce Commission to supervise the observance of the above provisions, and decides that they shall be provided with a sufficient number of military observers;

Instructs the United Nations mediator to make contact with all parties as soon as the cease fire is in force with a view to carrying out his functions as determined by the General Assembly;

Calls upon all concerned to give the greatest possible assistance to the United Nations mediator;

Instructs the United Nations mediator to make a weekly report to the Security Council during the cease fire;

Invites the states members of the Arab League and the Jewish and Arab authorities in Palestine to communicate their acceptance of this resolution to the Security Council not later than 6 p. m. New York standard time on June 1, 1948;

Decides that if the present resolution is rejected by either party or by both, or if, having been accepted, it is subsequently repudiated or violated, the situation in Palestine will be reconsidered with a view to action under chapter VII of the Charter; and

Calls upon all governments to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of this resolution.

**RESOLUTION ON THE PALESTINIAN QUESTION
ADOPTED AT THE THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-EIGHTH MEETING OF THE SECURITY
COUNCIL, JULY 15, 1948**

The Security Council taking into consideration that the provisional government of Israel has indicated its acceptance in principle of a prolongation of the truce in Palestine; that the states members of the Arab League have rejected successive appeals of the United Nations mediator, and of the Security Council in its resolution of July 7, 1948, for the prolongation of the truce in Palestine; and that there has consequently developed a renewal of hostilities in Palestine;

Determines that the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to the peace within the meaning of article 39 of the Charter;

Orders the governments and authorities concerned, pursuant to article 40 of the Charter of the United Nations, to desist from further military action and to this end to issue cease-fire orders to their military and paramilitary forces, to take effect at a time to be determined by the mediator, but in any event not later than 3 days from the date of the adoption of this resolution;

Declares that failure by any of the governments or authorities concerned to comply with the preceding paragraph of this resolution would demonstrate the existence of a breach of the peace within the meaning of article 39 of the Charter requiring immediate consideration by the Security Council with a view to such further action under chapter VII of the Charter as may be decided upon by the Council;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to continue to cooperate with the mediator with a view to the maintenance of peace in Palestine in conformity with the resolution adopted by the Security Council on May 29, 1948;

Orders as a matter of special and urgent necessity an immediate and unconditional cease fire in the city of Jerusalem to take effect 24 hours from the time of the adoption of this resolution, and instructs the Truce Commission to take any necessary steps to make this cease fire effective;

Instructs the mediator to continue his efforts to bring about the demilitarization of the city of Jerusalem, without prejudice to the future political status of Jerusalem, and to assure the protection of and access to the holy places, religious buildings, and sites in Palestine;

Instructs the mediator to supervise the observance of the truce and to establish procedures for examining alleged breaches of the truce since June 11, 1948, authorizes him to deal with breaches so far as it is within his capacity to do so by appropriate

local action, and requests him to keep the Security Council currently informed concerning the operation of the truce and when necessary to take appropriate action;

Decides that, subject to further decision by the Security Council or the General Assembly, the truce shall remain in force, in accordance with the present resolution and with that of May 29, 1948, until a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine is reached;

Reiterates the appeal to the parties contained in the last paragraph of its resolution of May 22 and urges upon the parties that they continue conversations with the mediator in a spirit of conciliation and mutual concession in order that all points under dispute may be settled peacefully;

Requests the Secretary-General to provide the mediator with the necessary staff and facilities to assist in carrying out the functions assigned to him under the resolution of the General Assembly of May 14, and under this resolution; and

Requests that the Secretary-General make appropriate arrangements to provide necessary funds to meet the obligations arising from this resolution.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 101, noes 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I simply do this to inquire as to the program on Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman made that inquiry, as I had intended to make a statement to the House. I had previously indicated there would be nothing on Monday and Tuesday, and that as far as Wednesday or any other day of this week was concerned I would give 24 hours' notice to the Members.

On Wednesday, if a rule is reported from the Rules Committee—and I am not specifying the order as I make this statement—we will call up H. R. 1660. That is a bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the same bill that we passed last year?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. This bill simply extends it until September 30.

Then there is House Resolution 22, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], creating a select committee to be known as the Small Business Committee. The older Members are familiar with that.

Then there is H. R. 128, a bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be considered in computing the cotton acreage for any ensuing year. I understand that has the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will be on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have scheduled those matters for Wednesday. If they are not completed then, of course they will come up on Thursday.

While I have no knowledge of any other legislation for the remainder of the week, I wish to announce that if any is reported out I reserve to myself the right to call up any such bills on Thursday and Friday. I know of none now. I will try to give the House 24 hours' notice, if I can, in connection with any other legislation. I give notice now that if they are reported out and they can be called up I shall call them up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You are simply serving notice so that everybody will be on the job Thursday and Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, but particularly Thursday.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Frank R. Kent; also to extend his remarks and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include telegrams and resolutions.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF WILLIAM MCKINLEY

Mr. JENKINS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the birthday anniversary of William McKinley. Heretofore we have observed that with some fitting ceremony. The House not being in session, we could not do it this year.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also I ask unanimous consent that any Member may have permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD with reference to McKinley and his achievements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the birthday of President McKinley.

For quite a number of years we have here in this House taken notice of Mc-

Kinley's birthday by some kind of fitting observance. Because this date came on Saturday this year, when this House was not in session, we could not well hold one of our usual ceremonies, so we decided to distribute our red carnations today as we have done for a number of years. To our colleagues the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman MCGREGOR, and the gentleman from Ohio, Congresswoman BOLTON, we are indebted for making the arrangements whereby the carnations were distributed.

We, the congressional delegation from Ohio, appreciate the fact that practically all of the membership are wearing one of these carnations here now, and this regardless of political affiliations.

The reason we from Ohio feel justified in holding these special observances is due to the fact that Mr. McKinley was, without any doubt, one of America's greatest Congressmen. We have had many great Presidents, but we have had very few Presidents who have been Members of Congress. From Lincoln, who had once been a Member of Congress, down to Mr. Truman, who had been a Member of the United States Senate, I think that Mr. McKinley and Mr. Harding were the only Presidents, except Mr. Garfield, who had ever been Members of Congress.

I have always maintained that the most important work of Mr. McKinley was the work that he did while he was a Member of Congress. He was a great Governor of Ohio after he left Congress, and he was a great President after the people of the country promoted him from the governorship to the Presidency, but he would never have been elected Governor except for his preeminent service as a Member of the Congress.

McKinley was a man of the highest character. His strength of character manifested itself when he volunteered to join the Union Army when he was only 18 years of age. This strength of character manifested itself when General Sheridan, in one of the fierce conflicts of the Civil War, complimented him for his heroism and his sensible generalship in that great battle.

McKinley was a man of great ability. He discharged his every responsibility with great fidelity.

McKinley was a great statesman. This fact will be attested to by all impartial persons who write history.

McKinley was a great Congressman, for his record made on this floor will prove it.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY AND THE ANNEXATION OF HAWAII

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on the lawn of Hawaii's largest high school stands an imposing statue of William McKinley. The school, which bears his name, is a living memorial to the twenty-fourth President of the United States.

To the people of Hawaii, President McKinley's name holds a place of honor and esteem. There is reason for this—it was he, on July 7, 1898, who signed the resolution which made Hawaii a part of the United States.

Soldier, statesman, teacher, and twice-elected leader of his country, William

McKinley was a man of great foresight and keen awareness of America's destiny. He saw Hawaii not as an isolated group of islands in the middle of the Pacific, but as a crossroads of trade and commerce and a new American frontier in the West.

President McKinley's role was not merely that of affixing his signature to a resolution. The annexation of Hawaii to the United States was to him a matter of deep personal conviction. He had the vision to see that the people of Hawaii, like the people of Texas, Oregon, and California, were pioneers who were forging a new frontier.

The move to annex Hawaii was not without opposition. In 1893, 4 years before McKinley became President, a treaty of annexation was offered in the Senate but action was not completed.

President McKinley took office in March 1897 and 3 months later another annexation treaty was submitted to the Senate.

In an accompanying message of support, President McKinley reviewed the history of American-Hawaiian relations and justified annexation on the grounds that it was a logical and legitimate step and not a departure in American foreign policy. He stressed the fact that the new Republic of Hawaii, founded on the will of the people, had demonstrated its stability and its fitness to become a part of the United States.

In spite of this, and the strong public support which annexation had received, there was a highly vocal group in the Senate, consisting chiefly of antiexpansionists and opposing commercial interests, that argued against the treaty. As a result the Senate again adjourned without taking action.

When Congress reconvened in 1898, the administration renewed its fight for acceptance of the treaty. President McKinley, aware of the growing tension over the issue both in the Senate and in the islands, had a joint resolution for annexation introduced in Congress in place of the treaty.

Although the President's move was dictated by practical statesmanship, it gave the House of Representatives a chance to express its will on this vital measure.

The strategy brought quick results. The House approved the resolution 209 to 91. In the Senate the issue continued to be debated heatedly, but largely as a result of President McKinley's dynamic leadership the resolution was approved in the Senate by a vote of 42 to 21. The President signed the bill on July 7, 1898, and Hawaii became an integral and indivisible part of the American Union. Two years later Hawaii became a Territory and, we of Hawaii believe, set on the road to statehood.

There are few people now who will question this great American's judgment. Today, a half century after annexation, the record of Hawaii as an American community and its contribution to the country can leave no doubt as to wisdom and foresight of our country's twenty-fourth President, William McKinley.

Today the students of McKinley High School in Honolulu will honor the memory of this great American whose statue

serves as a constant reminder to the people of Hawaii of his faith in them and their role in the American Commonwealth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement of the executive committee of the National Catholic Resettlement Council, asking for an impartial and effective administration of the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech on displaced persons.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles from his home paper.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

COCKTAIL PARTIES

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] make the remarks he did. A lot of misinformation naturally goes throughout the country as the result of some unnecessary and unfortunate observations that have been made.

Members of Congress are a very hard-working group. We do not want to be praised for it; that is our duty. But on the other hand it is only fair that the people of the country realize, and this is what the gentleman had in mind, that there is very little activity of the nature referred to that received wide publicity, engaged in by the great majority of the Members of Congress. This is an 18-hour day job for any of us; and so far as I know, on both sides of the aisle, the Members of this body and of the other body likewise—a great majority of the Members of both bodies—devote themselves wholly to the duty of representing their people and trying to carry out their legislative duties as Members of Congress.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Leaving out religious bodies, I dare say that this is the soberest body of men on earth of its size.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's observation is absolutely correct; not only sober in the use of intoxicants, but sober in thought.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I have been invited to a great many of these cocktail parties but I have still to take my first drink.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, somebody must have drunk my share, for I have not been asked to go to any cocktail parties.

Mr. McCORMACK. Other than the observation made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, I think perhaps the best thing to do is to ignore the matter. We simply want to stop the erroneous impression from going further.

This is a hard-working body, and the people of the country should know it. I know they appreciate it.

ANNOUNCEMENT FROM COMMITTEE ON LABOR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have heard rumors and even received calls from Members of the House to the effect that the Committee on Education and Labor was not interested in testimony from interested witnesses. That is not a fact. We are trying to give everybody as much time as possible. That is the reason we are holding hearings forenoons and afternoons also when time is available.

I wish also to announce that yesterday you read in the press that repeal of the Taft-Hartley bill was introduced in the Senate in the nature of a substitute. I am today dropping the original bill in the hopper, in substance the same as the Senate bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 31, 1949.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 28, 1949.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

The Speaker,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In conformity with section 124 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Con-

gress, I have this date appointed the following members to represent the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation for the Eighty-first Congress: Hon. SOL BLOOM, New York; Hon. JOHN KEE, West Virginia; Hon. JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio.

Very sincerely yours,

SOL BLOOM, *Chairman.*

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 23, 1949.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In conformity with section 124 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, I have this date appointed the following members to represent the Committee on Appropriations on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation for the Eighty-first Congress: CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri; JOHN TABER, New York.

Very sincerely yours,

CLARENCE CANNON, *Chairman.*

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

The SPEAKER,

The House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public Law No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1949: Hon. EDWARD J. HART, Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

The SPEAKER,

The House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1949: Hon. EDWARD J. HART, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial comment.

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

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper editorials.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 4, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. LESINSKI, Michigan; Mr. BARDEN, North Carolina, Mr. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; Mr. KENNEDY, Massachusetts; Mr. MCCONNELL, Pennsylvania; Mr. GWINN, New York, Mr. SMITH, Kansas.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. SASSER, Maryland; Mr. FALLON, Maryland; Mr. THORNBERRY, Texas; Mr. STEFAN, Nebraska; Mr. MILLER, Maryland.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BOGGS, Louisiana; Mr. LATHAM, New York.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BURLESON, Texas; Mr. PATTERSON, Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COFFEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE AIR FORCE

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to some remarks recently made by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, who was commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet during the last war, and whose brilliant contribution to victory over Japan is one of the most glorious in the history of that war.

While I join with every American in expressing the greatest admiration for Fleet Admiral Nimitz and his demonstrated ability as a naval strategist, I am alarmed by this grand old seadog's state-

ment that the World War II land-sea-air team in any future war will have the same roles as in the last war. When we put our faith in the limited description of air-power effectiveness given us by the admiral, I am afraid that we may be following the fatal example of the French who placed their confidence in the Maginot Line philosophy of the generals of World War I. A later error equally fatal was made by the Germans when they concentrated on short-range tactical planes for their air force basing this decision on their earlier successes.

I feel that each of my countrymen, in view of the present world situation, must remain keenly aware of recent technical developments and their application in the development of new strategic concepts. Those of us more recently in touch with the latest techniques and technology of war think in terms, not just of orthodox bombing, as Admiral Nimitz expressed himself in a recent article, but rather as members of a nation living in an atomic age and possessing atomic weapons. I believe the present Air Force leaders have an acute understanding of this fact and have developed means and methods of delivering this new weapon to any place in the world.

Let us very briefly review a few of the basic and salient facts of the last war. For the first 2 years the Air Force, inadequate as it was, fought a delaying action characterized by the Battle of Midway and culminating in the beginning of the daylight bombing of Germany. Some of the action during this period was tactically offensive, but the strategic conception was a holding action, while our pitifully small Army and our Navy, all but destroyed at Pearl Harbor, prepared themselves for their later glorious achievements. The success of this mission was realized when our Army, Navy, and Air Force coequally shared in that great combined operation, the invasion of Normandy. This landing epitomized the triphibious warfare concept of Admiral Nimitz. Then plans were made ready for a similar combined offensive against Japan. The cost in lives anticipated by this offensive was made unnecessary, however, by the swarms of B-29's and escorting fighters over the strategic heart of Nippon and the coup de grace administered by one B-29 against Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

World War II has written indelibly the fundamentals of a new strategic concept. That which has astounded the world, particularly in the closing days of this war, will be vastly outmoded and outdated for any future war. In this the possibility of a future war and national protection against future wars lies the rebuttal to a triphibious cause.

Let us for the moment examine the portent of this statement.

The atomic bomb is at present nothing more than a very fine bomb, a thousand times more powerful than any before it, but nevertheless a bomb to be delivered to the target by its carrier, the airplane. This bomb gives to the aggressor nation an advantage so catastrophic in its implication that no defenses exist as such. If this aggressor should shoot first and

can shoot several times before we can shoot back, he will, in all likelihood, win the next war. To secure ourselves against any again-rising international gangster, we must be able to strike with greater power, almost simultaneously with his initial attack. The knowledge that we will be able to do this will best deter him from making this attack.

Let us look also at another aspect of this possible future war:

Where is it likely its theater will be? From where can any aggressor nation attack most swiftly with the least amount of warning at the heart of our Nation? Obviously, to meet these conditions, he will want to strike over the shortest possible route, along which it will be most difficult for us to place the radar nets and other warning devices which we have on hand. That is across the polar wastes. Just as obviously we must strike back in a similar direction. Now, I ask you, is any war fought in this area an army, a navy, or an air war?

There appears to be some objection to this strategic plan on the grounds that triphibious success—as costly as it was—in this war leads to the conclusion that the land-sea-air team composed of each member in equal strength is now essentially sound. Admiral Nimitz's recent article in support of this balanced team challenges the arguments for the new strategic concept on the grounds that he does not believe it to be practicable to use orthodox bombs in the quantities necessary to inflict important damage on military objectives by air operations in excess of 3,000 miles involving a round trip of 6,000 miles. In other words, if we do not have bomber aircraft that can get to the target from fixed bases as they now exist and are available to us, let us move up the bases, let us advance the aircraft by means of carriers. But this is a tactical rather than a strategic argument. It is the frighteningly recurring Maginot-line-mind argument that we now refer to as triphibious operation. What the admiral calls an orthodox bomb is no longer a strategic weapon.

In any future war, the bombs for a strategic target will be the same, and we dare not have it otherwise, as imprinted Hiroshima so deeply in our minds. Furthermore, it is a fact that what the Air Force calls its "today" airplane has already made a round trip of just under 10,000 miles, employing refueling techniques now being rapidly developed. Such in-flight refueling methods are thoroughly practical. Some of you may recall that 20 years ago, in 1929, Maj. Carl Spaatz, Capt. Ira Eaker, and Lt. Pete Quesada kept a Fokker trimotor aloft over Los Angeles for 151 hours—over 6 days—by in-flight refueling. At present-day bombardment aircraft speeds of 300 miles per hour and over, their plane would have traveled over 45,000 miles without coming to earth. At this point it is interesting to note that the cost of one of the new mammoth aircraft carriers now planned by our Navy could provide for the construction and delivery of 150 modern, long-range strategic bombers and their operational cost for 2 years. Add to this the probable number of bombers that could be built for the initial cost

and operation of the task force supporting one supercarrier—cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and a line of supply ships extending entirely across the ocean.

We can summarize our rebuttal with the words of one of the world's foremost aeronautical experts, Alexander D. Seversky, who, in his article, *Peace Through Air Power*, in the current Reader's Digest stated:

We need to be reminded that the triphibious strategy of World War II was an improvisation forced upon us by failure to provide air power with sufficient range to strike at the vitals of Japan from bases already in our possession.

This is the opinion of a man who has proven not only his technical ability but also his farsightedness time and time again. I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD.

The picture of air power in the atomic era is a frightful one, a fright no longer conceivable and interpolated into our past conception of military might. Similarly, if another war should come 20 years hence, the conduct of that war may be beyond our present imagination, but there is one thing we can be sure of—the weapons, projectiles, rays, or what have you, will come to us through the medium of air.

We, the representatives of our people, recognizing our responsibility for the security of our Nation, must stay alert to the new techniques, the new technology, and to up-to-date concepts of global strategy. Only thus may we utilize, with the wisest economy, our resources allocated to national defense.

Let us not suffer again the consequences of disinterest, or inaction, or, above all, wrong action. While paying tribute to the heroes of World War II, we must not allow our clear conception of the future to be clouded by the glories of the past.

[From the Reader's Digest of February 1949]
PEACE THROUGH AIR POWER
(Condensed from a chapter of a forthcoming book)

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

In a world that has not yet learned to dispense with force, our ardent hope is that our military strength will prevent war. The important question is, What kind of strength?

Mere quantity in armed men and weapons will not serve. If war comes, the enemy will have at his disposal teeming populations, and possibly vast resources of the whole Eurasian Continent. American strategy must therefore gear to quality rather than quantity.

Fortunately, we have within our grasp a strategy that meets this condition. It is uniquely suited to American genius and capacity. It is the strategy of air power.

But what kind of air power? The assumption that a lot of indiscriminate planes—a 70-group air force, a huge naval air arm, a tactical air force supporting an army, marine aviation, Coast Guard aviation—add up to air power is wrong. A country may possess swarms of aircraft, yet be deficient in air power, as Hitler and Tojo learned too late.

True air power means a strategic striking force that can rise from our own American continent for direct assault against the industrial solar plexus of the enemy and return to its home bases. It means aviation freed from dependence on overseas bases. The creation of such an aerial force is fully possible. It calls for no new inventions; the necessary aircraft are already in the skies,

but we are not building enough of them. What is more, this air power can be created as soon as, if not sooner than, the mountains of equipment on land, sea, and in the air now proposed.

Instead of continuing to spread our limited manpower and resources thin in all three elements, the proposed air strategy would concentrate on the decisive weapon for clean-cut superiority in the decisive element. By reducing sharply the roles of armies and navies, the fearful drain on men and materials can be stopped, the crushing burden of military expenditures can be eased.

With control of the air ocean enveloping the whole globe in our hands—the test and purpose of adequate air power—our position would be analogous to Great Britain's in the last century. A small island off Europe in effect gave mankind a century of peace, the Pax Britannica. It did this without militarizing or regimenting its people. This miracle was possible because Britain did not attempt to be strong on land and sea at the same time. Living in an era when water was the decisive medium for carrying destruction to enemies, Britain channeled practically its entire military potential into sea power, attaining command of the seas through an invincible fleet.

Today the air has become the primary medium of global power. An air force capable of commanding the skies can enforce its will on everything below. If we hold our effort on land and sea to a minimum and channel our resources into long-range air power, we likewise can be incomparably strong without the risk of military regimentation. When we muster the intellectual courage to face the new power equation, we can have a century of peace. Not a Pax Americana but a Pax Democratica, in partnership with all other free nations.

It sounds incredible today, but more than 2 years after the outbreak of World War II, and months after America was in it, bomber aircraft were still at the bottom of the priority lists. The men who were then—and for the most part are still—in charge of our military destinies locked on them as an unwarranted luxury. For these generals and admirals the unfolding struggle was merely a continuation, with modern trimmings, of the surface strategy of World War I.

That grim spectacle of stubborn inertia left airmen like myself no alternative but to speak out vigorously. I believed an enlightened public opinion could serve as a corrective on the natural conservatism of a great military establishment rooted in tradition. That faith was amply justified.

Today it is again a deep anxiety for the state of our national security that moves me to write. The moment is crucial because we are now in the first stages of a large-scale rearmament. The plans now being shaped up, if allowed to congeal, cannot easily be undone. They will commit us irrevocably.

It would be against nature to expect the elder services to make a strategy decision amounting to an order for their own demotion to secondary roles. It is the American people who must determine the military course through their Congress and their President. They must choose between the profligate land-sea-air strategy of the recent past and the interhemispheric air strategy opened up by modern aeronautics.

Winning nations tend to glorify the methods and weapons that brought them victory. France at the end of World War I, flushed with triumph in the trenches, proceeded to construct a supercolossal de luxe trench: the Maginot Line. It was an engineering marvel, embodying all the latest scientific gadgets. But it was still a trench: a steel-and-concrete monument to the tragic belief that any new war would be as static as the last one.

¹ See *Victory Through Air Power*, the Reader's Digest, July 1942.

True, a young officer named Charles de Gaulle foresaw the advent of mobile and motorized warfare that would nullify super-trenches. But would France listen? Its illusions of safety were confirmed by such newly haloed heroes as Foch, Joffre, Pétain, Gamelin. To question their military wisdom at that time seemed close to treason.

The implications of the Maginot Line—a symbol of futility—have not been fully grasped. We Americans are at this very moment perpetrating a tragedy of the same order, for the same reasons, with the blessings of our own haloed heroes of recent victory. Having won the last war with triphibious task forces, Army-Navy-Air teams, we are proceeding to build supercolossal task forces which will embody all the latest technological innovations. Little gliders are being displaced by big gliders; tanks by supertanks. Assault barges firing primitive rockets are being replaced by superbarges firing V-2 rockets. Escort carriers are to be replaced by gigantic floating islands at a quarter of a billion dollars a throw. In America today, as in France a generation ago, legislators are overawed by the prestige of the five-star generals and admirals who delivered victory.

We need to be reminded that the triphibious strategy of World War II was an improvisation forced upon us by failure to provide air power with sufficient range to strike at the vitals of Japan from bases already in our possession. Such air power was technically possible but had been arbitrarily brushed aside by surface-minded planners. The land-sea-air team was an emergency device for carrying short-range aviation step by step, island by island, within striking distance of the ultimate target.

Indeed, as the range of available aviation was extended, those steps could be stretched, by-passing the intermediary islands where the enemy was entrenched. Every enlargement of range thus paid off in lives saved. In the final stage, our Superforts were planted within direct striking reach of Japan proper. At that point their surface teammates became in effect mere bystanders, as air power undertook the systematic demolition of the enemy sources of power.

Air power finished the job—and this is the key to an understanding of the events—with great Nipponese armies on the home islands and on the Asiatic mainland still intact, but impotent. Air power finished the job with a fantastic mass of American land and sea forces likewise intact and useless.

As late as June 21, 1943, General Marshall explained in a speech that "your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing but he will recover unless the knock-out blow is delivered by the army." Fortunately he was wrong. The knock-out blow was delivered by air power, sparing perhaps a million American and Japanese lives. Our actual invasion came after the surrender. A handful of American officers landed and took control of a country still possessing millions of fresh troops.

Most civilians could grasp the obvious lessons of this picture. But professional surface-strategists, innocent of the aeronautical facts of life, were bewildered. With few exceptions, they emerged from the war sold to the hilt on the triphibious team for securing outlying bases. They still remain blind to strategy based on victory without the orthodox show-down by foot soldiers on a battlefield. We are still witnessing the Maginot Line mentality at work. The current program of defense through balanced forces operating from a chain of bases means only one thing: the perpetuation of the methods of the last war.

Our projected 70-group air force is built around 20 groups of medium bombers of the B-29 and B-50 types—which is to say, around a 5,000-mile flying range, 2,000-mile striking radius. (Striking radius is about 40 percent of total flying range.) It provides for

only 5 groups of long-range B-36 bombers, which have an effective flying range of 10,000 miles—with current modifications promising 13,000 miles—enough to blast any target in Eurasia from our own continent. Why do we thus continue to put our faith in an old-fashioned and technologically out-moded air force?

The telltale fact about the 2,000-mile radius is that it requires an array of overseas bases. Bases in turn call for large land and sea forces to hold and supply them. The over-all military pattern thus remains unchanged. Whether we have 70 groups or 700, the complex set-up on the surface remains indispensable. The more air power of this limited reach, the larger the land and sea forces required to make it operative.

Before the last war we had built and flown 82-ton aircraft with a flying range of some 8,000 miles. Did we put them into production to fight the war? Not at all. Instead, we produced 20-ton aircraft with a flying range of 2,000 miles. Today we have a few bombers of 150 tons with a flying range of 10,000 miles. But what are we building? Seventy-ton bombers with a flying range of 5,000 miles (combat striking range, 2,000)—just short enough to rule out transoceanic offensives.

True, we are now resorting to air-refueling and other tricks to extend the range of action. These will work under conditions of surprise, but I am convinced that sustained offensives cannot be maintained without planes of inter-hemispheric range. One can understand the present face-lifting improvisations by our Air Force. Its leaders have no alternative. Aircraft of inadequate range have been imposed upon them by military planners hell-bent on fighting from distant bases guaranteed by huge armies and navies.

The arguments advanced today for holding back the extreme planes are the same as those we heard when the 82-ton B-19 seemed extreme. The real explanation for freezing our strategy at the 2,000-mile radius is not technological but psychological. Military minds of the old stamp cannot admit the possibility of war without show-down land and sea battles, spearheaded by marines and supported by complex supply lines all over the world.

I do not hesitate to challenge the 2,000-mile-radius restriction. It is destined to join the Maginot Line in the limbo of out-lived military notions. Even if a war should begin on this basis, it would inevitably be transformed into an all-out contest of inter-hemispheric dimensions before a decision could be scored. The logic of air power means an air force with enough range to strike from its own continent. The nation that is first in preparing for intercontinental aerial warfare will win the next war.

The United States should begin now. Tomorrow may be too late.

The advent of the atomic bomb does not alter this picture. The bomb is not a new military force, in the sense that the Army, Navy, and the Air Force are military forces. It is a new and horribly destructive explosive, as yet of finite scope. Before it can score a decision, it must be delivered, like any other explosive, by one or a combination of military forces to the right target at the right time. Thus it is not the stock pile of atomic bombs that will decide the issue, but superior means of delivery—and that means air power. Far from nullifying the art of war, the atom bomb puts a higher premium on correct strategy.

There are two possible strategies open to us. One, when air power can deliver the atom bomb only when provided with overseas bases. This demands a large army and a great navy. The national effort is split three ways so that none of the forces attains its maximum potential.

Two, when air power has sufficient range to deliver the atom bomb directly from this continent, without need of overseas bases.

This reduces our Army and Navy to a minimum and allows us to put most of the national effort into the Air Force so that it attains its maximum potential.

There is nothing novel about the first strategic plan. That is how the last war was fought, and it is, unfortunately, the strategy underlying our present plans for national defense. But suppose that Soviet Russia possessed similar air bases in Cuba or Greenland—how long would they remain Russian after the start of hostilities? Obviously, we could kill them off by throwing against them the full weight of our bombing power. We would operate from the source of our strength and supplies, while the enemy could use only one segment of his and would have to depend on thousands of miles of vulnerable supply lines. The idea that Russia could hold Cuba or Greenland is fantastic.

But is it any less fantastic when we propose to hold bases on the periphery of the Eurasian Continent? Our projected air outposts in north Africa, Europe, the Near East, and the Far East are within striking range of Soviet air power. Most of these bases could be attacked not only by long-range bombers but also by great masses of short-range tactical planes, a type in which quantity rather than quality is the vital consideration. And we know that German and Russian factories are now producing thousands of tactical planes. The Soviet leaders can be expected to use these planes ruthlessly, considering them as expendable as so many shells. Finally, to hold these bases and keep them supplied would also mean challenging the 300 divisions of the Red Army.

The use of outer bases for initial surprise action is possible. But their permanent control for sustained strategic offensive is the stuff of dreams. Being within the orbit of the total hostile air potential, these bases will be captured or demolished, paralyzing the strategy dependent upon them. The ultimate decision will be postponed until we are ready to use long-range strategic aviation based on our own continent. Unless the enemy is ready with that kind of air power first.

Everything we have said about fixed bases applies a hundredfold to the floating bases called aircraft carriers. The only advantage they claim is mobility. But maneuverability reckoned in hundreds of miles becomes meaningless against aircraft covering thousands of miles. How a ship sailing 600 miles a day can evade detection by planes flying 600 miles an hour the admirals haven't explained.

In the last war carriers could not operate in the Mediterranean or North Sea within reach of the German Luftwaffe. Enlarging a carrier merely provides the foe with a larger target. The 80,000-ton floating islands on which our Navy has set its hopes are military monstrosities. They will be quarter-of-a-billion-dollar expendables, good at most for one limited sneak assault before they are annihilated. And their planes will be inferior to equivalent planes operating from the ground. I have no doubt that when military history is written these marine mastodons will be cited as a prime example of strategic folly.

If this strategy of carriers, overseas bases, and short-range aviation is allowed to stand, we would be called upon, in the event of war, to produce simultaneously the world's largest army, navy, and air force, while dividing our aeronautical effort between strategic and tactical planes, both in maximum numbers. Since our resources are not infinite, we could not hope for absolute superiority in any one of these forces. And, according to Government figures, we would be putting 10 dollars into surface elements for every dollar put into the skies. We don't need a calculating machine to realize that we are here dealing with strategy which, if it is to have the magnitude for victory over the

world's No. 1 land power, would bankrupt a nation 10 times as rich as the United States.

A recent press summary of the views of our high command stated that "the United States can develop overwhelming superiority in the air and at sea, but will find it hard to compete with Russia's land power." The allusion to sea superiority is frivolous. Soviet Russia, a self-contained and blockade-proof continent, has no navy, needs no navy, fears no navy. But if a contest on land is dangerous, if superiority in the air can be made overwhelming, why do we earmark a third of America's manpower and resources to face an admittedly superior land force and the near certainty of defeat? Why allocate another third to futile and irrelevant sea power? Why not convert the whole potential to the force recognized as our realm of supremacy—the Air Force?

Let us have the intellectual clarity and daring to break with the past. For a small fraction of the cost of conquering, maintaining, and supplying bases for short-range aviation, we can buy long-range aviation that nullifies the need for those bases and the huge surface forces that go with them.

The Air Force stated recently that "the possession of the B-36 will make it possible for us to operate against a possible aggressor anywhere in the world" from bases on the North American continent. Why, then, is the bulk of our money being put into 20 groups of medium bombers, while only 5 groups of the B-36 type are projected?

The answer is that our defense policy is shaped by men reared on surface concepts. Critics warn that the huge, unwieldy B-36 will be shot down. Of course some will. The medium-range bombers we plan to send from overseas bases will also be shot down. War without combat is a pipe dream.

We face today a crucial choice. Either we continue to divide our national potential three ways for land-sea-air operations tied to distant bases or we channel our strategy boldly into the skies for direct operations, with command of the whole air ocean as the objective.

That is the only strategy that will serve as a real deterrent to aggressors. It is the natural product of our way of life. No one will be able to challenge that kind of force. In order to create it—and more important, to exercise it properly—the challenger would have to possess talents equivalent to ours, and to acquire those talents he would have to adopt our way of life. But if he adopts our way of life, there will be no need for war.

The change called for is a bold reversal of prevailing concepts. Nothing less than an aroused public opinion can accomplish this. The pressure of the American people on their representatives in Congress can force revision of obsolete strategic plans.

The decision must be made quickly. Only the Nation as a whole can make it. Our people must choose between outmoded methods and an historic opportunity to win peace through air power.

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.)

INFORMATION, PLEASE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, without having consulted any Member of the Senate or the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and disregarding the truth of the statement that "fools rush in where angels fear to tread," because it is my desire to maintain friendly relations and a good-neighbor policy with the citizens of our sister

Republic to the south, will endeavor once for all to settle a question as to my gender. Although fearful, I will endeavor to follow this suggestion as to the giving of advice to Mr. Dewey, which advice, I hope, will not involve us in any international entanglements, but which, if accepted, might aid in giving the American people an overdue opportunity to express their will on foreign and domestic policy.

From an individual who may be man or woman, spinster or bachelor, widow or widower, who gives the address of Medellín 184, P. B., Colonia Roma, Mexico City, Mexico, signed Lee Gandee, comes the following letter:

DEAR MRS. HOFFMAN: I noticed in the papers that you have been reelected and mentioned it to a friend of mine from Detroit. She said she knew that you had been reelected, but this chance remark led to a discussion that has grown into something of a dispute which you can settle perhaps better than anyone else.

My friend maintains that you are a spinster, and that you have been in Congress several years. She likes to speak of you as an example of the success that a liberated American woman can enjoy in a political career, by devoting her life to public affairs unencumbered by a husband and children. The Mexicans, who believe that woman's place is the home, find her opinions quite shocking. I maintain that you have had no such career, for I am quite certain that I remember a Mr. HOFFMAN having been in the House of Representatives not many years ago, and I think I read some time later that following his death, you as his widow, were selected to complete his term, as has been the case with other women in Congress. I have given this explanation to our mutual friends, who feel that there is a certain propriety in this situation which places you in a more favorable light than my friend's contention. It is a high compliment to your ability that the electorate of your district has returned you to office in your own right. Please accept my congratulations.

It is to be deplored that Mr. Dewey, due to his poor technique of campaigning, failed to enjoy the success that you have attained. It must be a bitter experience for him to be repudiated, when a mere woman, faced with the inherent obstacles attending female participation in public life, has been returned to office by her constituents. You ought to give him a little motherly advice.

I shall appreciate having you settle our contention by telling us your exact status, whether spinster or widow.

Yours very truly.

As so often happens, I cannot settle this argument with the simple statement that either party is right. As a matter of fact, both are in error. I am not, as Lee Gandee insists, a widow and, on the other hand, I cannot accurately be described as a spinster. I do not chew tobacco, smoke, or make a practice of drinking hard liquor, but those facts are no longer decisive on the question of sex.

Searching back into history, yes, even before man or woman began to write or print on paper a record of their doings, there is evidence that our ancestors, both men and women, had and exercised equal rights in the pursuit of many activities.

But judged by all the accepted standards of the modern day, as well as by those which prevailed in the horse-and-buggy days, it has been established that I at least belong to the male sex, though

my good wife sometimes insists that I have never grown up, am still in some respects a child, that I have never attained the dignity which a Congressman, to say nothing of a Senator, should have. That is not due to the fact that time has not given me an opportunity to become either inactive or dignified. Sometimes pomposness is mistaken for dignity. As long as I am able to enjoy some of the pleasures of youth such as hunting and fishing and to act like a boy when such a trip appears possible, I will probably embarrass some of my friends by my lack of dignity and sedateness. In fact, figuratively speaking, I hope to be able to walk to my own funeral.

After giving the matter the usual consideration given by a Congressman or a Senator to a constituent's inquiries or requests, I wrote my Mexican correspondent that I was neither a spinster nor a widow; that I was twice a father, five times a grandfather, and still the husband of a long-suffering wife gifted with an unusually kind and tolerant disposition.

Thinking that my Mexican correspondent might be disappointed to learn that I am not a woman, attention was called to the fact that today we have in the House a number of women on both sides of the aisle who are not only a credit to their constituents, but who chart a course in decorum, legislative procedure, and domestic and foreign policy which might well serve as a guide for their less accomplished colleagues.

Attention was also called to the fact that a former Member of the House from Maine—and I trust this observation is not a transgression of the rules of the House—now sits in another body—the Senate—where it is certain other Members of that august body will have an opportunity to profit by watching her in action. Already in the Senate, as formerly in the House, she has outlined a sound domestic policy which the country may follow with profit.

But to get back to that part of the letter which refers to Mr. Dewey, my correspondent writes:

It is to be deplored that Mr. Dewey, due to his poor technique of campaigning, failed to enjoy the success that you have attained—reelection. It must be a bitter experience for him to be repudiated, when a mere woman, faced with the inherent obstacles attending female participation in public life, has been returned to office by her constituents. You ought to give him a little motherly advice.

Let me again quote that last sentence: "You ought to give him a little motherly advice."

Mr. Dewey has a wonderful mother, a typical American mother. Undoubtedly she has given him much good advice. Beyond question, she is, as she has a right to be, extremely proud of her son, who made an unexcelled record as a prosecutor in New York. Tom Dewey is known throughout the Nation as one who did a most remarkable job in exposing the activities of and convicting gangster criminals. Tom Dewey has a magnificent record as an administrator of the great State of New York. He has given that State a businesslike administration

and has earned the approval, as a governor, of the overwhelming majority of the citizens of that great State. No one has ever questioned his sincerity, his executive ability, and undoubtedly there lies before him brilliant success in his chosen field of the law and politics.

He has never asked and undoubtedly never will ask for my advice, for he has always had experts to advise him. However, believing in the good-neighbor policy, I am willing to do the best I can, and, on the suggestion of my Mexican correspondent, offer gratuitously to the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey a few random thoughts. I might, if it was to be motherly advice, advise him as mother advised me, by using the old, old words: "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again."

But, speaking as a Republican, I might quote to Mr. Dewey these words:

Like warmed-up cabbage served at each repast, the repetition kills the wretch at last.

I might use the old saying of the Danes:

The goose goes so often to the kitchen that at last she is fastened to the spit.

Thomas Fuller once said:

The pitcher that goes often to the well, comes home broken at last.

Bovee wrote:

A sound discretion is not so much indicated by never making a mistake as by never repeating it.

Then here is one more from the Universal Songster:

Hope tells a flattering tale,
Delusive, vain, and hollow.
Ah! let not hope prevail,
Lest disappointment follow.

Or, disregarding the words of others, think it permissible to suggest to Mr. Dewey that he and his associates, yes, and I might include certain other individuals who are presumed to have been the Republican leaders during the last few years, having gone to bat twice and whiffed on two occasions, the last time with three men on base and two out, Tom and some others might sit on the bench through at least one game and let someone else come up as a pinch hitter.

Of course, we have been told so many times that we almost believe it, that Senator TAFT just cannot get the votes. We learned to our sorrow that a group of Dewey's supporters and promoters gave Senator BRICKER, who looks, talks, thinks, and acts like a real American President, a basswood bat at a gridiron dinner, and so sent him back to the bench.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was at Omaha. Did Mr. Dewey win there?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman, in his statement relative to the soundness of officials in Ohio, is eminently correct. Anyone from Ohio always takes a sound position on governmental matters, especially the gentleman from the other body who was a candidate for President.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was speaking of Governor BRICKER. I regret very much that he was not the nominee of the Republican Party.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And so do I regret that Ohio's candidate, Senator

TAFT, was not the nominee. I might also add, in answer to the gentleman's inquiry about Omaha, that if the gentleman's representatives on the committee from his own State of Michigan had followed the advice, counsel, and leadership of members of the national committee from the State of Ohio he would not be quite as embarrassed as I am sure he is at this moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are right again. They did it, but they will hear from some of us in Michigan. Do not think they will not. They can ride on the rear end of an old broken-down wagon, but I will not.

Mr. Dewey would make a great Senator from the great State of New York, and, as such, he could very effectively voice the desires of his New York City constituents that we go along with the Acheson foreign policy as announced by the President in his inaugural address, and increase our efforts to feed, clothe, and house the unfortunate peoples of the world. But as a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Dewey has twice gone to bat. Perhaps the pitcher in the first contest was a Bob Feller or a Dizzy Dean and hence the young man's strike-out was excusable. But on this last occasion, a soft, easy ball was tossed up to him and he just did not take his bat off his shoulder or start to swing until the catcher had it in his mitt.

No, in all fairness, Mr. Dewey, his "metoo" and international supporters, should get out of the batter's box, cease trying to carry the ball, and if they cannot run interference or do some minor job on the team, go back and sit down on the bench.

It is long past time when the American people should have an opportunity to vote upon the very simple issue as to whether the interests of this country are to be given first consideration or whether the ideas, the policies, and the practices used in other lands where they have been demonstrated to be failures, should be continued here without the people being given an opportunity at a national election to say whether they approve or disapprove. The rank and file of Republicans are tired of taking a New Deal remedy even though the bottle out of which it comes is labeled "Republican."

From the Niles Daily Star of Niles, Mich., comes an editorial of John R. Schamehorn, under date of January 25, which reads as follows:

TIME TO STEP DOWN

There are continuing signs that Thomas E. Dewey is still attempting to head up the Republican Party. If he continues in those efforts it will inevitably result in disaster for both himself and the party.

Dewey and his advisers were solely responsible for shaping policies during the last campaign and it resulted in failure, as it did 4 years ago. The whole thing seemed to be so much in the bag that he declined to put on a hard-hitting campaign.

His speeches were so indecisive, in fact, that he was continually criticized for not expressing his opinion on various issues of the campaign.

As a twice rejected candidate, Dewey should step aside as far as national politics is concerned and not pretend any longer to head the party. He had that chance a few days ago but failed to take advantage of it. Instead, he left the impression that he might be available again in 1952.

Mr. Dewey should know from past history that voters will not support him in a third attempt for the White House. Under the circumstances, he should make a prompt disclaimer of any further aspirations in that direction so that party leaders will not be hampered by the efforts of any of his faithful supporters in a die-hard struggle that could only result in further damage to the party.

That is typical of practically every editorial comment in southwestern Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

OLEOMARGARINE AND THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the new dairy policy toward oleo is in harmony with the Democratic platform. The Democratic platform favored the removal of taxes on oleomargarine, but said nothing about allowing the unrestricted sale of the yellow product. The President has said that he wants the taxes removed. Leading dairy and farm organizations favor the same action.

However, the time is absolutely inopportune for placing a greater burden on dairy farmers. Numerous bills have been introduced to permit unrestricted sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter. Yet there is growing economic distress among the people who milk cows in the great dairy States. Why anybody would want to do anything to make their burden heavier, I am unable to understand.

I am speaking about the people in every congressional district in the country who build the county roads and maintain schools. Hay is now as high as \$45 a ton and cottonseed cake fed to dairy cattle costs from \$80 to \$100 a ton, yet the oleo interests would make it still more difficult for these people to survive.

In the Western States it has been snowing intermittently since the first of January. Hundreds of thousands of cattle and sheep are marooned, and losses will be tremendous. This is one of the most devastating and unprecedented blows at our livestock economy within the memory of man. We cannot afford further to imperil our supplies of meat, as well as our source of milk and other vital food products, by striking at the dairy industry.

Members of this House who are also members of the Committee on Agriculture are well aware of the difficulties which face the southern cotton grower. It is necessary, we are told, to preserve the economy of the Cotton South. But, Mr. Speaker, it is even more necessary to preserve the family-sized farms of this country that depend upon dairying for their continued existence. To the more than 2,500,000 dairy farmers of this country, the dairy industry represents a regular source of cash income throughout the year, a decent standard of living for their families, education for their children, and increasing productivity for their land.

These things are important to the farmers of the South as well as to the

northern farmers—perhaps even more important. Dairy farming has made splendid progress in the South, to the enrichment of whole areas of land that had begun to lose its fertility under single-crop cultivation. The hard facts are that we cannot afford to sacrifice either southern gains or northern accomplishments in the development of a diversified agriculture merely to meet the selfish demands of a handful of oleomargarine manufacturers.

Oleomargarine is a substitute for butter, and therefore competes with butter in the market place. Ordinarily, substitutes do not differ greatly from the original in price, but through the years oleomargarine has maintained a price level approximately half that of butter, on the average. The price of butter has not been dragged down to the level of the substitute, because oleomargarine, colored or uncolored, has not been as acceptable to consumers as real butter. Moreover, colored oleomargarine—being less distinguishable from butter than the uncolored form—has been carefully regulated under Federal tax legislation. Finally, the dairy farmer has not been able to afford to produce butter at the price of oleomargarine.

Now it is proposed to repeal the restrictions on yellow oleomargarine, which will then be able to compete more closely with butter. Oleomargarine manufacturers may take advantage of this opportunity to increase their prices and profits, thus destroying the price differential. Or they may hold their prices unchanged and increase their profits through increased sales volumes, at the expense of butter. In any case, it cannot be denied that an improved competitive position for oleomargarine would result in reduced sales of butter.

INCREASED OLEO SALES HURT BUTTER SALES

In the past an increase in the sales of oleomargarine has usually been accompanied by a somewhat larger decrease in the sales of butter. In the 35 years from 1912 to 1947, there were 22 years when oleo consumption went up, and in 16 of those years, butter consumption decreased. On an average, over those 22 years the increase in oleo consumption per capita was approximately one-third of a pound, while the accompanying change in butter consumption was a per capita decrease of almost one-half a pound.

During 11 of the 13 years in which oleo sales showed a decrease, butter sales increased. The average oleo decreases were about one-third of a pound per capita, accompanied by an average increase in butter sales of slightly more than that amount.

It is clear that when oleo is sold as a substitute for butter, either fraudulently or because consumers made a conscious choice, the immediate effect on the dairy farmer is the same as though the supply of butter had increased. Naturally this lowers the price at which his butter can be sold. On the average, a 1-percent increase in the quantity of butter available tends to result in a 1-percent decrease in the selling price of butter. In

other words, the loss of 1 percent of butter sales to competitive oleomargarine results in a 1-percent drop in the price of butter.

The experience of other countries shows that unrestricted competition in yellow oleomargarine demolishes the market for butter. In this country, under similar conditions, oleomargarine might very well take over from two-thirds to three-fourths of the total sales of spread fats, according to competent economists. The total annual consumption of oleomargarine in the United States would then be 1,500,000,000 pounds, as against 870,000,000 pounds in 1948. On a pound-for-pound displacement, the butter market would shrink to 900,000,000 pounds as against 1,500,000,000 pounds in 1948.

IMMEDIATE RESULTS OF INCREASED OLEO SALES

The first result of a possible 600,000,000-pound expansion in oleo sales would be a 20 to 40 percent drop in butter prices. In this connection, a 10-percent increase in butter production in the fall of 1948, over the corresponding months of 1947, was accompanied by an equal reduction in oleo sales on a 25-percent fall in butter prices.

Price reduction of 20 to 40 percent probably would protect butter against loss of sales, but dairymen could not stand any such decline in butter prices for long. Thus, as a second effect of increasing oleo sales, there would be a drastic decline in butter production, as dairymen in large numbers left the dairy business or sought other markets than butter. This decline in production would lead to some recovery of butter prices, but a decline of 5 to 10 percent over the long-run probably would liquidate milk production to the equivalent of 600,000,000 pounds of butter.

DAIRY FARMING WOULD VANISH IN SOME AREAS

These effects accounted for part of the 600,000,000-pound butter decline in production from 1941 to 1948. The declines would have been more drastic, and wider spread, if the artificially stimulated export trade in dairy products of 1941 to 1948 had not absorbed the annual output of approximately one million cows. Allowance also should be made for the increase in demand resulting from population growth.

It is reasonable to expect that the further displacement of 600,000,000 pounds of butter by oleo would lead to the displacement of another 2,000,000 cows. But 2,000,000 cows in butter areas produce only 360,000,000 pounds of butterfat annually, and a 600,000,000-pound loss of butter markets would mean 480,000,000 pounds of butterfat. Where would the other 120,000,000 pounds of butterfat go?

THE STRUGGLE FOR MARKETS WOULD ENDANGER DAIRY PRICES IN ALL CORNERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Some dairy farmers, rather than accept extinction, would struggle to dispose of their milk in the form of products whose prices already teeter precariously between too low for producers and too high for the market demand.

Increased cheese, evaporated milk, ice cream, and fluid cream—even increased fluid milk—would overburden those markets and tear down the level of returns to every producer in the land.

Even the South would reel from the blow. There a thriving dairy industry has supported the most vigorously growing farm enterprise for more than two decades, yet the wrecking of price levels at the South's ice-cream plants, condenseries, and cheese factories would cripple dairying in that region. Factory dairy products other than butter now utilize 33 percent of the milk sold by farmers in the South Atlantic States and 45 percent in the South Central States. These markets in South, North, East, and West would react to the pressure of dairy farmers deprived of their butter market. The lowered level of all dairy prices then would force some dairy farmers out of business in every State—up to another half-million cows.

NET RESULTS TO FARM INCOME

It should be apparent that anything which would lead to a liquidation of 10 percent of the milk cows in the country would be a major disaster, yet there is another way of calculating the effect of increased oleo sales.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics calculates that the farmer received 12.8 cents out of every pound of oleomargarine sold in 1947. The farmer received 59.7 cents per pound from butter. Thus, for every pound of oleo which displaced a pound of butter, the total income of American agriculture was reduced by 46.9 cents. If oleo replaced butter to the extent of 600,000,000 pounds, the loss to agricultural income in general would total more than a quarter of a billion dollars. This would occur even before reckoning the sizable side effects on other dairy products. It disregards the probability that increased demand for vegetable oils would be met by increased imports, with no benefit at all to domestic producers.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would protect the farmers of this country against the loss of more than a billion dollars. The bill is fair to the consumer, in that it makes it possible for the housewife to buy all the oleomargarine she wants in its most economical, uncolored form, without the payment of any taxes whatever. It is a fair bill in that it relieves the oleo retailer, wholesaler, and manufacturer from all license fees and reporting requirements. But most of all, my bill is a fair bill in that it protects the dairy farmer against a sure loss of income—a loss which a large part of our agricultural economy cannot afford at this time.

I am convinced that the administration does not intend to let farm income suffer in this country, and that no Member of this House would willfully sponsor any measure to that effect. By contrast, my bill is in complete harmony, as I have said earlier, with the Democratic platform on which the majority of this House was elected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recollect that some Members of this House who favor the coloring of oleomargarine yellow have insisted that the dairy farmers of the country must yield to scientific progress. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to elaborate on that a little bit.

The scientific progress that has been made on oleo to make it taste and appear like butter results from a ruling made by Mr. McNutt, when he was head of the Pure Food and Drug Section, because he issued a regulation that the oleo industry could put in vitamins the equivalent to butter and he also ruled that they could use butter flavor and flavor the product to taste like butter. He also ruled that they could churn it in milk in order to give butter texture to the product so that it would taste like butter and have the same nutritive value as butter. I therefore contend that it was not as a result of scientific progress but it was by edict of a man in Government who issued a regulation permitting this apparent deception and fraud on behalf of a product in order to take the market away from the legitimate dairy farmers of the country.

Now, as the gentleman said, they want to color the product yellow to make it look like butter, thereby to not only destroy the integrity of two and a half million dairy farmers but also permit deception and fraud on the housewives of the country.

Mr. GRANGER. I think that is a fair statement. I do not want to argue the quality of margarine as compared with butter. But, now, we are getting down to what the issue really is in this fight. It is simply a question of color, and the oleo interests are determined to sell oleomargarine as butter. Make no mistake about that. If they are able to do that, it is going to mean that many of the dairy farmers of the country, and especially those in the South, will go out of business. I have been all over the South in the last 2 or 3 years. There has been great development down there in every line, and especially in dairying. While this bill is not sponsored entirely by people from that section of the country, undoubtedly they have a right to be interested in it.

It seems to me it would be a shortsighted policy to do anything to retard its development. The dairy farms and the dairy herds conform in every way with the preservation of our soil. As a Member said here the other day, one of the crying needs of our time is the preservation of our soil. The dairy farmer in his operations conforms in every detail with that program.

As I have said time and time again, these are little people that we cannot afford to run out of business. As a result of dairy farming, we have built up in every section of the country, in every congressional district, some activity connected with dairying. Either cheese making, butter making, or the preparation and delivery of milk to the home.

I dare say that in every congressional district of this country, regardless of where it is situated, there are more people who earn a living from dairying than there are who do from the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] that the dairy farmers of his State are being punished a great deal worse by this one-way freight rate than they are by competition with oleomargarine. That applies to every dairy farmer west of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio, outside of a few along the Pacific coast, where preferential rates are given to meet water competition.

I wonder if the gentleman will go along with us on the bill I have introduced to outlaw the one-way freight rates that the South and West have been punished with for the last 75 years, in order that those dairy farmers—and I will say to the gentleman from Missouri who is looking at me that I refer to farmers from Missouri and from every other State west of the Mississippi River—might receive something like justice in transportation rates for the dairy products and for other products they manufacture. I wonder if the gentleman will go along with me on that proposition?

Mr. GRANGER. I have always gone along with the gentleman in his fight for justice, for the South and West and other sections, with respect to how railroad rates should be handled, and certainly I would be willing to go along with him on that.

BUTTER VERSUS OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the splendid remarks made by the gentleman. I ask unanimous consent that the request I made earlier in the day be vacated and that I be allowed at this point in the RECORD to extend my remarks and include therein a very well written article by Louis Bromfield.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Louis Bromfield, world-famed novelist and operator of the successful Malabar Farm in my district, recently prepared a keen analysis on the butter-oleo question which appeared in approximately 50 newspapers in 20 States through the Bell Syndicate. Mr. Bromfield's judgment is considered as most responsible in agricultural circles throughout the world. I introduce the text of this article into the RECORD at this point:

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY—ASK RESTRICTION ON MARGARINE PROFITS

(By Louis Bromfield)

The butter-oleomargarine fight has come into the open again and it might be well to analyze the true elements in a situation which affects every citizen far beyond the point of whether oleo is cheaper than butter or whether it be taxed or not. Probably no controversy in American history as presented

has caused so much confusion in the minds of the people. This is so because the issue has been based, by the oleo interests, upon the easy political dodge of cheaper living costs and partly because many of the newspaper editorials on the subject have been written with perhaps incomplete knowledge of the whole question. Very great and even economically profound implications lie behind the battle.

Let me say at the outset that most of the butter producers have long since abandoned their fight to maintain the tariff tax which the oleo interests refer to as discriminatory.

The butter people seek only two things—the restriction of the oleo people's attempt to deceive by the close imitation possible and some sort of restriction upon the immense profit potentialities of the oleo and oleo-oil manufacturers. With the butter business, which can never create its product at a figure anywhere near the production costs of oleomargarine, knocked out by competition from big business and monopoly, there is no limit within reason to the profits of the industrially produced oleo.

Essentially the struggle is one between big business and tacit monopoly on one side and small private enterprise on the other and, as such, it touches the very foundations of our social economy and our political future.

Butter is produced largely by some 4,500 creameries, mostly individually or cooperatively owned, and by the thousands of dairy and general farmers who produce the cream from which butter is made. Oleomargarine, an assembly line industrial product, is concentrated in the hands of 28 companies, with 65 percent of production in the hands of only five gigantic industrial corporations such as Procter & Gamble and vast Lever Bros. interests.

PACKAGES SIMILAR

Since the very beginning, the whole purpose of the oleo interests has been to attempt the imitation of butter as closely as possible. Their slogan might well have been not "as good as butter" but "the same as butter" which oleo is not.

One only has to look about in a grocery to see oleo packaged exactly like butter, nearly always in yellow cartons, with dairy scenes for ornamentation, even to such deceptive trade names as "Churgold."

The obvious campaign is less to imitate than to deceive and plenty of us know even today how often in restaurants and dining cars, oleo is served as butter.

It seems to me that the element of unfair and deceptive competition in this respect is clear as crystal.

The oleo interests, down to the oil-refining plants, represent big business and the oleo interests have been very successful in dividing the dairy from the soybean and cotton elements in the farm bloc so that agricultural representation has become badly weakened and divided.

They have accomplished this by holding up phantom profits on the materials used in making their synthetic product to cotton and soybean farmers, who, largely speaking, represent the most destructive and greedy element in American agriculture and are already the most highly subsidized at the taxpayers expense.

Before the war, foreign vegetable oils, produced by labor in Asia and Africa, paid at what in this country could only be regarded as slave wages, were largely used in oleo manufacture.

During the war, the oleo manufacturing interests found these cheap foreign oils unavailable and were forced to use home-produced cottonseed and soybean oils, but once the same interests have won their fight, there is no reason, judging from the whole history of big business, to prevent them from shifting

back again to cheap labor materials produced abroad.

The American cotton and soybean people, left holding the bag, will then ask for another protective tariff to add to living costs.

LASTING BENEFITS DOUBTED

Protective tariffs are by no means dead and can never be until that incredible day when there is free trade and universal leveling off of wages and living standards to a point far below that to which the American people are accustomed.

In the meanwhile, there will be either tariffs on imported goods or internal subsidies and high prices, both paid inside the country by the average tax-paying citizen. The popular assumption that wholly unrestricted oleo production will provide a universally cheap table spread by which everyone will benefit is merely a silly oversimplification of a very complex and profound problem.

It is significant that the interest in tariffs generally has shifted from the big manufacturing interests to organized labor and small business because obviously American labor cannot compete with slave-labor wages in the more primitive parts of the world and small business cannot compete with the power of the price controls exercised by vast cartels and tacit monopolies.

The question of tacit monopolies and hidden understandings among a few enormous industrial producers is one which has consumed endless precious hours in the Supreme Court, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other governmental agencies.

Where understandings among vast cartels and interests begin and end is a difficult problem, but even the average citizen knows that they operate.

The whole oleo question is one in which both organized labor and the Small Businessmen's Association might well take an interest, and the average citizen along with them. It is not as simple or as demagogic a question as the oleo interests have tried to make it.

Incidentally, I have in my possession an original letter circulated among the oleo interests pointing out the great advantages of pouring plenty of money into the advertising accounts of newspapers, especially in the butter areas, as mean an insult to the integrity of the American press as has been perpetrated in a long time.

I might also point out that great cartels and monopolies are the first step in the death of real free enterprise and in the direction of state socialism. There arrives a point when, as Europe well knows, they become intolerable and the state takes over.

Socialism arrives at the point where free enterprise has ceased utterly to exist and the big-business monopolies have taken over.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a memorial passed by the Legislature of Nebraska.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Wednesday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found to be truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HESLTON (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for the week of January 31, on account of the serious illness in his family.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to authorize the United States to break through snow-bound areas in western range States, to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms in such States, and to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, February 2, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

125. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of \$500,000 for disaster relief (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

126. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$20,000,000 for the Philippine War Damage Commission in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

127. A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report covering the operations of Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1948, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

128. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the proposed transfers of two 40-foot motor launches to be used by the Shell Fisheries Division of the Department of Conservation of New Jersey; to the Committee on Armed Services.

129. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning certain claims against the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

130. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; U. S. C. 144); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

131. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 7, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration,

on a preliminary examination and survey of Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and the pool at Biddeford, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

132. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of the Potomac Electric Power Co., for the year ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

133. A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Fifth Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, January 1949; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

134. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting proposed legislation to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

135. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the twelfth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, January 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

137. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

138. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1948 Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Investigations of Synthetic Liquid Fuels, Parts I, II, and III; to the Committee on Public Lands.

139. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the Tenth Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

140. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1948, in compliance with chapter 1628, acts of Congress 1904; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

141. A letter from the representative of the United States upper Colorado River Basin compact negotiations, transmitting a copy of a compact entered into on October 11, 1948, among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, to determine the rights and obligations of those States respecting uses and deliveries of the water of the upper basin of the Colorado River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

142. A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co. together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 22. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investiga-

tion of the problems of small business; with amendments (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 128. A bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton-acreage allotments for any subsequent year; with an amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 73. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1660, a bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; without amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 74. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 128, a bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton-acreage allotments for any subsequent year; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the House Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 50. Resolution to obtain information from the Secretary of State on the Palestine situation; without amendment (Rept. No. 10).

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 1995. A bill making an emergency authorization of an appropriation for the purpose of erecting in Bluefield, W. Va., a post-office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1996. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Opelousas, La., a post office and Federal court building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1997. A bill to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1998. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands heretofore described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 668, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1999. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2000. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2001. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 2002. A bill to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges near certain dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2003. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Lynchburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2004. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Smithville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2005. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Woodbury, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2006. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2007. A bill to equalize annual leave and sick leave of postal employees with that of other Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2008. A bill to create a presumption of service connection for World War II veterans in certain cases of tuberculosis disease; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2009. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2010. A bill relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army and the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2011. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2012. A bill to authorize the erection and operation of a museum at Klukwan, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2013. A bill to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2014. A bill to extend time for filing claim for pensions or other benefits withheld from persons residing in countries occupied by the enemy forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2015. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey and exchange certain lands and improvements in Grand Rapids, Minn., for lands in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2016. A bill to amend section 2000 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2017. A bill to amend section 2000 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2018. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to authorize the admission into the United States of 500 displaced doctors and 1,000 nurses, to provide for their employment in Government hospitals, including Indian hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 2019. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2020. A bill to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States

separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil-service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2021. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILMER:

H. R. 2022. A bill authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma, through its business committee, to sell and convey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Wyandotte Indian public burial ground in Kansas City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2023. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2024. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2025. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 2026. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2027. A bill to amend section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875-878; 8 U. S. C. 136); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2028. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Bayside, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2029. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under said act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2030. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities received by State, county, and municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2031. A bill to stimulate exploration, development, mining, production, and conservation of strategic and critical minerals and metals within the United States and its Territories, to establish an Office of National Minerals Development, Production, and Conservation within the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2032. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2033. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2034. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2035. A bill relating to the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2036. A bill to increase the mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees for use of privately owned vehicles and to increase the per diem allowances of civilian officers and employees while traveling on official business; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2037. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government employees who have attained the age of 60 years or who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2038. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain employees in neuropsychiatric hospitals of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2039. A bill to provide for promotion procedure within the executive classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2040. A bill to prohibit any carrier subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, in transporting property between two points, from making a difference in its charges depending on the point of origin or destination; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2041. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2042. A bill to amend title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2043. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2044. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2045. A bill to provide a program of assistance for the expansion and construction of medical colleges in the several States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2046. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2047. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2048. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 with respect to retirement of certain officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2050. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court,

to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2051. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2052. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1945 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide true time and one-half for overtime and true double time for Sunday and holiday duty and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2053. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2054. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Oberlin, La., a post office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LECOMPTÉ:

H. R. 2055. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for, and the construction of, a Federal building in Ottumwa, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2056. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia", approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2057. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2058. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from correction of military or naval records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2059. A bill relating to the furnishing of tools and equipment to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2060. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2061. A bill for the benefit of employees involuntarily separated from the service of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2062. A bill to create a United States Civil Service Board of Appeals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 2063. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2064. A bill to permit unincorporated businesses to be taxed as corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2065. A bill providing that certain real property, together with improvements thereon, acquired for military purposes, or for housing projects, national parks, or monuments, shall not be exempt from taxation by States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2066. A bill to provide special pensions for certain persons awarded medals for extraordinary heroism in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2067. A bill to provide for the restoration of a monument of the former Speaker of the House, the Honorable Henry T. Rainey; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2068. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution relating to the high cost of living and shortage of housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 69. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to urge the State of California to construct a tube and causeway across San Francisco Bay in accordance with the recommendations of a Joint Army-Navy Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. Res. 70. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to urge the State of California to construct a tube and causeway across San Francisco Bay in accordance with the recommendations of a Joint Army-Navy Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 71. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to urge the State of California to construct a tube and causeway across San Francisco Bay in accordance with the recommendations of a Joint Army-Navy Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 72. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 66; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of their Resolution No. 19, asking that the tax on oleomargarine be repealed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of Alton Bramer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of Peter Kotonopko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2071. A bill for the relief of John I. Malarin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2072. A bill for the relief of Rachel D. Gattgo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2073. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2074. A bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:
 H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of Frank G. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H. R. 2076. A bill for the relief of Cliff Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H. R. 2077. A bill for the relief of Jack Getty Pinkerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:
 H. R. 2078. A bill for the relief of Winston A. Brownie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:
 H. R. 2079. A bill for the relief of Emil Sbarbori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H. R. 2080. A bill for the relief of Anthony Perfetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H. R. 2081. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Aprea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2082. A bill for the relief of Lillian Taylor (nee Rose Mary Lillian Walker); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2083. A bill for the relief of Edna Perfetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:
 H. R. 2084. A bill for the relief of Teiko Horikawa and Yoshiko Horikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:
 H. R. 2085. A bill for the relief of Edit Han-nach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:
 H. R. 2086. A bill for the relief of the Sun Laundry Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Seaman Second Class Joseph T. Sypko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:
 H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:
 H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of William Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:
 H. R. 2090. A bill for the relief of Sam Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Althea Arthur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAYBURN:
 H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Jack McCollum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:
 H. R. 2092. A bill for the relief of Flury & Crouch, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:
 H. R. 2093. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to execute a quitclaim deed to property owned by Jacob F. Riedel; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:
 H. R. 2094. A bill for the relief of Romuald K. Mirzabekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:
 H. R. 2095. A bill for the relief of the estate of Kenneth N. Peel; 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:

31. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Chairman, Conservation Administration of Kewaunee County, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a Federal Government support price on butter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

32. Also, petition of executive vice president, Newspaper Guild of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to immediate record vote on the question of repeal of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

33. By Mr. SADLAK: Resolution adopted by the officers and members of the United Societies of St. Catherine's Church, Riverside, Conn., expressing condemnation of the Hungarian Government for its arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign affairs.

34. By the SPEAKER, petition of chairman, legal committee, Palm Beach Post No. 12, American Legion, West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the passage of a bill to amend and enlarge the definition of treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

35. By the SPEAKER, petition of Adrian Russo, German civilian, Wiesbaden, Germany, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the Malmedy case, and asking that hangings be discontinued in Germany; to the committee on the Judiciary.

36. By Mr. HART: Petition of New Jersey Retail Liquor Stores Association, urging stricter enforcement over the manufacture and sale of illicit alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

37. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the city of Bayonne, N. J., memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph O. Parker	Attorney	\$5,164.98
John J. Heimburger	Research specialist	4,927.08
Hugh H. Soper	do	3,676.20
George L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	5,164.98
Katherine D. Wheeler	Assistant clerk	2,861.10
Mary Elizabeth Laxton	Stenographer	2,102.40
Ruth B. Phillips	do	2,067.90
Lorraine Adamson	do	1,688.58
Fred H. Beuham	Attorney (Apr. 26, to Aug. 10, 1948).	846.18

H. Res. 298 and H. Res. 317 of the 80th Cong., 1st sess., authorized and appropriated \$25,000 for the House Committee on Agriculture to conduct hearings, studies, and investigations by the committee acting as a whole or by a subcommittee. H. Res. 676, 80th Cong., 2d sess., appropriated an additional \$5,000, making a total of \$30,000. The funds so appropriated have been used for traveling expenses, hotel and other expenses of the committee in conducting hearings in the various parts of the United States. No personnel has been employed from these funds.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	19,207.63
Amount expended from June 30, to Dec. 31, 1948	6,644.05
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	25,911.68
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	4,088.32

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
 Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	Clerk	\$5,164.98
Kenneth Sprankle	Assistant clerk	5,164.98
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk	4,992.90
Corhal D. Orescan	Assistant clerk	4,992.90
Arthur Orr	do	4,663.68
R. E. Lambert	do	4,663.68
Robert P. Williams	do	4,334.52
Paul M. Wilson	do	4,334.52
Claude E. Hobbs, Jr.	do	4,005.36
Jay B. Howe	do	4,005.36
Bert J. Skinnard	Junior assistant clerk	1,618.77
Lawrence C. Miller	do	2,516.22
G. Homer Skarin	do	2,309.34
Earl C. Silsby	do	2,102.40
Melvin E. Lejever	Clerk-stenographer	1,895.52
Watson L. Cormier	do	1,481.70
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,605.84
Frank B. Avery, Jr.	Page	1,481.70
William H. Jahn, Jr.	Clerk to minority	5,164.98
Dorothy Davis	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member	1,895.52
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	1,895.52
Molly J. Turner	do	1,895.52
Mary Jane Fisher	do	1,895.52
Helen Knechtel	do	1,895.52
Charlotte B. Plumley	do	1,895.52
Vivian I. Raber	do	1,579.60
Dorothy E. Henry	do	1,579.60
Graham W. Howe	do	315.92
David J. Phillips	do	947.76
Marjorie V. R. De-ment	do	947.76

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$185,000.00
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948	84,190.87
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948	100,809.13

JOHN TABER,
 Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. Lee	Chief Investigator	\$4,992.90
Harris H. Huston	Investigator	4,005.36
James J. Kerr	do	3,676.20
Harry S. Barger	do	3,676.20
Eugene F. Rinta	do	3,676.20

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Benjamin S. Simmons	Investigator	\$1,969.77
Clarence Turner	do	328.28
Enid Morrison	Legal clerk	2,309.34
Mildred E. McGinnis	Clerk-stenographer	1,232.73
Lois Moore	do	1,333.53
Virginia S. Keep	do	665.85
Stella M. Mohr	do	323.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$150,000.00
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 31,040.80
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 118,959.20

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert H. Harper	Chief clerk	\$5,164.02
James Deakins	Assistant clerk	1,785.12
John R. Blandford	Professional staff member	4,729.56
Clinton B. D. Brown	do	4,466.22
Bryce N. Harlow	do	4,729.56
Robert W. Smart	do	4,729.56
Agnes H. Johnston	Secretary	2,309.34
Rosemary Curry	Stenographer	2,102.40
Bernice Kallnowski	do	2,102.40
Gladys E. Flanagan	Stenographer (investigation staff)	1,813.88
Townsend W. Hoopes	Assistant to the chairman (July 1 to Aug. 15, 1948)	1,050.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$25,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 5,189.94
 Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 3,232.63
 Total amount expended from July 25, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 8,422.57
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 16,577.43

W. G. ANDREWS,
Chairman.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Technical staff director	\$4,532.04
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	4,268.64
Elsie L. Gould	Deputy clerk	3,544.50
Margaret P. Battle	Stenographer	2,309.34

JESS P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 14, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mabel G. Haller	Executive secretary (clerk)	\$4,274.55
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Minority clerk	3,676.20
Ruth Pingley	Stenographer	2,309.34

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOME RULE AND REORGANIZATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 14, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Clarence M. Pierce. Profession, assistant staff director. Total gross salary, \$3,728.20.
 Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$30,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 20,773.81
 Amount expended from June 1 to Dec. 31..... 5,750.70
 Total amount expended, 80th Congress..... 26,524.51
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 3,475.49

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclu-

sive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
W. Manly Sheppard	Chief Clerk	\$5,000.00
F. Albert Reiman	Assistant clerk (professional staff)	5,000.00
Irving G. McCann	Chief counsel (professional staff)	5,000.00
Frank S. McArthur	Investigator (professional staff)	5,000.00
Bingham W. Mathias	Minority clerk (professional staff)	5,000.00
Jennie Ward Carter	Clerk-stenographer	2,433.96
Mary Pauline Smith	do	2,433.96
Mary Ellen Sanders	do	2,433.96
Myrtle S. Locher	do	2,433.96
Frances A. Los	Clerk-stenographer (minority)	2,433.96
<i>Special employees pursuant to H. Res. 111</i>		
John O. Graham	Special investigator	5,000.00
Raymond Davey	do	2,666.67
Agnes Amilian	Clerk-stenographer	2,433.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$115,000.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 70,793.33
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 37,592.29
 Total amount expended from February 1947 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 108,385.62
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 6,614.38

FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Annual base salary rate during 6-month period
Douglas E. Alcock	Professional staff	\$7,000.00
Helen M. Balog	Clerk	3,700.00
Helen M. Boyer	Majority clerk	7,000.00
Dolores Fel'Dotto	Clerk-stenographer, July 1 through July 31, 1948	2,900.00
Carl E. Hoffman	Professional staff	6,000.00
Hazel Huffman	Investigator	6,200.00
Francis T. O'Donnell	Professional staff, Nov. 1 through Nov. 30	6,000.00
Martha C. Roland	Clerk	3,700.00
William A. Young	Professional staff	5,000.00
Annabell Zue	Clerk, Aug. 1 through Sept. 30	3,500.00
	Clerk, Oct. 1 through Dec. 31	3,700.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$6,500.00
 Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 1,210.01
 Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 1,055.15
 Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 2,265.16
 Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 4,234.84

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXTRA-LEGAL ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

None (all work done by staff of full committee).
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$40,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 10,384.60
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 5,117.62

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 15,502.22

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 24,497.78

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Extra-Legal Activities of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

STATE DEPARTMENT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Francis T. O'Donnell. Profession, counsel. Total gross salary for period July 1, 1948, to October 31, 1948, and December 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, \$3,612.10.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$10,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 975.13
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 3,612.10

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 4,587.23

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 5,412.77

J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Chairman.

SURPLUS PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Anna-Marie Hogin. Profession, stenographer. Total gross salary, July 1 to November 10, inclusive, \$1,518.40.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$90,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... \$88,578.32
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 1,793.30
Refund of deposit on air travel contract..... 425.00

Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 89,946.62

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 53.38

ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JANUARY 14, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Oscar L. Hume.....	Staff coordinator.....	\$3,939.54
Elizabeth Voth.....	Clerk.....	2,033.46
Hayward G. Austin.....	Chief investigator.....	1,721.66
Alfred J. Watson.....	Investigator.....	299.90
Richard J. Hodson.....	do.....	372.18
Barbara Yeaple.....	Typist.....	119.45

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$86,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 50,148.70
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 10,101.28

Total amount expended from May 1947 to December 1948..... 60,249.98

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 25,750.02

FOREST A. HARNES,
Chairman.

PROCUREMENT AND BUILDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Brooks, Benjamin J.....	Special counsel.....	\$512.57
Christerson, Mariella.....	Clerk-typist.....	627.42
Coleman, Peter.....	Stenographer.....	1,978.26
Cooley, Thomas, II.....	General counsel.....	3,610.32
Craft, Virginia.....	Investigator.....	384.89
Deem, Jane.....	Stenographer.....	1,605.84
Galland, Marion.....	Secretary to counsel.....	2,148.41
Glasse, Henry H.....	Chief counsel.....	4,935.28
Judd, Betty L.....	Typist.....	715.95
Lincoln, Virginia O.....	Stenographer.....	769.54
Manual, Fritzie.....	Investigator.....	3,676.20
Stillman, Saul G.....	Associate counsel.....	3,676.20
Terry, C. D.....	Chief clerk.....	3,676.20
Weber, Gertrude.....	Investigator.....	1,520.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:

First session..... \$40,000.00
Second session..... 40,000.00
Supplemental..... 15,000.00

Total..... 95,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 44,287.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31..... 33,725.40

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 10,562.20

Few outstanding bills remaining to be paid in January 1949.

GEORGE H. BENDER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford.....	Clerk and administrative officer.....	\$5,164.98
Charles Burton Marshall.....	Staff assistant.....	5,164.98
George S. Pettee.....	do.....	5,164.98
John W. Easton.....	do.....	5,164.98
Howard Piquet.....	do.....	5,164.98
June Nigh.....	do.....	2,378.31
Doris Leone.....	do.....	2,378.31
Winifred Osborne.....	do.....	2,723.16
Mabel Henderson.....	do.....	1,964.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$125,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 39,423.01
Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 5,285.22

Total amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 44,708.23

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 80,291.77

CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marjorie Savage.....	Clerk, Committee on House Administration (standing.....)	\$3,544.50
Frank J. Specht.....	Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration.....	3,412.86

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jack Watson.....	Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration.	\$3,412.86
Irene Gilchrist.....	do.....	2,102.40
Gladys Riggs.....	do.....	2,102.40
Maureen B. Sandiford.....	do.....	2,102.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$5,000
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 5,000

K. M. Lecompte,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<i>Clerical staff</i>		
Elton J. Layton.....	Clerk.....	\$5,164.98
Marjorie A. Biddle.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,309.34
Royce Reno.....	do.....	2,309.34
Georgia G. Glasmann.....	Assistant clerk-stenographer.....	2,185.14
Julia Watterson.....	do.....	2,185.14
Roy P. Wilkinson.....	Assistant clerk.....	1,619.64
<i>Professional staff</i>		
Arlin E. Stockburger.....	Aviation and engineering consultant.....	5,164.98
Andrew Stevenson.....	Expert.....	5,164.98
Kurt Borchardt.....	Professional assistant.....	5,164.98
John H. Frederick.....	Consultant.....	3,807.84
<i>Additional staff personnel</i>		
Martha E. Scha.....	Stenographer.....	1,895.52
Louis Berlinsky.....	Assistant clerk.....	668.53

The above additional staff personnel is pursuant to H. Res. 163, transportation survey and their services terminated as of Jan. 3, 1949.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$55,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 12,159.24
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 12,843.19

Total amount expended from June 30, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 25,002.43
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1949..... 29,997.57

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman, Eightieth Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits

the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
C. Murray Bernhardt.....	Chief Clerk.....	\$4,663.73
Velma Smedley.....	Assistant Chief Clerk.....	4,334.55
Walter R. Lee.....	Claims specialist.....	3,676.20
Walter M. Besterman.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	3,056.51
Anne J. Berger.....	do.....	2,171.40
Frances Christy.....	do.....	2,171.40
Harriet B. Lamb.....	do.....	2,171.40

SCHEDULE A

1. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures since Jan. 1, 1947:		
A. Unexpended balance July 1, 1948, preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944-46.....		\$79.90
B. Unexpended balance July 1, 1948, preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year).....	101,730.71	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947.....	8,000.00	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948.....	10,000.00	
E. Revision of the laws, 1949.....	10,000.00	
	<u>129,810.61</u>	
2. Amount previously expended during period covered by prior reports:		
A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944-46.....	0	
B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year).....	54,419.08	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947.....	0	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948.....	4,959.54	
E. Revision of the laws, 1949.....	0	
	<u>59,378.62</u>	
3. Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948:		
A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944-46.....	0	
B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year).....	32,000.00	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947.....	0	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948.....	0	
E. Revision of the laws, 1949.....	5,124.54	
	<u>37,124.54</u>	
4. Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948:		
A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944-46.....	0	
B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year).....	86,419.08	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947.....	0	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948.....	4,959.54	
E. Revision of the laws, 1949.....	5,124.54	
	<u>96,503.16</u>	
5. Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948:		
A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944-46.....	79.90	
B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year).....	15,311.63	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947.....	8,000.00	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948.....	5,040.46	
E. Revision of the laws, 1949.....	4,875.46	
	<u>33,307.45</u>	

¹ Returned to Treasury.

EARL C. MICHENER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gus S. Caras.....	Professional staff.....	\$3,939.54
Elizabeth B. Bedell.....	Chief clerk.....	2,990.04
Leonard P. Pliska.....	Clerk.....	2,171.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 3,866.04
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 7.75

Total amount expended Dec. 31, 1948..... 3,873.79
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 46,126.21

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Moore.....	Chief counsel.....	\$5,164.02
Frederick C. Belen.....	Counsel.....	4,663.68
Lucy K. Daley.....	Assistant clerk.....	2,171.40
Elayne Morelle.....	Secretary.....	1,954.46
Lillian Hopkins.....	do.....	1,825.52
Ann Hayden.....	Secretary (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1948).....	809.82
<i>Employed under H. Res. 176</i>		
Edward J. McCormack.....	Chief, Studies and Investigations (July 1, 1948 to Sept. 17, 1948).....	2,192.16
Ann Hayden.....	Secretary (July 1, to Sept. 30, 1948).....	809.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 26,488.38
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 4,585.13

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 31,073.51
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 18,926.49

EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George H. Soule.....	Mining expert.....	\$4,304.15
Ernest A. Grant.....	Clerk.....	5,164.98
Claude A. Ragan.....	do.....	2,861.10
Nancy J. Arnold.....	do.....	2,861.10
Gemma M. O'Brien.....	do.....	2,861.10
Forrest Reeve.....	do.....	238.42
Edith C. Curtiss.....	do.....	2,638.55

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 94)..... \$25,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported (Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948)..... 13,711.75
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 488.01

Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 14,199.76
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 10,800.24

RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert F. McConnell.....	Clerk of committee.....	\$3,136.98
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.....	Professional staff member.....	4,171.53
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.....	Minority clerk.....	2,309.34
Mrs. Vera Watts.....	Stenographer-clerk.....	2,654.19
Mrs. Elaine Jackson.....	do.....	2,654.19
Mrs. Violet Young.....	do.....	2,654.19
<i>Subcommittee investigating questionable trade practices</i>		
John T. M. Reddan.....	Counsel.....	5,164.98
E. R. Ferguson, Jr.....	Assistant counsel.....	3,939.54
Martin O. Hanson.....	Chief investigator.....	1,531.74
Charles F. Meany.....	Investigator-accountant.....	2,654.16
Arthur Perlman.....	Investigator.....	2,916.24
Walter Woods.....	do.....	3,150.72
Joseph M. Mannix.....	do.....	528.57
Herbert J. Cooney.....	do.....	1,787.84
Jay S. Hartzell.....	do.....	2,681.76
William E. Davis.....	do.....	2,100.48
Doris M. Mahood.....	Stenographer-clerk.....	1,992.06
Catherine C. Hubbard.....	do.....	1,964.46
Dorothy B. Hayward.....	do.....	1,964.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$125,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 56,766.74
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31..... 42,826.33

Total amount expended to Dec. 31..... 99,593.07
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31..... 25,406.67

GEO. A. DONDERO,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits

the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Lyle O. Snader.....	Clerk.....	\$5,165.00
Donald O. Montgomery.....	Assistant clerk.....	3,136.98
Humphrey Scott Shaw.....	Minority clerk.....	2,874.89
Jane W. Snader.....	Assistant clerk-stenotypist.....	2,874.89
Mildred M. McGuire.....	Stenographer.....	1,536.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.

LEO E. ALLEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 13, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<i>House pay roll</i>		
Robert E. Stripling.....	Chief investigator.....	\$5,164.98
Benjamin Mandel.....	Director of research.....	4,663.98
Louis J. Russell.....	Investigator.....	4,564.92
Donald T. Appell.....	do.....	4,050.64
John W. Carrington.....	Minority clerk.....	4,038.42
Ann D. Turner.....	File chief.....	3,676.20
Carolyn Graham.....	Assistant file chief.....	2,585.27
Juliette Joray.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,309.44
Margaret S. Kerwan.....	do.....	2,484.22
Rosella A. Purdy.....	do.....	2,792.10
<i>Voucher pay roll</i>		
Virginia Allen.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,309.44
Jo Benish.....	do.....	2,309.44
Jean D. Carey.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,309.44
Lucille Fitzgerald.....	File clerk.....	2,309.44
Lillian E. Howard.....	Research clerk.....	2,539.22
Mary E. McFerran.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	2,309.44
Lorraine M. Nichols.....	do.....	2,309.44
Thelma I. Secareo.....	do.....	2,481.75
Ruth Tansill.....	do.....	2,263.36
Peggy Shaw.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,309.44
Catherine Lee Crews.....	do.....	2,309.44
Sadie C. Carle.....	do.....	1,688.53
Alice Elaine Walker.....	do.....	2,309.44
Lucille Lowther.....	do.....	2,309.44
Lois Marie Padberg.....	do.....	1,688.58
Helen Irene Mattson.....	Research clerk.....	2,792.10
Asselia S. Poore.....	do.....	2,539.22
Anne W. Kelliher.....	Clerk-typist.....	2,309.44
Mary Ann Moffett.....	Research clerk.....	2,309.44
Alvin W. Stokes.....	Investigator.....	3,676.20
William A. Wheeler.....	do.....	3,807.84
Robert B. Gaston.....	do.....	3,807.84
Walter Wiczerzak.....	do.....	3,136.98
Courtney Owens.....	do.....	1,993.92
Charles E. McKillips.....	do.....	3,152.03
Margaret Mattson.....	Clerk-typist.....	1,143.98
Sonia Martinez.....	do.....	1,111.06
Jeanette Craig.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	239.51
Joy Cockrell.....	do.....	1,221.75
Michael Carey.....	Clerk.....	362.00
Rose Sanko.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	1,539.56
Helen Boyle.....	do.....	1,190.67
Barbara Hampson.....	do.....	1,319.79
Marjory Amidon.....	do.....	1,257.30
Barbara Mallon.....	File clerk.....	241.33
Mrs. Bert Kelly.....	Clerk-typist.....	459.12
May S. McKay.....	do.....	293.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948..... \$300,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported (Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948)..... 141,335.14
Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 109,159.62

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948..... 250,494.76

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 49,505.21

J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Karl Standish.....	Clerk, Committee on Veterans' Affairs.....	\$5,164.98
Bessie N. Kenyon.....	Assistant clerk.....	4,005.36
Louise M. Peter.....	Clerical staff.....	1,924.45
Frances Montayne.....	do.....	2,309.34
Mary C. Schmidt.....	do.....	2,309.34
George J. Turner.....	do.....	2,378.28
Casey M. Jones.....	Professional aide.....	5,164.98
Edwin B. Patterson.....	do.....	5,164.98
Ida Rowan.....	do.....	4,611.34

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$25,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 11,894.91
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948..... 1,320.86

Total amount expended from March 1947 to December 1948..... 13,185.77

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948..... 11,814.23

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

DECEMBER 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Serge N. Benson.....	Tariff expert (P).....	\$4,663.68
James A. Tawney.....	Social security adviser (P).....	777.28
Charles W. Davis.....	Minority adviser (P).....	4,663.68
Lynn L. Stratton.....	Tax adviser (P).....	4,260.22
Gordon Grand, Jr.....	Clerk (C).....	4,663.68
T. Janet Schnitz.....	Assistant clerk (C).....	3,676.20
Gladys Kullberg.....	Clerk-stenographer (C).....	2,309.36
Donald Larsen.....	do.....	2,171.60
Susan Alice Taylor.....	do.....	2,061.00
Margie Halsey.....	Stenographer (C).....	687.00

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Virginia P. Turner.....	Stenographer (C).....	\$1,167.75
Harry Parker.....	Messenger.....	1,318.16
Sam Hardy.....	do.....	1,275.96
Hughlon Greene.....	do.....	1,275.96
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		2,463.53
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948.....		849.19
Total amount expended from July 25, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948.....		3,312.72
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948.....		21,687.28
HAROLD KNUTSON, <i>Chairman.</i>		

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT AND PAPER SUPPLY
JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to January 3, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Name of employee, Alyce E. Warren. Profession, clerk. Total gross salary during 6-month period, \$1,713.97.		
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		7,608.41
Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Jan. 4, 1949.....		1,724.51
Total amount expended from Mar. 1, 1947, to Jan. 4, 1949.....		9,332.92
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 4, 1949.....		15,667.08
CLARENCE J. BROWN, <i>Chairman.</i>		

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS
DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James W. Foristel.....	Chief of staff.....	\$4,372.96
Paul O. Peters.....	Staff investigator.....	4,186.44
Leo P. Cullinane.....	do.....	3,676.20
Hobart Cooper.....	do.....	1,907.44
Willis J. Ballinger.....	Economic counsel.....	4,619.48
Virginia F. Flatley.....	Stenographer.....	1,610.42
Arvilla Benson.....	do.....	761.04
Hilfred G. Wood.....	do.....	1,605.25
Bettie H. Henderson.....	do.....	521.48
Jean Hudson Ellis.....	do.....	658.87

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gertrude V. Tefft.....	Stenographer.....	\$1,277.72
Willie E. Foristel.....	do.....	410.37
Virginia Rice.....	do.....	454.98
C. J. Reynolds, Jr.....	File clerk.....	1,412.70
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$130,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		87,056.48
Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948.....		40,716.34
Total amount expended from Mar. 24, 1947 to Dec. 31, 1948.....		127,772.82
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948.....		2,227.18
WALTER C. FLOESER, <i>Chairman.</i>		

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE COMMODITY TRANSACTIONS
JANUARY 12, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Golden N. Dagger.....	Chief counsel (July 1 to Sept. 15, 1948).....	\$2,775.70
Charles D. Budd.....	Investigator.....	3,379.04
Bertram M. Long.....	Investigator (July 1-11, 1948).....	132.69
Marie E. Wolff.....	Secretary.....	1,564.46
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:		
H. Res. 407, Dec. 19, 1947.....		\$25,000.00
H. Res. 674, June 18, 1948.....		10,000.00
Total.....		35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		12,263.00
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1949.....		12,263.00
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948.....		9,562.12
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 12, 1949.....		13,174.88
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, <i>Chairman.</i>		

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
JANUARY 14, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frank T. Bow.....	General counsel.....	\$5,164.98
J. Robert Brown.....	Investigator.....	3,171.42
T. F. Simpson.....	do.....	2,854.27
E. E. Fine, Jr.....	do.....	2,142.55
Dolores L. Fel'Dotto.....	Chief clerk.....	2,675.06
R. M. Thompson.....	Clerk.....	1,010.68
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$25,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948.....		18,355.65
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948.....		6,644.35
FOREST A. HARNES, <i>Chairman.</i>		
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES DECEMBER 31, 1948.		

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:
 The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
H. Ralph Burton.....	General counsel (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.).....	\$4,235.52
William E. Murray.....	Chief investigator (July 1 to Nov. 30, inc.).....	3,282.95
Robert B. Barker.....	Investigator (July 1 to Sept. 30, inc.).....	1,838.10
Frank F. Evans.....	Investigator (Oct. 19 to Nov. 4, inc.).....	296.27
J. V. Falvey.....	Investigator (July 1 to Nov. 30, inc.).....	2,614.15
Edward E. Fine, Jr.....	Investigator (Aug. 3 to 11, inc.).....	156.85
Gomer A. Gibson.....	Investigator (Oct. 17 to Nov. 4, inc.).....	331.12
John L. Grabber.....	Investigator (Oct. 17 to Nov. 4, inc.).....	331.12
Robert A. Grosselinger.....	Investigator (Oct. 29 to Nov. 2, inc.).....	87.13
John A. Kendrick.....	Investigator (Aug. 1 to 7, inc.; Oct. 17 to Nov. 4, inc.).....	453.11
Paul F. Morrison.....	Investigator (July 14 to 26, inc.).....	226.55
Walter K. Van Olinda.....	Investigator (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.).....	3,676.20
Charlotte S. Crosson.....	Stenographer (Oct. 25 to Nov. 9, inc.).....	134.97
LaRue Dickson.....	Typist (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.).....	1,619.64
Anna-Marie Hogin.....	Stenographer (Nov. 11 to Dec. 31, inc.).....	584.00
Kathryn E. Smith.....	Chief clerk (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.).....	2,309.34
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$40,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		8,937.51
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948.....		30,291.47
Total amount expended from Apr. 15 to Dec. 31, 1948.....		39,228.98
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948.....		771.02
ROSS RIZLEY, <i>Chairman.</i>		