



United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of Life and Light, help us with contrite hearts to begin this week, of all the year the holiest. May its sorrows search our souls. May we rise to newness of life as our glad hearts thrill again at the awakening earth robed in the blooming garb of spring. Make us more worthy of the high trusteeship of power and of opportunity which Thou hast committed to our hands in these decisive days. In this quiet moment of devotion, with all other voices stilled, breathe on us, Breath of God. Amid the turbulent things that are seen may the peace of the unseen and the eternal keep steady and steadfast our hearts and minds.

In the Redeemer's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 3, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1757) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.
Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to suggest that the Senate is in session following an adjournment, and there will be a morning hour very shortly, at which time Senators can present any matters they desire.

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

Aiken	Hunt	Mundt
Anderson	Ives	Murray
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Kem	Pepper
Capohart	Kerr	Robertson
Chapman	Knowland	Russell
Donnell	Langer	Schoeppel
Downey	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Long	Sparkman
Eaton	Lucas	Stennis
Ellender	McCarran	Taft
Ferguson	McCarthy	Taylor
Flanders	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Frear	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McGrath	Thye
George	McKellar	Tydings
Gillette	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Green	Malone	Watkins
Gurney	Martin	Wherry
Hendrickson	Maybank	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Miller	Williams
Holland	Millikin	Withers
Humphrey	Morse	Young

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOBY] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAVERNE] are necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official committee business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND WEEK-END HOLIDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief announcement for the benefit of Members of the Senate. After the morning hour has been completed we will then have the call of the calendar. After the calendar has been completed the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, House bill 2632, the first deficiency appropriations bill.

I desire to make a further announcement, Mr. President. Some Senators have been very much interested in what the Senate expected to do on Good Friday. It is the intention of the majority to take a recess or have an adjournment from Thursday night over until Monday. I thought Senators might want to know that at this time, in order that they might make their plans accordingly. In other words, there will be no session on Good Friday.

Those are the only announcements I have to make at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat will he yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any idea at what time the Senate may recess or adjourn on Thursday? Some Senators are interested in knowing, so they may make plans.

Mr. LUCAS. I assume the session on Thursday will be concluded around 5:30 or 6 o'clock, unless there is under consideration at that time some measure, action on which it is very important to have completed and to complete which will require but a short time.

I may say that after the Senate has completed action on the first deficiency appropriation bill it will take up the housing bill which is now on the calendar. I am not sure what measure the Senate will take up after that.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 42)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a

supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to \$595,890,000, for the Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1949, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 16

"Petitioning the President of the United States to prohibit the importation of furs from Russia

"Whereas the fur farming industry in the State of Colorado as elsewhere is fighting for its existence due to unjust competitive conditions brought about largely by the importation of furs from Russia: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado, That it respectfully petitions the President of the United States in the exercise of his emergency or other powers to prohibit the importation of furs from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in order to protect the fur farming industry in this State and elsewhere in the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this petition be forwarded to the President of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"WALTER W. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate."
"FRED C. FERGUSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 14

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide assistance to unemployables

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States various measures for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide for more comprehensive public welfare programs of assistance and welfare services to various categories of needy persons; and

"Whereas it is essential that provision be made through Federal legislation in cooperation with the States for the assistance of the chronically ill, physically or mentally handicapped, or otherwise unemployable persons between the ages of 18 and 65, who by clinical and laboratory tests, or otherwise, have been determined to have a chronic or prolonged disability which causes them to be unable or unavailable for gainful employment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the thirty-seventh general assembly (the senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve such proposed legislation providing for amendments to the Social Security Act in order to provide for assistance to the chronically ill, physically or mentally handicapped, or otherwise unemployable persons between the ages of 18 and 65, who have been determined by clinical and laboratory tests, or otherwise, to have a chronic or prolonged disability which causes them to be unable or unavailable for gainful employment; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the

Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States, and to the Federal Security Administrator.

"PAT MAGILL, JR.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."
"HENRY CHRISTENSEN,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."
"WALTER W. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate."
"FRED C. FERGUSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference petitions signed by 204 citizens of the city of Wilmington, and 30 citizens of Greenwood, both in the State of Delaware, praying for the the enactment of House bill 2428, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverages over the radio, and I ask unanimous consent that one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent \$9,640,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1947 as compared with \$7,770,000,000 in 1945. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime, juvenile delinquency, broken homes, deaths, and injuries due to intoxicated drivers, in the number of alcoholics and also of habitual or heavy drinkers. There is every reason why this waste of money and of human values should not be increased but rather greatly decreased.

INTERFAITH DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a joint resolution which was recently adopted by the New York State Legislature which memorializes Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 29, which would designate the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day. This joint resolution is identical with House Joint Resolution 40 and Senate Joint Resolution 6. The last-named joint resolution was introduced by me. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 6 may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, Senate Joint Resolution 6 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day

Whereas the United States of America was founded on the firm basis of freedom of thought and conscience; and

Whereas the fomenting of antagonism between Americans on a basis of sectarian creed is contrary to American traditions and to the spirit of the guaranties of freedom of worship embodied in the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas it ought to be, and is hereby declared to be, the policy of Congress to encourage the mutual understanding of all people of good will; and

Whereas the program of the interfaith movement offers a practicable means for encouraging such mutual understanding: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the fourth Sunday in September of each year is hereby designated as Interfaith Day, and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such day, and urging the participation of all Americans and all religious groups in the United States, regardless of sect or creed, to participate in the observance of such day by such means as they may deem appropriate.

The joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, relating to the designation of the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See text of joint resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate on April 7, 1949, p. 4014, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

PROTEST AGAINST INCREASE IN PENNY POST CARD—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF SOUTH-CENTRAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, ST. JAMES, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the South-Central Electric Association, at St. James, Minn., protesting against increasing the cost of a penny post card to 2 cents.

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:

The following resolution was adopted by the board of directors of the South-Central Electric Association at a special meeting held at St. James, Minn., at 2 p. m., on the 4th day of April 1949.

A motion was duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried adopting the following resolution and authorizing the manager to send a copy of said resolution to our Congressman and Senators:

"Whereas a proposed law (H. R. 2945) will increase the cost of a penny post card to 2 cents; and

"Whereas the post office favors it because they say big business buys post cards by the billions; and

"Whereas small businesses also use a considerable quantity of penny post cards; and

"Whereas increasing the rate from 1 cent to 2 cents would work a distinct hardship on many small businesses: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That a bill be introduced into the Congress in which penny post cards be rationed to not more than 10,000 per month to any one buyer, so that the penny post card can continue to help the little-business man in his competition with the chain stores and big business, and thereby save penny-post-card advertising for the small stores, churches, lodges, clubs, etc."

RESOLUTIONS OF INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION RELATING TO BANKING LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference resolutions adopted by the Independent Bankers Association, in convention assembled at the Buena Vista Hotel, at Biloxi, Miss., relating to banking legislation, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

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

I. TO CONVERT EITHER WAY

Whereas this association believes that the preservation of our free economy rests in the continuance of the dual banking system; and

Whereas the National Bank Act contains provisions authorizing two national banking associations to merge, a State bank to convert into a national banking association, and a State bank to be consolidated into a national banking association; and

Whereas the present National Bank Act does not permit a national banking association to convert into a State banking institution or to be consolidated or merged into a State banking institution without first going through the process of liquidation; and

Whereas in the event of a merger of a national banking association into a State banking institution, the bank shareholders are in most cases penalized taxwise, which is not true in the case of a State banking institution into a national banking association; and

Whereas this restricts the freedom of any bank to choose either the national or the State banking system and discriminates against the State banking system; and

Whereas this association is convinced of the vital importance to the preservation of the dual banking system of establishing and maintaining reciprocal conversion and merger privileges as between State-chartered banks and national banks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association expresses its firm belief in the need for the enactment of a bill designed to accomplish this result, such as H. R. 58, H. R. 1161, H. R. 1269, and S. 101, which have been introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, and urges the Congress to proceed promptly to pass such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the House and Senate Committees on Banking and Currency and to make known the views of this association to the chairmen of such committees; and be it further

Resolved, That each member of the association is requested to write his Congressman and Senators, urging the prompt enactment of such legislation.

II. TO CONTINUE THE STATUS OF THE THREE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCIES

Whereas this association is firmly and unanimously of the opinion that the continuance of the dual banking system is essential to the maintenance of free enterprise in this Nation; and

Whereas the continuance of the dual banking system in large measure depends upon the division of Federal bank supervision and examination among the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress has passed H. R. 1569, which is a bill authorizing the President to reorganize and transfer functions

among the Federal executive departments and agencies by reorganization plans, which plans will become law unless Congress disapproves by a majority of each House within 60 days after submission of the plan to Congress; and

Whereas in H. R. 1569, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System was placed in a special category of agencies which may be reorganized only by a separate reorganization plan that does not contain provisions for the reorganization of any other agencies, which amounts in effect to an exemption of the Federal Reserve System; and

Whereas the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of the Currency were not accorded such an exempt status: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of the Currency should be maintained on a parity with the Federal Reserve Board and should be given like status under H. R. 1569 and S. 526; and be it further

Resolved, That secretary of this association is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the House and Senate Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and to make known the views of this association to the chairmen of such committees; and be it further

Resolved, That each member of the association be urged to write to his Congressman and Senators requesting equal treatment for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Reserve Board in H. R. 1569 and S. 526, as all are entirely maintained by the banks with no expense to the Federal Government.

III. OPPOSE BRANCHES FOR FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Whereas this association is firmly and unanimously opposed to chain, group, or branch banking and the principle so involved; and

Whereas the Federal savings and loan associations are now establishing branches in several States: Be it hereby

Resolved, That this association go on record as opposing any branches whatsoever for Federal savings and loan associations excepting in States that permit State savings and loan associations to establish branches; and be it further

Resolved, That we recommend national legislation that will necessitate Federal savings and loan associations to comply with State law in regard to establishing branches.

IV. URGE LEGISLATION TO ADEQUATELY REGULATE THE BANK HOLDING COMPANY

Whereas holding-company operation of groups or chains of banks with its centralized control of credit and its lack of proper supervisory regulation constitutes a growing monopoly and is a dangerous move toward Government socialization of banking; and

Whereas holding-company operation of groups or chains of banks is inseparably linked to and identified with branch banking and is branch banking in fact if not in name; and

Whereas the expansion of bank holding companies across State lines is a device looking to and intended as a means of establishing branch banking privileges in many States in contravention of law; and

Whereas the Independent Bankers Association believes that a system of independent unit banking is best adapted to the highly diversified community life in the United States and it is therefore unalterably opposed to the growing menace of branch banking which growth has been and is aided, abetted, and made possible by its hidden identity with the uncontrolled and unregulated bank holding company: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Independent Bankers Association, That there be a prompt and speedy enactment by the Congress of the United States of such legislation as will—

1. Prohibit the further expansion of bank holding companies.

2. Place all bank holding companies under effective Government supervision and regulation similar to the supervision and regulation imposed on unit banks.

3. Require the separation of bank holding companies from all nonbanking activities.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF TAFT-HARTLEY LABOR LAW—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF COLERAINE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Council of Coleraine, Minn., favoring repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act is in effect antilabor legislation which aims at the ultimate defeat of labor organizations in their pursuit of bargaining freedom; and

Whereas under the Wagner Act, millions of workers did organize into strong unions, thereby providing the instrument necessary to protect their interests; and

Whereas the workers in America, through their unions, were able to hold up their heads in the knowledge that for the first time in history they were free men, proving this by their great production record during the terrible years of the past global war; and

Whereas President Truman in his pre-election tour of the United States brought the issue of the Taft-Hartley Act to the people, making it the major issue of the day, and the result was that the people voted supporting his stand in this matter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Taft-Hartley Act be immediately repealed and the Thomas-Lesinski bill (S. 249-H. R. 2032) which have the approval of the Senate Labor Committee be enacted as law; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be forwarded to President Harry S. Truman, Senators EDWARD J. THYE and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, and the Duluth and Iron Ranges Joint Council.

ARTHUR TOMS, Village President.

Attest:

RUTH F. HARRIS, Village Clerk.

LONG-RANGE FEDERAL FARM PROGRAM—STATEMENT OF POLICY OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FARMERS UNION OF WALSH COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a statement of policy adopted by members of the Walsh County Farmers Union board of directors, in meeting at Park River, N. Dak., relating to a long-range Federal farm program, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF POLICY, WALSH COUNTY FARMERS UNION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

We, the undersigned, members of the Walsh County Farmers Union board of directors, meeting at Park River, N. Dak., on this 2d day April 1949, do unanimously agree on behalf of 1,100 farm families of this

county that the following Federal legislation should be immediately enacted:

1. A long-range Federal farm program that would: (1) guarantee 100 percent of parity on all farm commodities up to what is normally considered farm-family production; and that parity price supports should be sharply reduced on all farm production above these definitely set production limits; that these and other limitations be effected so as to encourage farm-family agriculture and discourage present-day trends in factory-type agriculture; and (2) greatly increase all farm commodity storage facilities through the use of Federal loans to local and regional REA-type cooperatives; and where such farm commodities must be processed before storage, additional Federal loans be made for the construction, establishment, and maintenance of processing plants. Such a basic farm program would not only strengthen the Nation's agricultural economy but would, additionally, stabilize the total economy.

2. We urge Federal legislation that would equalize all education and health opportunities for everyone. We recommend Federal aid to education and Federal health insurance.

3. We urge immediate and sufficient appropriations so that REA development can be stepped-up in all areas not now serviced by central power stations. Such appropriation measures should definitely specify that they can be used for the construction and establishment of central power stations as well as transmission lines; and that the necessary materials be made available. We further urge, that legislation be passed to establish a rural telephone administration in conjunction and along the lines of the REA.

We direct that a copy of this statement be sent by the county secretary to both Members of Congress and to the United States Senators from this State; and that they be urged to use their influence and throw their wholehearted support behind this legislation.

A. E. ERICKSON,

Chairman.

GORDON TWEDT,
W. R. LILLEHAUGEN,
GEORGE R. BERTSON.
MRS. ELMER STAVEN.
W. N. ELZNIC.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 528. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 259);

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; with an amendment (Rept. No. 242);

H. R. 668. A bill for the relief of Alex Ball; without amendment (Rept. No. 244);

H. R. 679. A bill to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 258);

H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot; without amendment (Rept. No. 245);

H. R. 1010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, Frederick W. S. Mok, and Vincent W. C. Mok; without amendment (Rept. No. 246);

H. R. 1035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada M. Ryan; without amendment (Rept. No. 247);

H. R. 1041. A bill for the relief of Jeanette and Jesus Esteva and their four children; without amendment (Rept. No. 248);

H. R. 1052. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; without amendment (Rept. No. 249);

H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Maria Veltri Magnone; without amendment (Rept. No. 250);

H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Anna Malone and Rita Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 251);

H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 252);

H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Peter Drozd; without amendment (Rept. No. 253);

H. R. 1591. A bill for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp; without amendment (Rept. No. 254);

H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Kira and Nina Grigorieff; without amendment (Rept. No. 255);

H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell; without amendment (Rept. No. 256); and

H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Ben Luke Pond, Shao Hung Pond, and David Yat Wei Pond; without amendment (Rept. No. 257).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 243) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-4455093, Abbott, Arnold, or Felix Arnold Abbott.

A-4446440, Acuna-Salcido, Francisco.

A-6072837, Adamopoulos, Georgios Athanasias, or George Athos Adamson, George Athos Adamopoulos.

A-3305353, Andrianos, Panagiotis Stauros, or Peter Andrianos.

A-9186071, Apell, Karin Guborg Dagmar (nee Ericsson or Karin Apell or Appell).

A-6096785, Arriaza, Dafne Raquel Alvarez.

A-1416522, Atkinson, Marguerite Anne or Marguerite Anne Franklin Cavens or Marguerite Alice June Cavens (nee Marguerite Anne Franklin).

A-6248583, Balloff, Sophia (nee Papadoupoulou).

A-4391738, Bencivenga, Giuseppe, or Joseph Bencivenga or Raffaele Cirillo.

A-4897041, Bennett, Raya.

A-1385801, Blankenberg, Frederick Moritz Anst, or Frederick Moritz Ernest Blankenberg (alias Frederick Morris Ernest Blankenberg, alias Fred Blackwell, alias Fred Blackenberg).

A-6397588, Boellaard, Helena.

A-5713565, Bond, Austin.

A-6314545, Borg, Carmel Charlie.

A-7000606, Borza, Guseppe.

A-7000607, Borza, Antonia.

A-1387774, Bushey, Elmer Joseph, or Boucher or Bushey or Dick or Richard Bushey.

A-7032447, Caballero-Bustamante, Alberto Antonio.

A-7032445, Caballero-Bustamante, Rafael.

A-7032446, Caballero-Bustamante, Maria Estela.

A-6261651, Caramsaledis, Fotini (nee Dilleveu).

A-3725684, Castellano, Vincenzo, or Vincent James Castellano or James Castellano.

A-6720039, Cavallarin, Guerrino.

A-6448302, Chan, Kenneth Ivan, or Kenneth Ivan Hing.

A-6669678, Chavez-Reyna, Alfredo, or Alfredo Chavez.

A-6665545, Chew, Kwong Hai, or Harry Kwong (Hai Chew).

A-6261653, Christake, Merope (nee Kiloni).

A-3289766, Cipolat, Romano.

A-1235054, Cohen, Dora (nee Rom).

A-6798522, Courtsis, Elias Athanasias or Koutsis.

A-7005140, Cristiani, Henrietta Edith, or Henrietta Cristiani.

A-5343796, Cybulski, Benjamin, or Robert Gordon or Manuel Solis or Josef or Joseph Royer or Emilio Valdez or Emilio Honorato Valdez y Ramirez or Myer Bursyn or Burstein or Benumek Subelsky or Zubelsky.

A-3249572, DeGarciaaduenas, Adela Argulera.

A-6429946, DeLeon, Manuel Valencia.

A-6671577, Del Valle, Raul Rodriguez, or Raul Del Valle.

A-6323500, DePolendo, Genoveva Zavala.

A-6297365, Dittner, Pierre Raymond.

A-6194152, Eng, Winifred, or Winifred Ho Chong or Ho Gum Lan.

A-6440402, Fischer, Bela.

A-2856078, Fox, Irene (nee Fuschs or Ronia Malka Fuschs).

56051/858, Gali, Orzalo.

A-2358225, Gensen, Friedrich Paul, or Frederick Gensen.

A-5942350, Godinez, Juan.

A-6282215, Griffin, Robin Delmar.

A-9769331, Grizopoulos, George.

A-7629777, Grove, Marmaduke, or Marmaduke Grove-Valenzuela.

A-6226149, Guillemette, Dorothy Leslie.

A-4745611, Harb, Salem Arabaham Esah.

A-5382338, Hobbs, Ernest Frank.

A-4698673, Horvath, Zofia Mary Rawicz, or Zofia Mary Rawicz Oldakowska.

A-6707622, Koenig, Brigitta.

A-6489133, Kyriakakis, Constat.

A-1972384, Lawson, Margorie Ing-Kai (alias Marjorie Naitto).

A-7539114, Lee, Yung Tsin.

A-4593373, Lee, Joseph Tsu-An, or Jew On Lee or Joseph On Lee or Lee Jew On or Joe On Lee.

A-3454683, Leibovitch, Harold.

A-6405605, Lorenz, Kurt Paul.

A-6581437, Madrid, Manuel.

A-6581438, Madrid, Maria Elodia.

A-3405450, Matiatos, Spiros.

A-9533326, Matthios, Theodoros, or Terry Matthios.

A-6491875, Meireles, Domingos Amaral.

A-6261594, Mishas, Efthimia (nee Mandicas).

A-6533340, Nabra, Gabriel or Nahara.

A-1788665, Nemes, Bella, or Bill Names.

A-6450508, Niethe, Karl Wilhelm.

A-5295304, Onorati, Umberto, or Albert Onorati.

A-6022600, Orta, Maria De La Luz, or Maria De La Luz Horta.

A-6022602, Orta, Pilar, or Pilar Horta.

A-6022601, Orta, Ramona, or Ramona Horta.

A-5952938, Palmisano, Gaetano.

A-3491965, Panclera, Mario.

A-6268180, Pandelaras, Paraskevi Gregory (nee Paraskevi Apostolou Psylou).

A-3435006, Papadatos, Evangelos Gregori-

ous, or Angelos Pappas.

A-6355563, Perez, Antonio, or Antonio Perez Matezanta.

A-6911080, Perez, Virginia Soto, or Virginia Soto Lagos Perez.

A-6704624, Pieber, Gerda, or Bessie Soukaras.

A-1324167, Pinto, Alessio.

A-6339441, Pollett, Robert Anderson.

- A-5974374, Ramirez, Jesus, or Jesus Ramirez-Carrasco.
- A-6711690, Randolph, Frank Charles.
- A-1585863, Reichenbach, Mary Elaine (nee Pye, formerly Beebe).
- A-3433637, Richter, John Frank.
- A-6696460, Rodriguez, John Negrete.
- A-6451215, Rouse, Peter John.
- A-9620460, Samuel, George Ryan.
- A-6774210, Schlupp, Anna (nee Helman).
- A-6296216, Sereni, Pier Dino.
- A-4835531, Sobenko, Mary (see Maria Kuzmiak).
- A-3158427, Sootzmann, Alex Fritz, or Alex Soodsmann.
- A-1886212, Staub, Hyman, or Herman Staub.
- A-6492676, Stewart, Charlotte Rattray.
- A-6065478, Stipanovic, Branko, or Branko Stipanovich.
- A-6816833, Tarin, Berta Alicia.
- A-3363800, Tavares, Henry De Amorim Paula.
- A-6225120, Theodorides, Georgios Basileios, or Georgios Theodorides or Michael Panagiotis Hadjistyllianos.
- A-5987833, Thomas, Eugene Watkin.
- A-5916170, Thompson, Oscar Leonard, or Cyril Oscar Wilson.
- A-3672478, Tomaselli, Charles Rudolph.
- A-6245753, Trepcos, Helene (nee Helene Kovatsis).
- A-6260601, Van Hanen, Toivo, Albert.
- A-6738733, Vargas, Cesar Medrano, or Cesar Vargas Medrano or Jesus Maldonado Santiago.
- A-6706772, Vassilaros, Sofia Ilias (formerly Apostolakis).

- A-1467265, Vassos, Alfonso Apostolas, or John Paul Pappas or Paul P. A. Vassos.
- A-4865007, Vene, Bruno.
- A-1770952, Vitiello, Gennaro.
- A-5336993, Volksdorf, Ernest William.
- A-9726040, Vucetic, Henrik Emil.
- A-6081841, Walters, Jr., Alfred Ernest.
- A-1633174, Wineland, Marion Gladys (formerly Bundy, nee Walker).
- A-7035406, Yee, Gloria.
- A-2727259, Yue, Yeun Shal.
- A-2751327, Ha, Chan (Chow) Min.
- A-6724306, Zarate-Urzuva, Dionisio; Dionisio Zarate-Covarrubias.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government during the month of February 1949, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the Record as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1949, AND PAY DECEMBER 1948-JANUARY 1949

(Note with reference to personal service expenditures figures: It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of January, and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of December, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of February and are compared with the month of January. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.)

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

According to monthly personnel reports for February 1949 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures:

	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Pay roll (in thousands of dollars) in executive branch		
	In February numbered—	In January numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In January was—	In December was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total.....	2,104,979	2,102,809	+2,170	\$527,581	\$613,877	-\$86,296
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment.....	1,210,242	1,210,625	-383	307,968	380,263	-72,295
2. National Military Establishment.....	894,737	892,184	+2,553	219,613	233,614	-14,001
Within National Military Establishment:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,295	1,226	+69	434	450	-16
Department of the Army.....	370,024	367,884	+2,140	87,376	94,118	-6,742
Department of the Air Force.....	160,232	158,789	+1,443	38,297	38,292	+5
Department of the Navy.....	363,186	364,285	-1,099	93,506	100,754	-7,248

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number of employees inside continental United States, the number outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further break-down in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because pay-roll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES
(See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States decreased 170 from the January total of 1,911,297 to the February total of 1,911,127.

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was a decrease of 851 from the January total of 1,155,645 to the February total of 1,154,794.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for February was 756,332, an increase of 680 over the January figure of 755,652.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 69 from the January figure of 1,226 to the February figure of 1,295.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 783 from the January figure of 299,841 to the February figure of 300,624.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within the United States increased 730 from the January figure of 132,205 to the February figure of 132,935.

The Department of the Navy civilian personnel within the United States decreased 952 from the January figure of 322,380 to the February figure of 321,428.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES
(See table III)

Outside continental United States Federal personnel increased 2,341 from the January total of 191,512 to the February total of 193,853.

An increase of 468 was reported by the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the January total of 54,980 to the February total of 55,448.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment increased 1,873 from the January figure of 136,532 to the February figure of 138,405.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 1,357 in overseas civilian employment from the January figure of 68,043 to the February figure of 69,400.

The Department of the Air Force reported an increase of 663 in overseas civilian employment from the January figure of 26,584 to the February figure of 27,247.

The Department of the Navy reported a decrease of 147 in overseas civilian employ-

ment from the January figure of 41,905 to the February figure of 41,758.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT
(See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of February increased 582 from the January figure of 574,164 to the February total of 574,746.

The departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment decreased 270 from the January total of 19,753 to the February total of 19,483.

The National Military Establishment increased its total industrial employment 852 from the January total of 554,406 to the February total of 555,258.

The Department of the Army increased its industrial employment 1,476 from the January figure of 206,389 to the February figure of 207,865. Inside continental United States there was an increase of 114, and outside continental United States there was an increase of 1,362.

The Department of the Air Force industrial employment increased 823 from the January figure of 95,050 to the February figure of 95,873. Inside continental United States there was an increase of 186, and outside continental United States there was an increase of 637.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 1,447 from the Janu-

ary figure of 252,967 to the February figure of 251,520.

The term "industrial employees," as used by the committee, refers to unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects, such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

EMPLOYEES INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, BY STATE AND BY AGENCY, AS OF DECEMBER 1948

The information in table V, carried at the end of this report, was compiled by the United States Civil Service Commission, and is included in this additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures in response to nu-

merous requests for a break-down of paid civilian employees of the executive branch, by agency and by State.

It should be noted that differences between the figures released by the Civil Service Commission for the month of December and those compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures are not identical, but they are reconciled in footnote 1 which accompanies table V.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1949, and comparison with January 1949; and pay for January 1949 and comparison with December 1948

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	December	January	Increase	Decrease	January	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture.....	\$19,323	\$17,805		\$1,518	73,680	73,940	260	
Commerce.....	12,614	12,118		496	39,926	40,240	314	
Interior.....	13,999	12,826		1,173	49,588	49,901	313	
Justice.....	9,539	8,831		708	26,345	26,186		159
Labor.....	1,211	1,100		111	3,521	3,399		122
Post Office.....	178,809	122,108		56,701	507,507	507,430		77
State.....	5,941	5,369		572	20,115	20,210	95	
Treasury.....	28,075	26,074		2,001	89,015	91,302	2,287	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office.....	84	119	\$35		218	225	7	
Bureau of the Budget.....	261	244		17	530	531	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	15	15			69	60		9
National Security Council ¹	9	9			22	22		
National Security Resources Board.....	190	150		40	410	407		3
Council of Economic Advisers.....	23	22		1	39	39		
Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation.....	17	12		5	39	39		
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission.....	50	46		4	147	179	32	
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	876	928	50		3,078	3,078		
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	1,681	1,535		146	4,856	4,884	28	
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	34	32		2	128	127		1
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	203	190		13	933	943	10	
War Assets Administration.....	5,007	2,777		2,230	6,708	4,899		1,809
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	15	14		1	138	143	5	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	1,768	1,652		116	4,803	4,811	8	
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	274	254		20	670	682	12	
Civil Service Commission.....	1,480	1,167		313	4,228	4,227		1
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	61	55		6	121	121		1
Federal Communications Commission.....	535	485		50	1,353	1,349		4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	289	355		34	1,052	1,052	10	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	221	185		36	374	368		6
Federal Power Commission.....	341	311		30	824	819		5
Federal Security Agency ²	9,234	9,007		227	35,114	35,267	153	
Federal Trade Commission.....	296	259		37	650	662	12	
Federal Works Agency.....	5,978	5,775		202	23,081	23,124	43	
General Accounting Office.....	3,034	2,773		261	9,432	9,430		2
Government Printing Office.....	2,231	2,237	6		6,999	7,037	38	
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	3,895	3,741		65	11,862	11,873	11	
Indian Claims Commission.....	7	6		1	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	913	825		87	2,248	2,228		20
Maritime Commission.....	1,878	1,910	32		6,571	6,631	60	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	2,236	2,059		177	6,895	6,904	9	
National Archives.....	135	115		19	388	388		
National Capital Housing Authority.....	81	75		6	208	305		3
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	13	7		6	18	18		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.....	1	1			3	3		
National Gallery of Art.....	82	79		3	320	325	5	
National Labor Relations Board.....	567	509		58	1,582	1,517		65
National Mediation Board.....	58	48		10	108	113	5	
Panama Canal.....	3,216	3,590	374		22,920	22,804		116
Railroad Retirement Board.....	706	654		52	2,421	2,451	30	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	1,989	1,771		218	4,578	4,589	11	
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	486	450		36	1,165	1,163		2
Selective Service System.....	1,212	1,126		86	5,903	5,834		69
Smithsonian Institution.....	175	169		15	549	547		2
Tariff Commission.....	108	99		9	240	240		
Tax Court of the United States.....	53	52			122	121		1
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	3,775	3,914	139		13,771	13,581		190
Veterans' Administration.....	54,948	49,935		5,012	212,928	211,453		1,475
Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	380,263	307,968	636	72,931	1,210,625	1,210,242	3,759	4,142
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment.....				72,295			383	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	450	434		16	1,226	1,295	69	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States.....	78,463	73,617		4,846	299,841	300,624	783	
Outside continental United States.....	15,655	13,759		1,896	68,043	69,400	1,357	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States.....	32,661	33,800	1,139		132,205	132,985	780	
Outside continental United States.....	5,631	4,497		1,134	26,584	27,247	663	
Department of the Navy:								
100,754	93,506		7,248	364,285	363,186		1,099	
Total, National Military Establishment.....	233,614	219,613	1,139	15,140	892,184	894,737	3,652	1,099
Net change, National Military Establishment.....			14,001				2,553	
Grand total including National Military Establishment.....	613,877	527,581	1,775	88,071	2,102,809	2,104,979	7,411	5,241
Net change, including National Military Establishment.....			86,296				2,170	

¹ Exclusive of the personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
² Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
³ Revised.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1949 and comparison with January 1949

Department or agency	January	February	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	January	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	71,622	71,784	162		Indian Claims Commission.....	11	11		
Commerce.....	36,922	37,199	277		Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,248	2,228		20
Interior.....	44,290	44,222		38	Maritime Commission.....	6,532	6,592	60	
Justice.....	25,868	25,710		158	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	6,895	6,904	9	
Labor.....	3,485	3,363		122	National Archives.....	388	388		
Post Office.....	505,774	505,700		74	National Capital Housing Authority.....	308	305		3
State.....	7,744	7,792	48		National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	18	18		
Treasury.....	88,559	90,613	2,254		National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.....	3	3		
Executive Office of the President:					National Gallery of Art.....	320	325	5	
White House Office.....	218	225	7		National Labor Relations Board.....	1,570	1,509		64
Bureau of the Budget.....	530	531	1		National Mediation Board.....	108	113	5	
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	69	60		9	Panama Canal.....	647	646		1
National Security Council ¹	22	22			Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,421	2,451	30	
National Security Resources Board.....	410	407		3	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	4,565	4,577	12	
Council of Economic Advisers.....	39	39			Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,165	1,163		2
Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation.....	39	39			Selective Service System.....	5,742	5,664		78
Postwar agencies:					Smithsonian Institution.....	543	542		1
Displaced Persons Commission.....	56	66	10		Tariff Commission.....	240	240		
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	901	931	30		Tax Court of the United States.....	122	121		1
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	4,831	4,859	28		Tennessee Valley Authority.....	13,771	13,581		190
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	2	2			Veterans' Administration.....	211,327	209,833		1,494
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	5	5			Total, exclusive of National Military Establishment.....	1,155,645	1,154,794	3,223	4,074
War Assets Administration.....	6,693	4,896		1,797	Net decrease, exclusive of National Military Establishment.....				851
Independent agencies:					National Military Establishment:				
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	7	10	3		Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,226	1,295	69	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	4,800	4,808	8		Department of the Army.....	299,841	300,624	783	
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	650	662	12		Department of the Air Force.....	132,205	132,985	780	
Civil Service Commission.....	4,223	4,222		1	Department of the Navy.....	322,380	321,428		952
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	120	119		1	Total, National Military Establishment.....	755,652	756,332	1,682	952
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,318	1,314		4	Net increase, National Military Establishment.....				680
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,052	1,060	8		Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	1,911,297	1,911,127	4,855	5,025
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	374	368		6	Net decrease, including National Military Establishment.....				170
Federal Power Commission.....	824	819		5					
Federal Security Agency ²	34,141	34,279	138						
Federal Trade Commission.....	650	662	12						
Federal Works Agency.....	22,448	22,500	52						
General Accounting Office.....	9,432	9,430		2					
Government Printing Office.....	6,999	7,037	38						
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	11,814	11,828	14						

¹ Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
² Includes personnel of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

[†] Revised.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during 1949 and comparison with January 1949

Department or agency	January	February	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	January	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	2,058	2,156	98		Federal Works Agency.....	683	624		9
Commerce.....	3,004	3,041	37		Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	48	45		3
Interior.....	5,328	5,679	351		Maritime Commission.....	39	39		
Justice.....	477	476		1	National Labor Relations Board.....	12	11		1
Labor.....	35	36			Panama Canal.....	22,273	22,158		115
Post Office.....	1,733	1,730		3	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	13	12		1
State.....	12,371	12,418	47		Selective Service System.....	161	170	9	
Treasury.....	656	689	33		Smithsonian Institution.....	6	5		1
Postwar agencies:					Veterans' Administration.....	1,601	1,620	19	
Displaced Persons Commission.....	91	113	22		Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	54,980	55,448	645	177
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	2,177	2,147		30	Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment.....				468
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	25	25			National Military Establishment:				
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	126	125		1	Department of the Army.....	68,043	69,400	1,357	
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	928	938	10		Department of the Air Force.....	26,584	27,247	663	
War Assets Administration.....	15	3		12	Department of the Navy.....	41,905	41,758		147
Independent agencies:					Total, National Military Establishment.....	136,532	138,405	2,020	147
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	181	133		48	Net increase, National Military Establishment.....				1,873
Atomic Energy Commission.....	3	3			Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	191,512	193,853	2,665	324
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	20	20			Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....				2,341
Civil Service Commission.....	5	5							
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	2	2							
Federal Communications Commission.....	85	85							
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....		2	2						
Federal Security Agency.....	973	988	15						

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1949 and comparison with January 1949

Department or agency	January	February	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	January	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):					National Military Establishment—Con.				
Commerce.....	1,068	1,116	18		Department of the Army—Con.				
Interior.....	4,509	4,372		137	Outside continental United States.....	45,627	46,989	1,362	
State.....	353	352		1	Department of the Air Force:				
Treasury.....	4,352	4,402	50		Inside continental United States.....	75,764	75,950	186	
Independent agencies:					Outside continental United States.....	19,286	19,923	637	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	150	151	1		Department of the Navy.....	252,967	251,520		1,447
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	6	6			Total, National Military Establishment.....	554,406	555,258	2,299	1,447
Panama Canal.....	1,853	1,831		22	Net increase, National Military Establishment.....			852	
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	7,437	7,258		179	Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	574,164	574,746	2,368	1,785
Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	19,758	19,488	69	339	Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....			582	
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment.....				270					
National Military Establishment:									
Department of the Army:									
Inside continental United States.....	160,762	160,876	114						

TABLE V.—Paid civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, by agency and State of official duty station, December 1948, continental United States (excluding Alaska and Panama Canal Zone)

[This chart was prepared and released by the U. S. Civil Service Commission as of Mar. 18, 1949.]

Agency	Total	Washington, D. C., metropolitan area	Ala-bama	Ari-sona	Ar-kan-sas	Calif-ornia	Colo-rado	Con-necti-cut	Del-a-ware	Flor-ida	Geor-gia	Idaho	Illi-nois	Indi-ana	Iowa	Kan-sas	Ken-tucky
Total.....	1,899,143	210,629	31,845	12,050	14,305	206,014	22,191	11,432	1,765	33,618	40,166	5,832	97,742	29,803	15,369	19,307	24,405
White House Office.....	209	204															
Bureau of the Budget.....	521	497				6	6						6				
Council of Economic Advisers.....	38	38															
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	64	64															
National Security Council.....	20	20															
National Security Resources Board.....	353	353															
Office of Defense Transportation.....	26	24															
Philippine Alien Property Admin-istration.....	2	2															
War Assets Administration.....	7,326	1,217	21	25	14	459	106	6		50	283		892	271	3	15	2
State.....	7,625	5,978				18	1			5	1		5				
Treasury.....	88,801	19,605	619	212	217	5,301	908	814	87	971	1,160	127	9,111	1,005	593	527	1,116
Secretary of Defense.....	1,159	1,136															
Department of the Army.....	297,019	26,567	6,053	736	3,343	26,474	4,714	11	81	649	11,707	13	14,634	4,750	531	2,282	7,778
Department of the Navy.....	321,510	35,778	10	884	715	82,721	68	1,381		892	935	5,165	4,262			126	886
Department of the Air Force.....	130,946	4,310	7,344	1,612	1	15,794	1,287	2	19	3,143	6,422	51	3,235	627	55	1,518	122
Justice.....	25,666	7,998	138	245	79	2,037	255	237	13	473	586	29	581	375	23	393	227
Post Office.....	506,585	7,623	6,247	1,910	5,029	38,830	4,672	6,962	959	6,778	7,913	1,734	41,329	12,141	9,280	7,412	7,652
Interior.....	44,185	4,131	170	4,235	114	3,472	4,000	20	4	285	213	881	270	510	58	374	227
Agriculture.....	70,054	10,822	1,482	666	1,428	4,255	1,586	137	4	955	2,139	1,053	2,625	1,072	1,429	1,410	1,159
Commerce.....	37,072	13,408	365	207	200	2,101	439	103	53	912	914	191	1,138	500	257	465	277
Labor.....	3,422	1,629	63	7	10	133	20	24	2	17	54	5	170	34	20	45	19
American Battle Monuments Com-mission.....	7	7															
Atomic Energy Commission.....	4,824	664				144	60						241		9		
Board of Governors, Federal Re-serve System.....	529	513			1		2						3				
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	643	587				11	2			2	5		4				
Civil Service Commission.....	4,066	2,240			1	265	83	1		2	171		170				
Displaced Persons Commission.....	45	45															
Economic Cooperation Administra-tion.....	854	852															
Export-Import Bank.....	121	121															
Federal Communications Commis-sion.....	1,318	883	2			69	3			12	31	3	13				4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corpo-ration.....	1,029	319	4		4	22	2	7	2	4	42		52	19	17	4	9
Federal Mediation and Concilia-tion Service.....	377	72	3	1	1	25	4	3		4	15		25	5	4	1	3
Federal Power Commission.....	831	662				50					29		31				
Federal Security Agency.....	33,994	10,879	500	53	262	1,350	201	92	16	243	1,021	23	1,124	149	74	92	565
Federal Trade Commission.....	634	563				11							23				
Federal Works Agency.....	22,321	12,527	160	60	76	1,186	670	40	17	99	265	66	613	96	82	17	84
General Accounting Office.....	9,413	6,468	1			110	16			11	43		131	5	7	7	8
Government Printing Office.....	6,953	6,788				28	22						32				
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	11,548	3,063	79	54	61	1,330	58	107		171	203	19	333	193	61	248	48
Indian Claims Commission.....	11	11															
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,286	1,577	5	5	8	48	19	2		10	19	2	60	9	9	8	7
Maritime Commission.....	9,072	1,331	434			1,089				456	5						
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	6,870	130				1,098											
National Archives.....	380	363															
National Capital Housing Au-thority.....	306	306															
National Capital Park and Plan-ning Commission.....	7	7															
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.....	3	3															
National Labor Relations Board.....	1,643	561	2			122	12			2	60		80	9			
National Mediation Board.....	107	41											66				
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	4,813	301	52	28	25	498	44	50	12	116	197	7	310	92	37	44	29
Panama Canal.....	130	99											4				
Panama Railroad Company.....	505					3											

¹ GENERAL NOTE.—It is emphasized that the above break-down of Federal civilian employees of the executive agencies by States was prepared by the U. S. Civil Service Commission. It is noted that the total figures in this break-down are not identical with the number of Federal agency civilian employees of the Federal Government reported for December by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The difference of 11,546 between the figures in these 2 reports is accounted for by the fact that the joint committee report excludes the employees of the Federal Reserve System, Maritime Commission trainees, and employees of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, which are included by the Civil Service Commission. The employees of the Federal Reserve System and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency are paid from funds collected through levies on banks. The Joint Committee report includes persons of the "expert consultant" type who serve without compensation, and persons receiving compensation while on terminal leave, which are excluded in the Civil Service report.

² Partially estimated.

TABLE V.—Paid civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, by agency and State of official duty station, December 1948, continental United States (excluding Alaska and Panama Canal Zone)—Continued

Agency	Total	Washington, D. C., metropolitan area	Alabama	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky
Philippine War Damage Commission	7	7															
Railroad Retirement Board	2,388	7	9	5	7	86	51	2		9	81	2	1,419	11	7	9	8
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4,610	1,588	82	3	68	215	54			100	110		196				64
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,159	829				35	18				13		49				
Selective Service System	5,819	228	113	83	105	315	92	54	16	96	209	58	224	131	149	128	140
Smithsonian Institution	867	855											12				
Tariff Commission	239	231															
Tax Court of the United States	124	124															
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,982	8	3,953							3	9						143
Veterans' Administration	201,800	13,295	3,884	1,547	2,448	16,302	2,718	1,377	422	2,792	5,353	633	13,366	3,537	2,604	4,182	3,828

Agency	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland ¹	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York	North Carolina	North Dakota
Total	22,679	12,991	40,464	55,992	36,745	19,320	15,419	48,905	7,602	16,060	3,545	2,959	42,031	10,910	181,110	24,119	5,956
White House Office				1											3		
Bureau of the Budget																	
Council of Economic Advisers																	
Executive Mansion and Grounds																	
National Security Council																	
National Security Resources Board																	
Office of Defense Transportation								2									
Philippine Alien Property Administration																	
War Assets Administration	88	40		71	81	3	45	271					142		967	5	
State	6			4	1	1		1		1					799	1	
Treasury	1,328	424	3,104	2,734	2,471	1,245	219	3,812	193	459	48	118	1,797	119	11,184	657	176
Secretary of Defense															23		
Department of the Army	5,190	183	13,201	6,197	5,751	1,239	3,425	13,123	441	3,115	1	28	14,410	1,470	25,605	2,122	658
Department of the Navy	1,747	6,076	7,025	11,714	92	103	63	152		1,502	1,200	4	4,129	108	19,577	6,020	
Department of the Air Force	1,198	371	1,121	2,141	518	103	1,449	789	346	1,149	87	202	1,697	1,529	5,375	147	7
Justice	211	152	211	393	679	234	35	440	126	104	19	9	285	51	3,060	121	1
Post Office	5,480	3,614	5,857	21,412	10,102	8,180	4,341	17,875	1,852	5,488	410	1,985	14,331	1,534	79,369	7,343	2,520
Interior	145	226	97	217	72	414	229	879	2,108	964	1,053	19	50	2,248	334	272	847
Agriculture	2,289	218	415	411	934	1,582	1,704	1,649	1,290	1,534	185	156	476	945	1,694	1,488	655
Commerce	642	114	144	335	422	292	304	1,751	372	321	140	61	150	347	1,731	392	171
Labor	22	13	21	113	47	28	12	46	6	9	4	4	5	5	256	10	3
American Battle Monuments Commission																	
Atomic Energy Commission				2				19					37	1,175	547	4	
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System				1	1			6					1				
Civil Aeronautics Board				2	2	2		6							13		
Civil Service Commission	73			117	2	83	1	124		3					248		
Displaced Persons Commission																	
Economic Cooperation Administration															2		
Export-Import Bank																	
Federal Communications Commission	7	3	41	25	23	4	3	15		15					61		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	4	3	7	16	9	32	5	55		8			44		138	7	1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	2		1	19	19	3	1	21	1	1		2	3		27	3	
Federal Power Commission															27		
Federal Security Agency	984	110	5,739	734	495	112	121	801	141	70	19	27	175	176	3,003	152	22
Federal Trade Commission	7														26		
Federal Works Agency	96	35	179	386	40	125	61	525	44	75	6	18	109	45	1,650	112	20
General Accounting Office	32		28	39	61	24		774	4	5				9	109	951	
Government Printing Office			1												43		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	86	18	229	64	699	76	107	115	12	77	13	35	231	36	999	115	
Indian Claims Commission																	
Interstate Commerce Commission	12	2	5	32	9	29		52	5	14		2	12	4	69	20	3
Maritime Commission	170	196	156	196				290					224		2,603	488	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics															17		
National Archives																	
National Capital Housing Authority																	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission																	
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission																	
National Labor Relations Board	36		46	64	70	37		66							169	9	
National Mediation Board																	
Office of the Housing Expediter	49	19	52	203	108	65	29	117	16	33	9	11	107	16	741	61	6
Panama Canal				3											9		
Panama Railroad Company															502		
Philippine War Damage Commission																	
Railroad Retirement Board	11	2	7	12	7	63	3	82	9	8	1		9	6	160	6	4
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	97		8	106	165	58		170	30	35	2		2	1	290	50	
Securities and Exchange Commission				11	3	2		2							139		
Selective Service System	128	82	75	130	206	126		107	261	67	141	26	28	85	48	276	70
Smithsonian Institution															8		
Tariff Commission																	
Tax Court of the United States																	
Tennessee Valley Authority								100									124
Veterans' Administration	2,539	1,170	2,694	8,089	4,656	5,037	2,763	4,929	339	929	298	254	3,510	988	19,177	3,267	724

Agency	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia ²	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming	Undetermined
Total	81,130	32,025	15,897	111,158	11,117	18,745	7,427	36,210	86,903	20,924	3,082	66,268	49,157	10,531	20,198	4,913	178
White House Office																	
Bureau of the Budget																	
Council of Economic Advisers																	
Executive Mansion and Grounds																	
National Security Council																	
National Security Resources Board																	
Office of Defense Transportation																	

¹ Excludes employment within the Washington, D. C., metropolitan area.
² Partially estimated.

TABLE V.—Paid civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, by agency and State of official duty station, December 1948, continental United States (excluding Alaska and Panama Canal Zone)—Continued

Agency	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia ¹	Washington	West Virginia	Wisconsin	Wyoming	Undetermined
Philippine Alien Property Administration																	
War Assets Administration	698	15	25	703	26	14		3	526	9		7	184	15			
State	2			4					696				1				
Treasury	2,812	493	476	4,366	266	314	129	525	2,620	225	199	977	1,482	404	992	62	
Secretary of Defense																	
Department of the Army	10,921	2,633	2,990	19,012	164	1,732	616	6,398	17,754	7,324	51	8,660	10,201	1,342	765	8	
Department of the Navy	1,853	1,712	364	33,055	7,200	8,726		933	5,653	3,091		33,428	15,847	593	75	3	
Department of the Air Force	20,596	13,486	1	5,520	1	673	299	938	18,172	4,143	1	1,067	1,416	1	1	865	
Justice	650	368	97	917	31	38	12	181	1,567	72	168	449	791	244	96	9	
Post Office ²	25,941	6,890	4,675	30,373	2,520	3,840	2,693	7,559	19,241	2,018	1,752	7,829	7,394	4,507	11,252	887	
Interior	251	1,867	2,204	1,067	4	54	1,368	264	673	902	6	635	3,605	269	206	1,463	178
Agriculture	1,088	1,397	1,850	1,441	70	1,221	778	1,068	5,143	861	210	1,095	1,203	550	1,712	396	
Commerce	716	610	332	555	51	212	150	423	2,116	291	61	443	1,248	140	190	203	
Labor	111	17	19	159	12	13	4	23	94	7	3	25	29	8	29	3	
American Battle Monuments Commission																	
Atomic Energy Commission	46							1,537					339				
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	2			1				1	2								
Civil Aeronautics Board									6				3				
Civil Service Commission	144	3	2	132		1			100	3		1	93		3		
Displaced Persons Commission																	
Economic Cooperation Administration																	
Export-Import Bank																	
Federal Communications Commission	2	4	24	8	5				33			9	16				
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	27	9	2	37		3	5	10	26		5	23	6	4	36		
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	37	3	5	23	1	2		4	11	1		5	10	2	3		
Federal Power Commission									32								
Federal Security Agency	676	77	86	792	45	152	21	262	1,120	32	22	437	516	92	119	20	
Federal Trade Commission													4				
Federal Works Agency	230	65	305	672	43	75	14	116	477	85	26	157	298	39	74	33	
General Accounting Office	392	1	16	37				13	53	1		15	34	1	7		
Government Printing Office	22												17				
Housing and Home Finance Agency	357	142	107	315	14	160	28	88	363	128	23	475	206	45	126	31	
Indian Claims Commission																	
Interstate Commerce Commission	40	7	20	44	2	3	2	23	39	13		17	9	5	4		
Maritime Commission			213	42					197			791	191				
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,341											3,301					
National Archives																	
National Capital Housing Authority																	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission																	
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission																	
National Labor Relations Board	87		15	108		2		9	43				39				
National Mediation Board																	
Office of the Housing Expediter	284	56	40	223	21	21	10	76	285	18	9	69	79	48	80	10	
Panama Canal				15													
Panama Railroad Company																	
Philippine War Damage Commission																	
Railroad Retirement Board	103	5	6	39		2	2	17	68	8		11	8	7	7	2	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	179	80	81	147				74	312	41		93	108			1	
Securities and Exchange Commission	22	2							18				16				
Selective Service System	236	130	50	248	24	85	37	147	252	46	21	171	57	76	137	33	
Smithsonian Institution																	
Tariff Commission																	
Tax Court of the United States																	
Tennessee Valley Authority								9,636				6					
Veterans' Administration	10,253	1,953	1,892	11,103	617	1,401	1,259	5,882	9,205	705	525	6,072	3,707	2,139	4,288	883	

¹ Excludes employment within the Washington, D. C., Metropolitan area.
² Partially estimated.

Source: U. S. Civil Service Commission, March 1949.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian personnel in the executive branch of the Federal Government in February increased by 2,170. The total employment for the month was 2,104,979.

Civilian employment by the National Military Establishment for February totaled 894,737—a net increase of 58,000 since February 1948. The February 1949 increase was 2,553. This was partially offset by a decrease of 383 in the civilian agencies of the Government.

In addition to the Military Establishment there was an increase of 2,287 in the Treasury Department and lesser increases in 24 other agencies.

Principal decreases were reported by the War Assets Administration which is in liquidation and the Veterans' Administration. In addition to these decreases there were lesser decreases in a score of other agencies.

Civilian employment inside continental United States decreased by 170 during the month and outside continental United States it increased by 2,341.

These figures were revealed today in the monthly check of civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL BY STATES

In addition to the usual break-down of civilian employment the committee this month includes also a break-down of civilian employment by the various agencies of the Government showing the number of employees in each State of the Union and the District of Columbia as of December 1948. This break-down was compiled as of this month by the United States Civil Service Commission. It shows that the State of California is running a close race with the District of Columbia in the number of Federal employees. As of December the Federal executive agencies were employing 206,014 people in the State of California as compared with 210,629 in the District of Columbia.

The number of employees in New York State ranked next with 181,110. Outside of the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania was the third ranking State in terms of Federal employees with 111,158. Illinois was fourth with 97,742. Delaware was forty-eighth among the States with 1,765 Federal employees.

In the field the Post Office and the Veterans' Administration as a rule were the largest employers of Federal civilian personnel, with the Military Establishment employing large numbers in certain States.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, 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.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1546. A bill disclaiming and reconveying any interest of the United States to the mineral rights in the lands comprising the Peason Artillery Range, La.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1547. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 1548. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make arrangements

for adequate educational facilities in connection with the opening of lands on the Hunt unit of the Minidoka reclamation project, Idaho; and

S. 1549. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make provision for public roads in connection with the construction of the Hunt unit of the Minidoka reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1550. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1551. A bill for the relief of Jose Augusto Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1552. A bill for the relief of Ernest E. Heintz; and

S. 1553. A bill for the relief of Mary Ann Wilkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1554. A bill to extend the time within which claim may be filed by O. M. Shaller of Lake Butler, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1555. A bill to amend section 144 (b) (4) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code to make applicable to pumice and scoria the percentage allowance for depletion applicable to certain other minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1556. A bill to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1557. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1558. A bill for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. TOBEY):

S. 1559. A bill for the establishment of the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER AND STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WIDOWS' ANNUITIES UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Public Law No. 426, enacted last year, provided

that under the Retirement Act widows should get annuities or benefits. However, for some reason or other, widows under the Panama Canal Retirement Act were excluded. In order to take care of widows of retirees from service in the Panama Canal Zone, I now submit for appropriate reference and printing an amendment intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 1081, to repeal the Canal Zone Retirement Act, and to extend the Civil Service Retirement Act, with amendments, to employees affected by such repeal, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, together with a statement by Mrs. Louise G. Franklet, of Bradenton, Fla., be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT

On page 5, before the period in line 6, insert a colon and the following: "And provided further, That any such officer or employee who shall have died during the period beginning on April 1, 1948, and ending on the last day of the month following the month in which this paragraph is enacted, leaving a surviving wife or husband, shall be deemed to have made such election and to have named such wife or husband to receive an annuity as provided in the proviso in such paragraph, but no such annuity shall become payable to such wife or husband prior to the date of enactment of this paragraph."

STATEMENT ON WIDOWS' ANNUITIES UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

The Panama Canal Retirement Act at present provides no annuity benefit for the widows of Canal-Railroad retirees.

The Civil Service Retirement Act does provide for widows of retirees. The amendment authorizing this became effective April 1, 1948 (Public Law 426).

There has been introduced in the Senate of the present Eighty-first Congress, a bill, S. 1081, which proposes to merge the Panama Canal and Civil Service Retirement Systems.

If enacted into law, in its present form, S. 1081 would provide for the widows of previously retired Canal employees, as an optional alternative to be exercised by the retiree annuitant under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, as amended by Public Law 426.

This optional alternative involves a possible increase of 25 percent in the previously established annuity, not to exceed \$300 a year, as in lieu thereof the establishing of a future annuity for the surviving widow in an amount equal to 50 percent of the previously established annuity but not to exceed \$600 a year.

There has also been introduced, in the House of Representatives, a bill, H. R. 1722, which proposes to modify the above optional alternative for widows under the Civil Service Act. H. R. 1722 proposes to establish an annuity for the surviving widow if the retiree accepts a 10-percent reduction in his annuity after it has been increased by 25 percent not to exceed \$300 a year, and thereby establish a future annuity for the surviving widow of 50 percent of the amount of above resultant annuity.

It remains to be developed whether the present Congress will enact S. 1081 without change and whether or not it will become effective as of April 1, 1948, to place the Pan-

ama Canal retiree in the same status as civil-service retirees.

It would be quite a discrimination against Panama Canal retirees if the increase in previously established annuities was not made applicable the same time as other Government retirees simply because the past Eightieth Congress did not get around to consider their case before it adjourned in June 1948.

It is not now apparent what consideration would be given to those who become widows before the above merger becomes law, as in case the option has not been exercised by a retiree before his death.

Mrs. LOUISE G. FRANKLET.

BRADENTON, FLA.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PHILIP J. FINNEGAN TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, April 18, 1948, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Philip J. Finnegan, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, vice Hon. William M. Sparks, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGrath], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is now holding hearings on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, be permitted to continue its hearings during the session of the Senate.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Finance Committee may be privileged to continue the hearing on the oleomargarine bill during the afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, consent is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate for a period of 2 weeks, when I shall be absent on official business.

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

VETERANS' PENSIONS—LETTER FROM S. FRED OLSEN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relative

to pensions for veterans addressed to him by S. Fred Olsen, of Seattle, Wash., which appears in the Appendix.]

MORAL REARMAMENT—LETTER FROM H. KENASTON TWITCHELL

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of moral rearmament, addressed to him by H. Kenaston Twitchell, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF ACCOUNTS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON (PA.) OBSERVER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Warren Backs Williams," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer of April 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PENNSYLVANIA GRIDIRON DINNER—SONG BY MILTON V. BURGESS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a song entitled "Roll Along, Pennsylvania," composed by Milton V. Burgess for the Pennsylvania gridiron show at Harrisburg, Pa., on April 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MILITARY PROBLEM IN THE PACIFIC—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MCCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Pacific Retreat—Military Planners Are About To Let Down the United States and Asia," from the current issue of Life magazine, and the second, entitled "United States Neglecting to Protest Pacific Interests," published in the Washington Sunday Star of April 3, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Invitation to the Hangman," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RATIFICATION OF NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Petition Asks Senate To Ratify Atlantic Treaty," published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOP-LEVEL SALARIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Top-Level Salaries," published in the Washington Post of April 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY DEMOCRACY WORKS—PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY MISS ISABEL BERN

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an essay entitled "Why Democracy Works," by Miss Isabel Bern, as printed in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent on April 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERSTATE COMPACT RELATING TO BETTER UTILIZATION OF FISHERIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating

the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, which was, on page 6, line 16, after the word "limit", to insert "or add to."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. O'CONNOR, and Mr. BREWSTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Before the call of the calendar is begun, the Chair would like to make a statement. His attention has been called to the confusion which frequently arises when a bill is called and a Senator, without rising from his seat, says "Over," or "I object." That is not in accordance with the rule. The rule requires that before a Senator may make any statement he shall rise from his seat and address the Chair. It is difficult for the reporters and the clerks at the desk to know which Senator objects to a bill unless that course is pursued. Their ears must be fairly well attuned to voices in order to enable them to know which Senator objects, if a Senator remains in his seat and objects.

The Chair will ask Senators who intend to object when a bill is called to rise and address the Chair, so that the RECORD may properly show who objects to the consideration of a bill.

The clerk will proceed to state the business on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 130) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities was announced as first in order.

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 206) relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese-treaty merchants was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. DONNELL, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. THYE rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 196) for the relief of James G. Smyth was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 612) to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed \$10,607,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 45) for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208 was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

LIMITATIONS OF TIME ON ACTIONS FOR RECOVERY BROUGHT AGAINST CERTAIN COMMON CARRIERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 257) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by water, and freight forwarders, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment in section 5, on page 4, line 25, after "Sec. 5," to strike out "Title" and insert "Part", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 204 thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 204a. (1) All actions at law by common carriers by motor vehicle subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(2) For recovery of overcharges, action at law shall be begun against common carriers by motor vehicle subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (3) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the carrier within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(3) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in paragraph (2)

a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to this part begins action under paragraph (1) for recovery of charges in respect of the same transportation service, or without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the carrier.

"(4) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the carrier, and not after.

"(5) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for transportation services in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(6) The provisions of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this section."

Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purposes of this section the term 'carrier' means a common carrier by water."

Sec. 3. (a) Subsection (f) (1) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) (A) All actions at law by carriers subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(B) All complaints against carriers for the recovery of damages not based on overcharges shall be filed with the Commission within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subdivision (D).

"(C) For the recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun or complaint filed with the Commission against carriers subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subdivision (D), except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the carrier within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(D) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in subdivision (B) or the 2-year period of limitation in subdivision (C) a carrier subject to this part begins action under subdivision (A) for recovery of charges in respect of the same transportation service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the carrier."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this act.

Sec. 4. Paragraph (5) of subsection (f) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

Sec. 5. Part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after section 406 thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 406a. (1) All actions at law by freight forwarders subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(2) For recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun against freight forwarders subject to this part within 2 years

from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (3) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the freight forwarder within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the freight forwarder to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(3) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in paragraph (2) a freight forwarder subject to this part begins action under paragraph (1) for recovery of charges in respect of the same service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the freight forwarder.

"(4) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the freight forwarder, and not after.

"(5) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for service in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(6) The provisions of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1070) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 110) to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS OF ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 213) to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability

or death in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training was announced as next in order.

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

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

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the bill proposes exactly what the title says, to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training. It also includes the National Guard.

The thought behind the bill is that we must build up the Reserve if we ever intend to decrease the expense of our Regular Military Establishment. Up to date the young men who are serving in the Reserve, training for periods of less than 30 days, have not been permitted full coverage for disabilities incurred because of accidents or otherwise. It seems to me that they should be given the same consideration as those who are training for periods longer than 30 days.

In short, the bill proposes to give the same disability coverage to reservists and national guardists injured or killed while serving their country in peacetime as the Regulars now enjoy. Under present law they are not accorded the same protection that Regulars receive unless they are on active-duty orders for more than 30 days.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Maine.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "perform", to insert "active duty for training or"; in line 13, after the word "compensation", to insert "death gratuity"; and after the word "pay", to strike out "and"; in line 14, after the word "benefits", to insert "and pay and allowances"; and in line 21, to strike out "United States Employees' Compensation Commission", and insert "Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency"; on page 3, in line 2, after the word "receive", to strike out the colon and the words "Provided further, That this section shall be effective from September 8, 1939"; in line 10, after "United States", to insert "or the Air Force of the United States"; in line 12, after "Army", to insert "or the Regular Air Force"; in line 16, after "days", to strike out "(other than for service with the Civilian Conservation Corps)"; and in line 21, after the word "perform", to insert "active duty for training or"; on page 4, in line 2, after the word "compensation", to insert "death gratuity"; in line 3, after the word "pay", to strike out "and"; and after the word "benefits", to insert "and pay and allowances"; in line 4, after the word "law", to insert "or regulation"; in line 6, after the word "Army", to insert

"or the Regular Air Force"; beginning in line 8, to strike out:

Sec. 3. The amendments made by the preceding sections of this act shall take effect as of August 14, 1945. No back pay, pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall be held to have accrued as a result of the enactment of this act prior to the date on which it is enacted.

And insert:

SEC. 3. All officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, the federally recognized National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia—

(1) if engaged for periods in excess of 30 days in any type of training or active duty under section 5, 81, 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so engaged; or

(2) if engaged for any period of time in any type of training or active duty under such sections of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed, shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army.

Sec. 4. The provisions of this act shall be effective from August 14, 1945, but no back pay, pension, compensation, death gratuity, or retirement pay shall be held to have accrued as the result of the enactment of this act for any period prior to such date: *Provided*, That in the case of persons electing to receive the benefits of this act, the amount of any monetary benefits received for any period subsequent to August 14, 1945, under any provisions of law providing benefits for disability or death incident to the service described in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act, shall be deducted from the monetary benefits provided for herein.

Sec. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any benefits to which he was entitled prior to its enactment.

Sec. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 855c-1), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. All officers, nurses, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the United States Naval Reserve or United States Marine Corps Reserve, who—

(1) if called or ordered into active naval or military service by the Federal Government for extended naval or military service in excess of 30 days, suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so employed; or

(2) if called or ordered by the Federal Government to active naval or military service or to perform active duty for training or inactive-duty training for any period of time, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed;

shall be deemed to have been in the active naval service during such period, and they or their beneficiaries shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps: *Provided*, That if a person who is eligible for

the benefits prescribed by this act be also eligible for pension under the provisions of the act of June 23, 1937 (50 Stat. 305); compensation from the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, under the provisions of section 304 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1181) or retired pay under the provision of section 310 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1183), he shall elect which benefit he shall receive."

Sec. 2. The last proviso to section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress," approved April 3, 1939, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States, or the Air Force of the United States, other than the officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, or the Regular Air Force who—

(1) if called or ordered into the active military service by the Federal Government for extended military service in excess of 30 days suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so employed; or

(2) if called or ordered by the Federal Government to active military service or to perform active duty for training or inactive-duty training for any period of time, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed,

shall be deemed to have been in the active military service during such period and shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force."

Sec. 3. All officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States, both ground and air, the federally recognized National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia—

(1) if engaged for periods in excess of 30 days in any type of training or active duty under section 5, 81, 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease while so engaged; or

(2) if engaged for any period of time in any type of training or active duty under such sections of the National Defense Act, as amended, suffer disability or death in line of duty from injury while so employed, shall be in all respects entitled to receive the same pensions, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be provided by law or regulation for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army.

Sec. 4. The provisions of this act shall be effective from August 14, 1945, but no back pay, pension, compensation, death gratuity, or retirement pay shall be held to have accrued as the result of the enactment of this act for any period prior to such date: *Provided*, That in the case of persons electing to receive the benefits of this act, the amount of any monetary benefits received for any period subsequent to August 14, 1945, under any provisions of law providing benefits for disability or death incident to the service described in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act, shall be deducted from the monetary benefits provided for herein.

Sec. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any benefits to which he was entitled prior to its enactment.

Sec. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

REFORESTATION AND REVEGETATION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this joint resolution follows a series of recommendations by congressional committees and by others in regard to reforestation and replanting of sections of the public range.

Two years ago an investigation was conducted by the Barrett committee of the House of Representatives. It visited a number of the western areas that complained that the stockmen were having their grazing areas reduced, and suggested that that would not be necessary if the Department of Agriculture would undertake a replanting program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two tables, one showing the acreage of planting in each State, and the other showing the amount of revegetation which is proposed.

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

Initial planting program¹ on national-forest lands by States (as of March 1949)

State	Non-stocked land	Under-stocked land	Total
	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Alabama.....	60,000	10,000	70,000
Arizona.....	13,000		13,000
Arkansas.....	35,000	5,000	40,000
California.....	314,000	271,000	585,000
Colorado.....	70,000	8,000	78,000
Florida.....	80,000	6,000	86,000
Georgia.....	1,500		1,500
Idaho.....	466,000	20,000	476,000
Illinois.....	12,000	2,000	14,000
Indiana.....	10,000		10,000
Kentucky.....	10,000		10,000
Louisiana.....	10,000	6,000	16,000
Michigan.....	510,000	180,000	690,000
Minnesota.....	175,000	190,000	365,000
Mississippi.....	155,000	17,000	172,000
Missouri.....	25,000	17,000	42,000
Montana.....	90,000	5,000	95,000
Nebraska.....	9,000		9,000
Nevada.....	15,000		15,000
New Hampshire.....	2,000		2,000
New Mexico.....	115,000	5,000	120,000
North Carolina.....	10,000	5,000	15,000
Ohio.....	10,000	1,000	11,000
Oregon.....	310,000	220,000	530,000
Pennsylvania.....	45,000	6,000	51,000
South Carolina.....	15,000	6,000	21,000
South Dakota.....	30,000	3,000	33,000
Tennessee.....	5,000		5,000
Texas.....	10,000	17,000	27,000
Utah.....	10,000		10,000
Vermont.....	1,000	1,000	2,000
Washington.....	135,000	70,000	205,000
West Virginia.....	12,000	1,000	13,000
Wisconsin.....	165,000	95,000	260,000
Wyoming.....	1,500		1,500
Virginia.....	1,000	6,000	7,000
Total.....	2,938,000	1,173,000	4,111,000

¹ Includes both areas to be planted and areas to be seeded to tree species.

State:	Acres
Arizona.....	100,000
California.....	250,000
Colorado.....	450,000
Idaho.....	526,000
Montana.....	100,000
Nevada.....	600,000
New Mexico.....	250,000
Oregon.....	280,000
South Dakota.....	10,000
Utah.....	1,169,000
Washington.....	65,000
Wyoming.....	200,000
Total.....	4,000,000

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, my hope is that this authority may be granted, and then the whole matter may be considered by the Appropriations Committee, and funds may then be made available in such amounts as the Congress may determine.

But I believe it is important to start now in the replanting of our forests. During the wartime period we harvested timber 50 percent faster than it was grown; and if that process is not reversed, we shall soon have exhausted our supply of timber.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of the purpose, but I am interested to know the amount of the authorization proposed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Three million dollars is proposed for the first year, and then there would be gradually increasing amounts, until finally a rather substantial sum would be reached. It would be \$5,000,000 in the second year, \$7,000,000 in the third year, \$8,000,000 in the fourth year, and thereafter \$10,000,000 a year for a long period; but all those are thus far merely proposed authorizations; and appropriations would be required, of course.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many trees does the Senator anticipate will be planted during the first year for which the \$3,000,000 expenditure will be made, if such appropriation is actually made?

Mr. ANDERSON. I cannot answer the question, because the difference in costs of plantation as between various areas is substantial. But I have already had inserted in the RECORD a list of the various States and the amount of acreage in each State. The total is somewhat in excess of 4,000,000 acres, and nearly every State in the Union is affected.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That it is the declared policy of the Congress to accelerate and provide a continuing basis for the needed reforestation and revegetation of national-forest lands and other lands under administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture in order to obtain the benefits hereinbefore enumerated.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution on national-forest lands and other lands under the administration or control of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, in-

cluding the acquisition of land or interests therein for nurseries, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to remain available until December 31 of the ensuing fiscal year, \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for reforestation; and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; \$1,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; a like amount for each subsequent year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and thereafter such amounts as may be needed for range revegetation.

The preamble was agreed to.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN ROBINSON REMOUNT STATION, NEBR.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 314) authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a brief comment on the bill, which I hope will be discussed by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

This bill presents a difficulty in respect to an important matter of policy which I think should be considered by the Senate in connection with the question of disposing of property belonging to all the people of the United States for the benefit of a group in a particular locality.

As I read the report on the bill, what it amounts to, when we get down to its very essence, is that it is proposed that approximately 43 acres of land be given to the citizens of Crawford, Nebr., for public park purposes. I am at a loss to understand why all the people of the United States should donate a park to Crawford, Nebr. The record in this case shows that there is involved the question of an easement for a water main; and I certainly think the people of Crawford, Nebr., should have that easement. I think the record also shows that certain park improvements have been made by the people of Crawford, Nebr., because over the years they have been making use of these 43 acres for park purposes.

I should like to accommodate the Senators from Nebraska; but, so far as I am concerned, as in the last session of Congress, I think we must call a halt to giving away Federal property for the benefit of people in local communities, without their paying a reasonable or fair price for the benefit received.

I would much prefer this bill if it provided that the people of Crawford, Nebr., should pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the 43 acres of land.

Of course this bill involves a rather small item; but some time ago the Senators from Michigan encountered the same difficulty with respect to Fort Wayne; the Senators from Massachu-

setts ran into a similar difficulty in respect to a park in Massachusetts, and the Senators from Minnesota ran into the same difficulty in respect to certain property wanted by the University of Minnesota Medical School. Certainly we should follow a consistent principle in regard to all these matters; and I have not been shown to date that in such proposals as these an equitable solution would not be to have the citizens involved pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property.

So, Mr. President, subject to the right of the Senator from Nebraska to reply to this point, I wish to object.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, and I further wish to say that I am very sympathetic with him in regard to a general proviso that towns or municipalities or other groups which receive Federal property should pay something for it.

In this case, this particular piece of land was put under a revocable lease some 23 or 25 years ago. I suppose the land was then worth not more than \$5 an acre. Since then it has been improved by the people of the city of Crawford, so that it has provided public park services, not only to the people of Crawford and their community, but also to the persons living in the remount station grounds. At times hundreds of such persons enjoyed the benefits.

The land was made into a park. It is not a residential part of the city at all; it is a playground or recreation area. At the present time there is a concrete stadium there, for which the people of Crawford have paid.

In view of the free services on the part of the people of Crawford to the people attached to the remount station, who are our servants, I think the people of Crawford have paid a considerable amount for this small tract of 43 acres, which is a part of some 15,000 or 20,000 acres of the remount station.

I have given the distinguished Senator from Oregon the other facts pertaining to the matter. The bill was passed in the Eightieth Congress, but it reached the House of Representatives too late for action there before the end of the session. That is why the bill has not been enacted before now.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the bill is in need of amendment; therefore I object at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill is passed over.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, may I have the understanding that we will try to bring up the bill at the close of the calendar call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot have any understanding about it.

Mr. BUTLER. I make a motion to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the next bill.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or

obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF POMONA STATION OF AGRICULTURE REMOUNT SERVICE

The bill (S. 969) to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is their objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I correct in my understanding that we are now on Calendar 84, Senate bill 969?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If I may inquire, can the Senator from Oregon tell us whether consideration of this bill also is objected to on the same basis as the objection to the bill relative to Crawford, Nebr.?

Mr. MORSE. No. Mr. President, I have gone into this bill, and it is a good example of the distinction in principle to which I have heretofore alluded. In this case all the bill proposes to do is to return to the Kellogg Foundation the property which they sought to turn over and did turn over to the Federal Government for a particular use. The Federal Government no longer desiring the property for that purpose, I think it is perfectly proper to return the property to the Kellogg Foundation. It is not a case of giving away property that belongs to all the people of the United States, but rather returning property turned over to the Government for a particular use which the Government no longer wants to make use of. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "California", to strike out ", which was conveyed to the United States acting through the War Department (now Department of the Army) by W. K. Kellogg", and insert "which tract, originally in the ownership of W. K. Kellogg, was conveyed to the United States acting through the War Department (now Department of the Army)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Inc., without cost, the real property, comprising 812 acres, more or less, of the Agriculture Remount Station at Pomona, Calif., which was conveyed to the United States acting through the War Department (now Department of the Army) by W. K. Kellogg and subsequently transferred to the Department of Agriculture pursuant to the act of April 21, 1948 (62 Stat. 197), and such of the personal property of this station as may be agreed upon, in writing, by the Secretary of Agriculture and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Inc.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ADMINISTRATION OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2663) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill. This is a very important bill to those who are identified with the Central Intelligence Agency. In modern times it is necessary to assemble all the information that can be obtained concerning our own national security and its relationship to the national security of other countries. All governments—we might as well be frank about it—utilize every reasonable agency they can to assemble desirable information concerning the activities of other governments. Sometimes in some countries men who are engaged in trying to find out what is going on lose their lives. They are caught, held as spies, and liquidated. They are never heard of again. The bill does not provide for any new activity. What it does particularly is to seek to safeguard information procured by agents of the Government so that it will not fall into the hands of enemy countries or potential enemy countries who would use the information to discover who the agents were, and kill them.

To my certain knowledge, in a certain area, not many years ago three good Americans who were trying to serve their Government by finding out whether the intentions of another government were strictly honorable were liquidated. The men were detected and killed. What the bill does is to seek to keep their names and identities out of the normal accounting channels, so that they cannot be picked up through the promiscuous dissemination of information. That is the principal point in the bill.

I shall not ask for its immediate consideration. I know there are some Senators, one of whom is my good friend and colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, who wants more time to look into it. But I wanted to make this brief explanation, so that Senators would have in mind what is in the bill as they consider it and read it in the future. I shall be very glad to yield, within the time limit that is left to me, to answer, if I can, any question any Senator may desire to raise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over, then.

DISCLOSURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES CODES, ETC.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 277) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communications intelligence activities of the United States was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in order to get an answer on the record, I may say that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] explained to the Senator from

Michigan that the words "lawful demands," do not mean that a subpoena by Congress will be necessary in order to obtain information for congressional committees, either of the Senate or House, or joint committees. Will the Senator from Texas make a statement to that effect for the record?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Michigan has correctly stated the meaning.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator object?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over. I should also like to have the same statement made following the objection raised by me to Calendar 71, Senate bill 1070.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 900) to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. By request, I object.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Massachusetts will withhold the objection for a moment?

Mr. LODGE. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma I am making objection at the request of a colleague who cannot be present today. I, myself, have no interest in the matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, essentially the bill contains but two provisions. One is a reference to the board personnel. The second is a reference to broadening the powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I understand there are objections to the personnel of the board as proposed in the bill. It is not necessary, in my opinion, to consider the second objective, which is to give the Commodity Credit Corporation power to acquire property by gift, lease, or otherwise for the construction of storage facilities. In order to secure action on the bill if the objection runs to the first feature, the personnel of the board, I should be willing, as author of the bill in part, to waive that feature in order to have the second part enacted into law.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to the Senator I, myself, have no knowledge of the bill. My colleague is necessarily absent today, and I suggest that it go over until his return, which will be very soon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection the bill will be passed over.

FEDERAL HOUSING IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 851) to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not know which Senator raised objection, but I hope he will reserve the right to object, in order that I may offer an explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not heard any Senator object. The Chair recognized the Senator from Washington. But if a Senator wishes to be recognized in order to object, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask for information about the bill. I wanted to have an explanation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Utah that my colleague and myself are quite anxious that the bill be not passed over, for the reason that there is an explanation for it, and a further more compelling reason, that the season in Alaska for housing construction is very short, and unless the bill can be passed, the whole season will be lost, particularly in the northern area of Alaska.

Mr. WATKINS. What does the bill seek to do?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill proposes a certain housing code applicable to Alaskan construction, which is of a peculiar character. It creates a different set of rules and regulations, whereby the Federal Housing Authority may operate in Alaska. I am sure my colleague could furnish the Senator from Utah the details. I hope there will be no objection, because it is important that the bill be considered promptly, by reason of the shortness of the season in Alaska.

Mr. WATKINS. There may be no objection, when we know what it is all about.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to say, very briefly, to my friend the Senator from Utah and all other Senators, that the bill which is before us presumes to accomplish four objectives. First, the Federal Housing Authority may increase by one-third the dollar amount limitation for insuring mortgages in Alaska.

Second, the powers of Federal National Mortgage Association are broadened and liberalized in two ways:

A. Direct loans can be made if such loans are insured by FHA.

B. Loans may be purchased in excess of the statutory \$10,000 ceiling, and more than 50 percent of the mortgages held by any mortgagee can be purchased.

Third, the Alaskan Housing Authority, with the consent of the Alaska Legislature, is permitted to make loans for either sale or rental housing. It is also permitted to make small or character loans.

Fourth, the FNMA would have the power to purchase from the Alaska Housing Authority, notes up to \$15,000,000. These notes are interest-bearing and would have a 40-year maturity.

The reason the bill was favorably considered by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency is that circumstances and conditions pertaining to Alaska will not be found anywhere else under the American flag.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Was the report of the committee unanimous?

Mr. CAIN. I think the report of the committee was unanimous. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a member of the committee, can speak with better authority than can I.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield, I will say that the report of the Banking and Currency Committee was unanimous. I may add that the House Committee on Banking and Currency has likewise reported a similar bill, and I believe it is scheduled on the calendar today.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That report was also unanimous.

This bill involves a problem of health in Alaska. The Eskimos are being rapidly wiped out because of tuberculosis. The disease was introduced by the white man, and research has developed the fact the disease is increasing because of the camp and igloo conditions, and their summer housing. The bill would allow the Alaskan Housing Authority to make small character loans to the extent of from \$100 to \$200 to the Eskimos, who fish in the summer and have money at that time, so that they may build floors in their camps and tents. It is thought that in that way we can stop the spread of tuberculosis among the Eskimos and the Aleutian Indians, who are rapidly disappearing. The housing situation in Alaska is very acute, and we hope to get started this year. I hope the Senate will pass the bill. As has been pointed out, it has the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask whether the bill has the personal approval of the junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. In response to the proper and direct question from my colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey, "Does the junior Senator from Washington personally endorse this bill?" My answer is a most positive "Yes."

This bill, S. 851, permits of mortgage-lending procedures by both the Federal Housing Authority and the Federal National Mortgage Association with which I thoroughly disapprove. Those procedures are excessive loan limitations and direct equity loans. I retreat from these objectionable practices only for the compelling reason that this legislation pertains to Alaska, not the continental United States.

Needs for housing, both for sale and rental are desperately needed there. Lending agencies up there are few. Private builders are unable to finance houses they desire to create. Building loans are

unattractive to lenders, who can readily make other types of loans at interest rates up to 8 percent. Building costs are from 35 to 100 percent higher than in the Pacific Northwest. The building season is short. Transportation of needed materials from the States is and has been subjected to disastrous maritime interruptions which add to the costs. It is for these inescapable factors that I, in this legislation, approve those lending procedures that I shall sturdily oppose within continental United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in view of the explanation, I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 851) to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "That (a) title II of the National Housing Act, as amended," and to insert "That this act may be cited as the 'Alaska Housing Act'"; on page 1, line 5, to insert "Sec. 2. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended"; on page 2, lines 3 and 4, to strike out "title II and title VI of"; in line 7, to strike out "said titles" and insert "this"; in line 12, to strike out "(b) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, or any other law, the Alaska", and to insert:

No mortgage with respect to a project or property in Alaska shall be accepted for insurance under this act unless the Commissioner finds that the project or property is an acceptable risk, giving consideration to the acute housing shortage in Alaska: *Provided*, That any such mortgage may be insured or accepted for insurance without regard to any requirement in any other section of this act that the Commissioner find the project or property to be economically sound or an acceptable risk. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act or any other law, the Alaska.

On page 2, line 25, and on page 3, beginning with line 1, to strike out "mortgage insurance under the provisions of titles II and VI of said act; and paragraph (A) of the proviso of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not apply to any mortgage offered, for purchase, to the Federal National Mortgage Association by, or if it covers property held by, the Alaska Housing Authority or any Federal, Territorial, or municipal instrumentality in Alaska," and insert "mortgage insurance under the provisions of this act. Upon application by the mortgagee, where the Alaska Housing Authority is the mortgagor or mortgagee, for the insurance of a mortgage under any provisions of this act, the Commissioner is authorized to insure the mortgage (including advances thereon where otherwise authorized), and to make commitments for the insuring of any such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon, under

such provisions (and this section) without regard to any requirement that the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property or shall have paid a prescribed amount on account of such property."

On page 3, line 20, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; on page 4, line 2, to strike out "title III of"; beginning in line 4, to strike out "unless enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Federal National Mortgage Association shall be authorized to make real-estate loans, including advances thereon during construction, secured by property located in Alaska if such loans or advances are insured under any of the provisions of title II or title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended" and insert "unless enacted expressly in limitation hereof, any mortgage loans, or partial interests therein, may be offered to the Federal National Mortgage Association for purchase, and the association shall be authorized to make real-estate loans, including advances thereon during construction, if such loans or advances are secured by property located in Alaska and insured under any of the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended."

On the same page, line 18, to strike out "2" and insert "3"; at the beginning of line 24, to insert "other", and in line 25, after the word "for", to strike out "other"; on page 5, beginning in line 8, after the word "investment", to insert: "and the legislature of that Territory may authorize said authority to make character loans to individuals or cooperatives for the improvement, conversion, or construction of dwellings in remote areas to be occupied by such individuals or members of such cooperatives where the loan does not exceed \$500 per dwelling."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this public housing?

Mr. CAIN. The bill, in itself, has nothing whatsoever to do with the question of subsidized low-rent housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 4, after the word "interest", to insert:

And provided further, That such Authority shall exercise its powers under this section to encourage and assist the production, at lower costs, of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life, and the development of well planned residential neighborhoods. Any law enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska which, except for its enactment prior to the enactment of this act, would be authorized under this section, is hereby authorized, approved, and validated.

In lines 15 and 16, to strike out "projects for the construction and sale or rental of dwelling accommodations, or of making loans for such projects, the", and insert "and administering projects or of making loans pursuant to any authority conferred by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska under subsection (a) of this section, the."

On page 7, beginning in line 2, to insert:

Provided, That such notes and other obligations issued and outstanding for the purpose of making character loans to individuals or cooperatives shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

Beginning in line 16, to strike out:

(c) The Governor of Alaska shall make an annual report to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, for transmission to the Congress, for each fiscal year, ending on June 30, with respect to activities pursuant to the authorization provided in this section.

And insert:

(c) The Alaska Housing Authority shall make an annual report to the Governor of Alaska on all of the activities of the Authority, for each fiscal year ending June 30, for transmission with his comments and recommendations to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

On page 8, beginning in line 11, to strike out "section, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Administrator and the Alaska Housing Authority under this section (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress for the administrative expenses of the Administrator and the Alaska Housing Authority in connection with the performance of such functions" and insert: "section. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this section, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the making of loans or advances of funds and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government."

On pages 9 and 10, to strike out section 3 as follows:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, the Federal Housing Commissioner is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure or to make commitments to insure under section 207 of title II, or section 603 or section 608 of title VI, of said act, as amended, any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Alaska Housing Authority of any housing constructed or acquired by it under the authorization provided in this act (including any property acquired, held, or constructed in connection with such housing or to serve the inhabitants thereof, without regard to—

(1) any limit as to the time when any mortgage may be insured under said title VI;

(2) any limit as to the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under said title VI, but the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under title VI pursuant to this section shall not exceed \$30,000,000;

(3) any requirement that the obligation be approved for mortgage insurance prior to the

beginning of construction or that the construction be new construction;

(4) any of the provisions of the first sentence of section 207 (c) or section 603 (b) (2) or section 608 (b) (5) or paragraphs (B) and (C) of the first sentence of section 608 (b) (3):

Provided, That such mortgage shall otherwise be eligible for insurance under section 207 or section 603 or section 608, as the case may be, and involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Commissioner shall approve) in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the appraised value of the mortgage property as determined by the Commissioner: *And provided further*, That any such mortgage insured under section 603 shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges) at not to exceed 5 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time.

On page 11, line 5, after the word "reserved", to insert "(in whole or in part)".

On the same page, after line 10, to insert new section 6, as follows:

SEC. 6. Any executive department or agency of the Federal Government is hereby authorized to sell, transfer, and convey to the Alaska Housing Authority at fair value (as determined by such department or agency), for use under this act, all or any right, title, and interest in any real or personal property under the jurisdiction of such department or agency which it determines to be in excess of its own requirements, notwithstanding any limitations or requirements of law with respect to the use or disposition of such property: *Provided*, That the authority conferred by this section shall be in addition to and not in derogation of any other powers and authorities of such department or agency.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Washington. After all the striking out and the insertion of other language, do we now have a bill which helps public housing, and does it differ generally from what is being done in continental United States?

Mr. CAIN. The bill, as amended, has nothing whatsoever to do with the question of public housing. The bill, in its amended form, has to do with the liberalizing of procedures which are presently followed by "Fanny May" and the FHA, within the continental United States; it gives to the Alaska Housing Authority the right to extend loans for rental and sale housing construction, which right the Authority does not now have; and it permits the HHFA to purchase up to \$15,000,000 of the notes of the Authority which are interest-bearing and repayable in 40 years. The amended bill does these things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Alaska Housing Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 214. If the Federal Housing Commissioner finds that, because of higher costs prevailing in the Territory of Alaska, it is not

feasible to construct dwellings on property located in Alaska without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, or livability, within the limitations as to maximum mortgage amounts provided in this act, the Commissioner may, by regulations or otherwise, prescribe, with respect to dollar amount, a higher maximum for the principal obligation of mortgages insured under this act covering property located in Alaska, in such amounts as he shall find necessary to compensate for such higher costs but not to exceed, in any event, the maximum otherwise applicable by more than one-third thereof."

No mortgage with respect to a project or property in Alaska shall be accepted for insurance under this act unless the Commissioner finds that the project or property is an acceptable risk, giving consideration to the acute housing shortage in Alaska: *Provided*, That any such mortgage may be insured or accepted for insurance without regard to any requirement in any other section of this act that the Commissioner finds the project or property to be economically sound or an acceptable risk. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act or any other law, the Alaska Housing Authority shall be eligible as mortgagor or mortgagee, as the case may be, for any of the purposes of mortgage insurance under the provisions of this act. Upon application by the mortgagee, where the Alaska Housing Authority is the mortgagor or mortgagee, for the insurance of a mortgage under any provisions of this act, the Commissioner is authorized to insure the mortgage (including advances thereon where otherwise authorized), and to make commitments for the insuring of any such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon, under such provisions (and this section) without regard to any requirement that the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property or shall have paid a prescribed amount on account of such property.

(b) The powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association, and of any other Federal corporation on other Federal agency heretofore or hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with properties or projects in Alaska designed principally for residential use; and, notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 301 of the National Housing Act, as heretofore or hereafter amended, or of any other law unless enacted expressly in limitation hereof, any mortgage loans, or partial interests therein, may be offered to the Federal National Mortgage Association for purchase, and the Association shall be authorized to make real-estate loans, including advances thereon during construction, if such loans or advances are secured by property located in Alaska and insured under any of the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to relieve the particularly severe impact of the housing shortage in Alaska, the legislature of that Territory may authorize the Alaska Housing Authority, in addition to the housing projects undertaken pursuant to the provisions of the Act of July 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 601; 48 U. S. C., secs. 481-483), as amended, also to undertake other projects for the construction and sale or rental of dwelling accommodations for inhabitants of the Territory, and to make loans for such projects to public agencies, or private nonprofit or limited dividend corporations, or private corporations which are regulated or restricted by the Authority (until the termination of all loan obligations to it) as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation to such an extent and in such manner as to provide reasonable rentals to tenants and a

reasonable return on the investment, and the legislature of that Territory may authorize said authority to make character loans to individuals or cooperatives for the improvement, conversion or construction of dwellings in remote areas to be occupied by such individuals or members of such cooperatives where the loan does not exceed \$500 per dwelling, and any powers of said Authority, including but not limited to powers of eminent domain and issuance of bonds and obligations, with respect to projects undertaken pursuant to the provisions of said act of July 21, 1941, may be made available with respect to projects undertaken pursuant to the authorization provided in this section: *Provided*, That the authorization provided in this section shall be limited to projects where adequate financing on reasonable terms and conditions, or entrepreneurial sponsorship, or both, as the case may be, is not otherwise available: *And provided further*, That any projects constructed and owned by such Authority pursuant to the authorization provided in this section shall be sold for cash or on reasonable terms and giving consideration to full market value, as promptly as may be advantageous under the circumstances and in the public interest: *And provided further*, That such Authority shall exercise its powers under this section to encourage and assist the production, at lower costs, of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life, and the development of well planned residential neighborhoods. Any law enacted by the legislature of the Territory of Alaska which, except for its enactment prior to the enactment of this act, would be authorized under this section, is hereby authorized, and approved, and validated.

(b) To obtain funds for the purpose of undertaking and administering projects or of making loans pursuant to any authority conferred by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska under subsection (a) of this section, the Alaska Housing Authority may, on and after the effective date of this act, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes or other obligations for purchase by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in an amount not to exceed \$15,000,000 and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby authorized to purchase such notes or other obligations to the extent that funds are available therefor: *Provided*, That such notes and other obligations issued and outstanding for the purpose of making character loans to individuals or cooperatives shall not exceed \$1,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities not exceeding 40 years, and shall be purchased under such general terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. Such notes and other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations.

(c) The Alaska Housing Authority shall make an annual report to the Governor of Alaska on all of the activities of the Authority, for each fiscal year ending June 30, for transmission with his comments and recommendations to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed \$15,000,000 for the purposes of this section. Funds made available to the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of

this section shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this section shall be available for any of the purposes of this section. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this section, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the making of loans or advances of funds and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

SEC. 4. The Housing and Home Finance Agency is authorized to provide technical advice and information and otherwise to cooperate to the full extent authorized by law to assist the Alaska Housing Authority in the program to relieve the severe shortage of housing in the Territory.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 4 and 301 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, with respect to the disposition of housing of a permanent character, any such housing in Alaska under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator which has been reserved (in whole or in part), prior to the enactment of this act, for employees of an agency of the Federal Government may be retained by him for employees of that agency for such time as he determines such action necessary to provide adequate housing accommodations for them in the area.

SEC. 6. Any executive department or agency of the Federal Government is hereby authorized to sell, transfer, and convey to the Alaska Housing Authority at fair value (as determined by such department or agency), for use under this act, all or any right, title, and interest in any real or personal property under the jurisdiction of such department or agency which it determines to be in excess of its own requirements, notwithstanding any limitations or requirements of law with respect to the use or disposition of such property: *Provided*, That the authority conferred by this section shall be in addition to and not in derogation of any other powers and authorities of such department or agency.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 498) to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JUDICIAL SALARIES IN HAWAII

The bill (S. 566) to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

DESTRUCTION OF LETTER BOXES OR MAIL

The bill (S. 1043) to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1705. Destruction of letter boxes or mail: Whoever willfully or maliciously injures, tears down, or destroys any letter box or other receptacle intended or used for the receipt or delivery of mail on any mail route, or breaks open the same, or willfully or maliciously injures, defaces, or destroys any mail deposited therein, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS

The bill (S. 1030) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, an identical bill, Calendar No. 193, House bill 779, is on the calendar, and I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if the bills are identical?

Mr. McCARRAN. They are identical, except that the title of the House bill should be amended.

Mr. GEORGE. They are identical in substance?

Mr. McCARRAN. The substance is the same.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, may we have a detailed explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill increases the time within which claims under the Tort Claims Act may be presented to Federal agencies. That is all the bill provides; it merely extends for 1 year the time for the presentation of claims under the Tort Claims Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe the Senate Judiciary Committee reported the bill with an amendment. I notice the House bill does not have an amendment. Does the amendment to the Senate bill run to the title merely?

Mr. McCARRAN. Only to the title. The Senate committee reported the bill

with a change of title. When the Senate takes up the House bill, it is the same as the Senate bill, with the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 779) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide additional time for bringing suit against the United States in the case of certain tort claims, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1030 will be indefinitely postponed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have some Senator explain the resolution. I observe that there are some four or five measures on the Calendar postponing the deportation of aliens, ranging from 10 pages of names to 16 pages of names. I should like to have some Senator explain the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Congress passed a bill during the Eightieth Congress whereby the Attorney General was permitted to suspend the deportation of certain aliens if their deportation would jeopardize the financial interests of any American corporation or person. We also required in the bill that when he suspended the deportation of any aliens, he must take affirmative action and submit the names to the Congress for their approval.

In the Committee on the Judiciary we receive several names every week, and we report them to the Senate. In other words, we are merely taking action in conformity with the bill we passed and the mandate we gave the Attorney General to submit the names to us.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to say, further, by way of explanation to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, that the Department of Justice has always had the right to suspend deportations. We put a limitation on that right of suspension, providing that the suspensions when made by the Department of Justice must be submitted to the Congress. These bills come to the Committee on the Judiciary under the Reorganization Act. The names of the suspended aliens are screened by the staff and by the Committee on the Judiciary, and in many instances we refuse to go along with the Department of Justice. For instance, in the group now

pending before the Senate, I think we eliminated about 34 or 35 names. The others, after a complete investigation, we approved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that answers the principal question I had in mind. I had some little familiarity with the basic legislation involved, but here are several hundred names of those who, under our laws, are subject to deportation, and I wanted to know whether the committee undertook to screen them, and to determine whether there was merit in the cases.

Mr. McCARRAN. We not only undertake to screen them, but we assign staff members to the work of screening, and they go into them in detail.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to hear that, because my experience in the past indicated that the Department of Justice was not too careful in dealing with these cases. I am glad to hear that the Committee on the Judiciary is screening and investigating the names.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator and to the Senate that this is one of the trying problems which was given over to the Committee on the Judiciary by the Reorganization Act. It is a perplexing problem, and one to which we give careful study at all times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was considered, and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each person hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

- A-9561344, Abrahamsen, Arne.
- A-6233871, Acriche, Leo Abravanel or Leon Acriche.
- A-5984018, Aguillo, Ofelia, or Ofelia Aguayo.
- A-9748978, Ahmed, Mustafa Ali (alias Mustafa Ali Achmed).
- A-5672802, Alter, Mollie (nee Malke Rubinstein).
- A-2457068, Aman, Eigene Vites.
- A-6195641, Amanatides, Erasmia, or Erasmia Sonikides.
- A-6655514, Anderson, Albert Lorenzo.
- A-6536080, Anjewierden, Dirk.
- A-6724309, Aranda, Miguel Angel, or Miguel Aranda or Miguel Aranda-Tarango.
- A-3882033, Arnoso, Louis Varela.
- A-6526204, Asher, Vivian Catherine (nee Jones).
- A-1862941, Atkinson, Stanley Reid.
- A-9559565, Augustinius, Jose Herman.
- A-5919879, Back, Erik Nestor Ernfrid.
- A-4024370, Bain, Zacharias, or Zechariah Bain (alias Zachirihl Bain alias Zacirihl Bain).
- A-2495593, Bank, John.
- A-7592940, Baptiste, Emma Josefina (nee Lujan Molina).
- A-4354716, Baur, Ludwig, or Ludwig Bauer.
- A-4182915, Bechara, Joseph Charles, or Joseph Bechara or Joseph Charles.
- A-2069293, Beckford, Percival.
- A-5342459, Bernier, Ann Claudine (nee De Freitas).
- A-3121501, Betz, Fred August, or Friederich August Betz or Frederick August Betz or Fred Betz.
- A-4826785, Bin, Anita (nee Toppazinni).
- A-9666533, Blom, Jan Leendert.
- A-3081497, Boffa, Luciano.
- A-5309178, Bould, James.
- A-5971012, Bousses, Nicolaos Stamatiou.
- A-9769305, Bradley, John Hubert.

- A-5991350, Brandon, Bertha Emily (nee Field).
- A-1278361, Burrows, John James (alias Jack Burrows).
- A-6489021, Campbell, Alexander.
- A-2817248, Candelora, Francesca (nee Zafino).
- A-4743272, Castro, Mercedes, formerly Mercedes Alvarez (nee Mercedes Figueroa).
- A-2022520, Chang, Mo Poon.
- A-7552570, Chang, Teresa Alay.
- A-5141080, Chaves, Faustino, or Faustino Chavis or Faustino Chavez or Faustino Chavis Murillo.
- A-2229390, Chinn, Yue Gim, or Gee Yen Gim or Yem Gim Gee or Yue Gim Gee or Yu Gim Chin.
- A-2592334, Cohen, Moe Martin.
- A-1715256, Cohen, Sarah Iroff (alias Sarah Iroff alias Sally Epstein).
- A-6246598, Coltras, Marica.
- A-6303160, Contreras, Jose, or Jose Almanza Contreras.
- A-5117652, Corrao, Carlo.
- A-6069924, Cox, Silveria Pana.
- A-6663382, Cragg, George Robert.
- A-4377394, Cremades, Miguel (alias Miguel Cremades Villarroya alias Mike Valencia).
- A-4335395, Cucksey, Anna Krebs, or Nita Krebs.
- A-1164881, Daniels, Jean Rene (alias Jean Rene Francois Daniels or Gaston Carle).
- A-5668032, Darkovich, Peter Stoitche.
- A-5971753, Davis, Gladys Ovilida Gladys, or Gladys Ovilida Georges.
- A-3860479, Dedis, Pantelis John.
- A-5740896, De Flores, Reyes Valenzuela, or Reyes Valenzuela or Reyes Valenzuela Flores.
- A-4150561, De Hernandez, Josefa Torres, or Josefa Torres.
- A-2817560, Delgado, Jesus Maria.
- A-4691015, De Llaverias, Maria Catalina (nee Evertsz).
- A-2767060, De Lucero, Manuela Avina, or Manuela Avina.
- A-6063059, De Luzuriaga, Enrique Ruiz.
- A-6405944, Luzuriaga, Evelyn Patricia.
- A-6405945, Luzuriaga, Eugenio.
- A-1722409, Deneau, Harold Edward.
- A-5863272, De Saine, Adeline (nee Simpson).
- A-3802400, Di Gregorio, Paola or Pauline (nee Onorato).
- A-4840700, Domenighini, Albert, or Aurelio Domenighini.
- A-6261640, Domsosiaris, Kalliopi.
- A-6212801, Domsosiaris, Konstantinos or Konstantinos.
- A-5909782, Dos Santos, Joaquim Antonio.
- A-5982057, Doush, Joseph Harry.
- A-5296040, Doyle, Paulette Marie (nee Briand).
- A-6755401, Dumitrescu, Radu.
- A-5455559, Duncan, Yeta Rosemburz or Jetta Rosemburz De Mojica or Yeta Rosemburz De Mojica or Yeta Rosemburz.
- A-6037097, Duncanson, Wentworth Eustace.
- A-4647266, Erdos, Vincent or Vince.
- A-9651529, Eriksen, Magne, or Magne Taranger or Magne Taranger Eriksen.
- A-6053925, Ertman, Einar Leopold Konstantin.
- A-5053923, Ertman, Ellen Alice (nee Sepapan or Elll Alisa).
- A-3720405, Fantasia, Salvatore.
- A-2370108, Fantin, Teresa (nee Teresa Pagura).
- A-3329048, Fazio, Pietro (alias Peter Fazio).
- A-3788785, Fein, Anna (nee Anna Fishman).
- A-5678327, Fisch, Meschulim, or Manny Fisher.
- A-5415760, Flores, Angelina Nieto, or Angelina Nieto.
- A-5415761, Flores, Eliseo, or Raphael Trejo.
- A-1473200, Ford, Thomas Francis.
- A-1615234, Fotenos, Stamatios (alias Steve Fotenos).
- A-5180485, Fragakis, Stavros Georgiou.
- A-5541925, Fuentes, Domingo.
- A-6666532, Galindo, Maria Teresa.
- A-5238894, Gansz, Elisabeth Anna Helene or Elisabeth or Elizabeth Gansz (nee Scholz).
- A-1216334, Gargiulo, Philippo or Philip.
- A-5220833, Geffke, Fritz Herbert.
- A-9769263, Gialourakos, Nicholas John (alias Nicolaus Yialourakos or Nick Gialourakos).
- A-6211352, Gittins, Alvin Lorraine (alias Charles Gittens).
- A-6211350, Gittins, Gwendolen Mary Ellis.
- A-1500640, Gloor, Theresa, or Theresa Koller (nee Schneider).
- A-9544853, Gomes, Raul Fonseca.
- A-3767333, Gonzales, Pedro Arambula (alias Pedro Arambula alias Pedro Gonzales alias Pedro Arambula Gonsalez alias Pedro A. Gonzalez).
- A-6199843, Goodstein, Stella, or Stella Zweig (nee Esther Akselrad).
- A-6757483, Goudsmit, Jeannette, or Jeannette Smith.
- A-3007301, Graeber, Adolf Paul, or Adolf Graeber.
- A-1363182, Grant, Frank.
- A-6458400, Greaves, Gayle Louise, or Gayle Louise Schluter.
- A-4196849, Gripalos, Mabel (nee Birch).
- A-6277066, Hanvey, Evelyn Maria.
- A-2693302, Haroutunian, Constance, or Knarig Garozasian or Knarig Keyalan or Connie Haroutunian.
- A-2464397, Harrigan, Alice Mabel (nee Dickson).
- A-6239763, Hermann, Liba Pourova.
- A-4947943, Hernandez, Mario Perez (alias Mario Hernandez alias John Luis Perez Hernandez).
- A-6267143, Holness, Gloriana.
- A-4887327, Holscher, Anton Karl.
- A-4963344, Hoogestraat, Herman Johann.
- A-2766922, Hopfeld, Heyneman Herman.
- A-2271554, Horn, Elmer Harry, or Elmar A. Horn.
- A-7529293, Hsiang, Tso Ming, or Hisang Tso Ming.
- A-2486359, Hsiang, Lan Ying Hsu (nee Lan Ying or Lan Ying Hsu).
- A-4686786, Huang, I-Chen, or Huang I-Chen or Chen Huang or Huang Chen.
- A-6210416, Iriarte, Blancamadruga.
- A-6042302, Janiszewski, Zofia, or Zofia Mizera.
- A-1636675, Jimenez (de), Esperanza Margarita Moreno, or Esperanza Margarita Jimenez Moreno.
- A-3107724, John, Renee (nee Wan Lai Wong or Lal Wan Wong).
- A-2559002, Johnsen, Arnst Henry, or Arnst Johnsen.
- A-6167344, Jones, Sheldon William.
- A-7674176, Kaniel, Alte Feiga Rivka (nee Kaplan).
- A-1326265, Karaffa, Joseph.
- A-3443887, Karsch, Gustav Adolf.
- A-4602439, Karulis, Constantinos, or Gust A. Karoulis or Constantinos Caroussis.
- A-6248971, Katschl, Vasilike (nee Hassopo or Hassopis).
- A-7606490, Ke, I-Djen Ho.
- A-7606670, Ke, Ting Su.
- A-6406522, Keating, John Stanley.
- A-6193198, Kelly, Randi Erna Eleanor (nee Nagell).
- A-9573408, Kingshott, John Horace Frederick Walter, or John Kingshott.
- A-5566265, Kiss, Louls.
- A-5686338, Kiss, Mary Josephine (nee Kun).
- A-5952072, Kalmpfer, Alois, or Louis or Alois Iblitz.
- A-6576269, Kornoff, Mary Dobrinin, or Mary Dobrinin.
- A-5969606, Kraij, Gjuro Nikola (alias George Kralj).
- A-3462421, Krivec, Mike or Michael.
- A-4755227, Laakso, Jalmar Kustaa, or Gust or Gus Laakso.
- A-3136596, Leandro, Constantino.
- A-6186635, Lee Ellen Sun (nee Ai-Ling Sun).
- A-4097955, Lehman, Ludwig.
- A-5341744, Lema, Mary Juliana, or Meeri Juliana Lema (nee Lundull).
- A-7634421, Lu, Rosabel (nee Hsu).
- A-3415507, Lynch, James Patrick.
- A-2867817, Manguso, Guido (alias Guido Mancuso).
- A-9540001, Manolakakis, Theodoros Emanuel, or Theodore Emanuel Manolakakis or Theodore Antone Emanuel.
- A-5104652, Mantione, Rosario (alias Loverdi, Antonio, alias Colodio Senna alias Antonio Laverde).
- A-9517528, Marmarinos, Grigorios John, or Grigorios (Gregory) John Marmarinos.
- A-5955493, Marmoratos, Gregorio Domenico, or Gregorio Marmorato.
- A-3100503, Martinez, Ceferino, or Ceferino Martinez Garcia.
- A-3591468, Mayr, Henry, or Ferdinand Mayr.
- A-3589127, Mazelow, Lillian (alias Lily Mazelow, nee Kaplan).
- A-4076891, Mazelow, William.
- A-6405631, McCallum, Elsa.
- A-5882989, Melis, Isidoros (alias Sederis Melis or Mellis).
- A-5990876, Meraz, Jose, or Jose Meraz Andrade or Manuel Garcia or Jose Mirass or Jose Miras.
- A-6365722, Meza, Esiquito (alias Exequiel Meza).
- A-4779627, Mihalka, Artur, or Arthur M. Maroth.
- A-4561348, Milici, Joseph Catanese, or Charles Martin.
- A-5690483, Moeller, Rudolph Christian.
- A-5780774, Friederichs, Agnes, formerly Agnes Friederichs Kniffke.
- A-6098940, Molina, Margarita.
- A-6098941, Molina, Della.
- A-6098942, Molina, Graciela.
- A-6098943, Molina, Heriberto.
- A-4818638, Moller, Paul Theodor, or Paul Moller or Paul Miller.
- A-5568513, Montion, Juanita (alias Juanita Lozano or Gomez).
- A-4881272, Moore, Mary Margaret (nee Wilton, formerly Stevens).
- A-7724011, Mora (y), Manuel Ramon Garcia.
- A-3554834, Moser, Peter.
- A-3489800, Naftis, Matheos George (alias Mathaios Georgios Naftis).
- A-1686562, Nagel, Erwin.
- A-9769308, Nicola, Primo.
- A-6199844, Nieves, Delia (nee Delia Francisca Gonzalez Trigola or Delia Gonzalez y Pugula).
- A-9524302, Nielsen, Svend Aage.
- A-6444886, Niemeyer, Elzo, or Dick Niemeyer or Dick Van Hall.
- A-2824650, Onga, John Rodica, or Severino Rodica.
- A-4656663, Orshingher, Umberto Vittorio (alias Umberto Vittorio Orshingher).
- A-6171441, Pamphills, Isabella (nee Mougannis).
- A-5414747, Panariello, Pietro.
- A-2036945, Pantring, Otto Wilhelm.
- A-4908373, Pappou, Asthanasios (alias Athas Pappou or Athos Papou).
- A-22330076, Pavlis, Apostolos Paraskevas, or Charles P. Pavlis.
- A-6261580, Paykou, Alexandra nee Galluri; Kallis.
- A-6313070, Perez, Eduardo.
- A-5294203, Petroutsa, Eleftherios Panayiotou, or Edward Panayiotou Petroutsa.
- A-4866498, Philippen, Peter Joseph.
- A-5132908, Pinto, Jacinto, or Jacinto Pinto Riquermo or Victorino or Francisco Pinto.
- A-3584354, Polatos, Vasilios, or William Polatos or Polatos.
- A-6610940, Press, Doris, or Dora nee Herscovitch or Doris or Dora Hearst.
- A-6288530, Quintana-Lopez, Angel, or Antonio Lopez Quintana.
- A-1993852, Rade, John Paul.
- A-6314073, Raptou, Eleftheria Apostolou (nee Economidis).

A-520221, Rasch, Heinz.
 A-9651792, Redo, Waclaw.
 A-2933966, Reichelt, Martha Luise.
 A-5182094, Reislwig, Elsie Ruth, or Elsie Ruth Kukert.
 A-3273271, Reiter, John, or Johann Reiter.
 A-6199573, Resch, Walter.
 A-6693292, Reiger, Ingrid.
 A-6041092, Rios-Cardoza, Carmen (alias Carmen Cardoza Rios).
 A-6051086, Rios-Cuellar, Herminio (alias Herminio or Herman Cuellar Rios).
 A-6041091, Rios-Cuellar Juana (alias Juana or Jenny Cuellar Rios).
 A-6075212, Robb, Elvira (nee Camara).
 A-6624990, Rodriguez, Jesus, or Jesus Rodriguez-Hernandez.
 A-5445641, Roeben, Richard Arthur Fred-erick, or Richard Fred Roeben or Rosen.
 A-3711643, Rolla, Felice Francesco.
 A-4175237, Rollins, John.
 A-1490125, Rotondo, Giovanni or John.
 A-6088182, Rueda, William Henry or Guillermo Enrique Rueda.
 A-6083480, Rueda, Ana Maria.
 A-5899553, Rueger, Oscar, or Oskar Ruger.
 A-6220625, Sacorafas, Athanasia Constantina (nee Kapnia).
 55860/943, Salmivaara, Laina Martha Maria, or Martha Lake.
 A-5991510, Samuels, Armon, or Herman Murdock.
 A-3187740, Schilling, Franz Xaver.
 A-6243223, Schou, Svend Aage.
 A-1768899, Scombulis Panagiotis Georgian, or Peter Scombul or Panagiotis G. Scombulis.
 A-4405150, Seifer, David, or David Seifer or David Seifer Y Kiply or Kipin (alias David Sobol).
 A-6093512, Shaik, Mohammed Ismail, or Batir Uddin (Udding).
 A-4255673, Shannon, William Antonio or Conton.
 A-6436388, Shemroy, Margaret.
 A-7648407, Sjoberg, Arne Leonard Ivar, or Arne Sjoberg or Arne Leonard Sjoberg.
 A-9769913, Small, Richard John.
 A-6078132, Snodgrass, Aurelia (nee Aquino).
 A-5947407, Sodergard, Lars Verner Aaron.
 A-9552911, Sonnevill, Wilhelmus Johannes.
 A-6195011, Sotter, Despina, or Despina Soteriou.
 A-5863250, Stathopoulos, George Constantine (alias George C. Stathis).
 A-4567264, Stamatopoulos, Panagiotis George, or Peter G. Stamos.
 A-6171438, Stefanopoulos, Alexandra (nee Zervos).
 A-9502998, Svenson, Sven Bertil, or Sven Zertil or Bertil Svenson.
 A-4987710, Tachman, Louis, or Louis Leib.
 A-1916810, Tarwater, Ruth Lucille (nee Ruth Lucille Burns).
 A-4814027, Thompson, Jane Kennedy Orr or Jean.
 A-9656937, Tonseth, Einar Gerhard.
 A-3465184, Traikoff, George Atanas, or George A. Tralkoff.
 A-5997606, Tromblay, Brigidia Colango.
 A-1020274, Valensuela-Rivera, Nicolas.
 A-5953947, Vanterpool, Othelia Zephera, or Othelia Zephera Maddox.
 A-6682322, Vidana, Jose.
 A-6268881, Villeneuve, Eleanor Rose (nee Perrin).
 A-5367655, Vlattas, Philip Leonidas, or Philipas Vlattas.
 A-3317688, Vrahatis, John Leonidas.
 A-5124778, Vukmanovich, Dusan (alias Ban Bukas).
 A-3782648, Warmbold, Helen Martha, or Helen Martha Winkler, Helen Altman, Helen Martha Heckendorf.
 A-4491798, Wasmer, Joseph.
 A-6699931, Watson, Raymond.
 A-1386494, Wilkins, Ivan King.
 A-9783055, Wojcicki, Stanislaw.
 A-6178542, Yarbrough, Vera Petrovna (nee Vera Petrovna Shebleva).

A-4410248, Zaffino, Joseph or Giuseppe.
 A-2817247, Zaffino, Raffaella Maria (nee Mannella).
 A-5870857, Zane, Irene Hsu (nee Irene Kingman Hsu).
 A-6397729, Zanutelli, Giuditta, Mengoni.
 A-2554473, Zavala, Pedro Reyes, or Pedro Zavala-Reyes.
 A-4494003, Ziccardi, Kay (nee Neamonitis or Katina Neamonitis or Papalambro or Pappalombro).
 A-4782964, Zuluaga, Angel (alias Angel Zuluaga Bidasolo).

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS UNDER THE WAR CLAIMS ACT

The bill (S. 326) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the need for this proposed legislation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill extends the time within which the persons who are named in the bill may file claims with the Commission. It further extends the time within which the Commission itself is required to submit a report to the President. This Commission was created by act of Congress, but no appropriation was made for the Commission, and the Commission was not appointed, and therefore did not function. This bill extends the time within which the Commission may function.

Let me say, further, that in the deficiency appropriation bill now pending there is an item for the implementation of the Commission. If I am wrong in that, I may be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his explanation. I withdraw any objection.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1240) is amended in the following respects:

1. The last sentence of section 2 (c) is amended to read as follows: "The limit of time within which claims may be filed with the Commission shall in no event be later than March 1, 1951."

2. Section 8 (a) is amended by striking out the words "March 31, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 15, 1950."

PER CAPITA PAYMENTS TO RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The bill (H. R. 1755) to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in conformity with the new ruling announced by the Vice President of the United States, I rise to my feet and object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wonder if it would not be well to have it understood by the Senate that where there is on the Consent Calendar a joint resolution providing for amendment of the Constitution of the United States, regardless of what the amendment may be, the joint resolution should not be passed on the Consent Calendar. It seems to me to be a mistake to have a joint resolution of this kind on the Consent Calendar so that it might slip through without proper consideration. I think such a joint resolution should in some way be segregated or designated on the Consent Calendar so that it would not go through by mere consent. It is an error to have measures of this type go through by mere consent, when a vote of two-thirds of this body and of the other body is required to pass such a joint resolution.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is the deficiency appropriation bill, the unfinished business, and will be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want it understood that the bill will go to the foot of the calendar because it is the unfinished business.

COUNSEL FOR IMPOVERISHED DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL CASES

The bill (S. 1124) to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel to impoverished defendants in criminal cases in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have some explanation of the bill, and of its scope?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the bill merely provides that when there are impoverished defendants not able to employ counsel, the court may employ lawyers and order the lawyers paid at the rate of not to exceed \$25 a day for preparation and \$25 a day while in court. The bill also provides for reimbursement of expenditures. This proposed legislation is similar to that which is in effect in most States. Its purpose principally is to protect the rights of an impoverished defendant.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the provision for \$25 per day for the preparation of and trial of a case apply to all criminal offenses or only to felonies?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is within the discretion of the court. It applies, I believe, to all criminal cases. The local bar drafted the bill. I have not gone into it in as much detail as I should have. But I am now informed it applies to any criminal offense.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can see a great deal of force to the proposal if it applies to felonies, but I question the wisdom of giving an attorney \$25 to prepare a case and try a case for a defendant involving a misdemeanor, such as exceeding the speed limit, or for not having garbage removed from an alley, or some other minor offense. I shall object, and ask that the bill go over, and ask further if the Senator will not confine the scope of the bill by appropriate amendment before it comes up for consideration on the calendar again. I would have no objection to the bill if it applied only to felonies.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would it not be more desirable to have a regular public defender appointed than to have the court appoint different lawyers in individual cases who might present large bills for a considerable number of days spent in working on cases?

Mr. McCARTHY. Counsel for the District of Columbia Committee tells me that in the past a number of bills providing for a public defender have been before the Senate, but none of them have been passed. I may say that the bill is identical to legislation which is now in existence in many of the States. I think the objection the Senator from Maryland makes would be well taken if we were to assume that the court appointing a lawyer to defend an impoverished defendant would not use his discretion. I do not believe a local judge would allow an attorney \$25 a day to defend the accused person in a speeding case.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the Committee on the Judiciary has reported a bill, which I believe is on the calendar, similar to the bill under consideration, but which would apply to Federal courts throughout the United States. The bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary provides that the court may appoint counsel and pay the counsel a certain amount per diem while in court defending a felony case. The Federal courts never did provide compensation to attorneys in such cases. The result has been that if an attorney had previously been a United States district attorney, or had been an assistant in that office, and he went to court on arraignment day, he would return with about six impoverished clients. The bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary has the endorsement of all bar associations.

I may suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that, in order that the two bills may conform, the amount to be applied in the District of Columbia for preparation of a case be limited to a flat sum of \$20, and the sum of \$20 per diem for each day the attorney appears in court in the trial of a felony case. I think that will meet the approval of all bar associations and all persons who have studied the matter. The two bills would then provide that an attorney appointed by the court to defend an impoverished de-

fendant in a criminal case would be allowed a flat sum of \$20 for whatever time he spends in the preparation of the case, and \$20 for each day he appears in court defending the case.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I might say that the Senator from Washington is in error when he says that all States have laws which provide that lawyers appointed by the courts to represent impoverished defendants in criminal cases shall be compensated by the State. There are a number of States which have no such law. I shall be obliged to examine the bill before I can permit it to be passed on the unanimous consent calendar. It seems to me we would be going rather a long way if we were to provide for appointment of attorneys by the courts to defend defendants in criminal cases, in any type of case that may come before the courts. Most of us are members of the bar and try to contribute to the ethics of the bar, but there are, unfortunately, some lawyers who might string out for a period of several days a case which should be tried in 35 or 40 minutes. That might result in the development in the courts of the land of what are called filibusters, which would place a very heavy and unjust charge upon the Government.

Some of the finest representations I have ever witnessed in a courtroom have been by attorneys who were appointed by the court to defend individuals charged with crime, for which the attorneys did not receive a dime, or for which they did not have the hope of ever receiving any compensation. One of the things that has made the legal profession preeminent is the fact that an attorney who is appointed by a judge puts into the trial of the case all the skill and energy within him, for which he does not receive any fee or any substantial fee.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I probably should have said "most of the States." I think there are some 37 or 38 States which have such laws. I have forgotten the number. I suppose the courts of the District of Columbia would have to O. K. the vouchers presented by attorneys who have been appointed by the courts. I do not believe any judge would allow an attorney to string out a case merely for the purpose of obtaining \$20 a day. Most of the lawyers who are appointed by the courts are young lawyers just starting to practice. If they secure a client in a Federal or a State court, and, under appointment, are paid \$20, or \$40, that might be barely sufficient to pay the rent for a month. I hope we can get together on these bills.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to point out in connection with this bill that very often a man charged with a misdemeanor deserves and should have a proper defense in his trial, fully as much as a man charged with a felony. What the Senator from Georgia has said is very true, that one of the great services the bar associations

throughout the United States render is in coming to the defense of indigent persons charged with violating the law. I hardly know any way that this type of legislation can be handled except to leave it to the discretion of the trial judge. We cannot write a law applying to felonies, on the one hand, and another law applying to misdemeanors. It does not mean that the attorney who may be appointed will have to be paid a fee; it probably does not mean that at all, for when only a short time may be consumed in advising a defendant of his rights before the court, and seeing to it that he has his day in court, most Federal judges probably would secure the services of an attorney of the Federal bar to do that without charge.

But here in the District of Columbia, and the same statement applies throughout the United States, many trials are long-drawn-out and protracted. Many times when a lawyer is asked by the court to represent a defendant in a criminal trial he does not know how long it is going to take him. He may very well believe that the trial will only require his services in court for half a day, or for an hour; yet when he gets into the situation he finds that his client has some rights, and in order properly to protect them the case must be adequately prepared, and must be presented over a long period of time in court. I have known members of the bar to undertake the representation of indigent persons in court, when they thought the case would be finished in 1 or 2 days, but, as a matter of fact, the trial lasted as long as 30 days and even as long as 60 days. I know of one such trial which lasted 6 months. In that case the attorney representing the defendant did not get a penny for his work. After he had accepted the case he did not want to appear to be slacking up in his defense of the case. Yet he received no pay, because there was no provision for pay.

Mr. President, in the District of Columbia we have a splendid set of Federal judges. It seems to me we can well leave to their discretion the cases in which they should pay attorneys and the cases in which they should not pay attorneys. That is all the bill does. I am frank to say that I know of no way we can draft a measure of this kind and take into consideration all the various contingencies which might arise, whether the charges involve misdemeanors, serious misdemeanors, felonies, serious felonies, cases requiring the work of 1 day, or the work of 3 months or 6 months.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice the title of the bill applies only to criminal cases in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Is it not true that minor cases in the District of Columbia are tried in the municipal court?

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. The bill applies only to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOLLAND. But is it not true that in the District of Columbia minor cases, such as misdemeanor cases, are as a rule tried in the municipal court of the District of Columbia?

Mr. McGRATH. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] having objected, the bill goes over.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Maryland to withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. McCARTHY. The type of cases referred to by the Senator from Maryland, traffic violations, health violations, violations of various District ordinances, do not come before the United States district court. They are mainly tried in the municipal court. So we are not dealing with the minor cases. From my experience as a judge I am firmly convinced that proper and adequate defense cannot be provided for an indigent defendant unless provision is made for appointment and compensation of an attorney in the case.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is an additional reason why the Senator from Maryland objects.

In the first place, I see no point in having one policy for the district courts of the rest of the Nation and another policy for the district courts of the District of Columbia, which come under the same Congress. The policy should be uniform. If we are making a policy for the United States district courts generally to apply only to felonies, then it ought to apply only to felonies in the District of Columbia. Whatever the law is for the rest of the Nation, it ought to be the same for the District, neither more nor less.

The Senator from Maryland will not object if the laws of the District of Columbia are brought into consonance with the laws for the rest of the Nation, if the policy applies only to felonies. The Senator from Maryland does not believe that it is good policy to pay out public money for the defense of mere misdemeanors.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, we shall be glad to discuss this question with the Committee on the Judiciary and try to bring our bill into line, if possible, with the legislation which is proposed for the rest of the country. I ask the Senator from Maryland to be present later this afternoon or tomorrow when we discuss another bill in which we shall try to bring legislation for the District into line with legislation for the Nation as a whole. If I may, I shall quote him at that time.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. The District of Columbia rent-control legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the cases are similar. The courts of the Nation operate under uniform rules, but the rents of the Nation are not uniform. Conditions are not uniform. Crime is the same all over the Nation; but the rent equation is different with each city,

each locality, and each State. Their climates are different. In some places heat is required, and in other places it is not necessary. There is no similarity between the questions. The Senator's argument is drawing, not a red herring, but a yellow herring, across the trail.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think our 5 minutes have about expired.

In my judgment, the two situations are identical. Right and wrong are the same in all 48 States and in the District of Columbia. If a rule or regulation is right for the people in cities in the Senator's State, it is right for the people in cities in my State, and for the people in the District of Columbia.

I hope the Senator will be present when we discuss the question to which I referred a moment ago. We want to have the same rules and regulations for the area in which Senators live as we have for the area in which the constituents of Senators live.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland insists on his objection. The bill will be passed over. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN COURT ORDERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN CONNECTION WITH PAYMENT OF TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT MAINTENANCE

This bill (S. 1125) to amend section 16-415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide for the enforcement of court orders for the payment of temporary and permanent maintenance in the same manner as directed to enforce orders for permanent alimony was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That that act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1346, ch. 854, sec. 980), otherwise known as section 16-415 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1940 edition, is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever any husband shall fail or refuse to maintain his wife and minor children, if any, although able so to do, the court, on application of the wife, pendente lite and permanently, may decree that he shall pay her, periodically, such sums as would be allowed to her as pendente lite or permanent alimony in case of divorce for the maintenance of herself and the minor children, if any, committed to her care by the court, and the payment thereof may be enforced in the same manner as directed in regard to the payment of permanent alimony."

NOTICES IN CONNECTION WITH PROBATE OF WILLS IN THE DISTRICT

The bill (S. 1127) to amend sections 130 and 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the notice to be given upon a petition for probate of a will, and to the probate of such will, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 130 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act approved June 30, 1902

(title 19, sec. 301, D. C. Code, 1940), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 130. Notice of petition for probate: Upon the filing of a petition for probate of a will, notice, as hereinafter provided, shall be issued to all persons who would be entitled to or interested in the estate of the testator in case such will had not been executed to appear in said court on a date named in the notice, and to show cause why the prayer of the petition should not be granted.

"(a) Such notice may be by a citation in which the return date named is not earlier than 10 days after the filing of said petition, and which citation shall be served in the District of Columbia, by the United States marshal, or deputy marshal, not less than 5 days before the return day named in said citation.

"(b) Such notice may be by a citation in which the return date named is not earlier than 20 days after the filing of said petition, and which citation shall be served not less than 10 days before the return date named in said citation: *Provided*, That such citation may be served only on nonresidents of the District of Columbia, and upon residents of said District who have been returned 'Not to be found' under paragraph (a) of this section, and such service may be made only by a person not less than 18 years of age who is not a party to or otherwise interested in the estate of the decedent, and the return in such case must be made under oath in the District of Columbia, unless the person making the service be a sheriff or deputy sheriff, a marshal or deputy marshal, authorized to serve process where service is made, and such return must show the time and place of service.

"(c) Such notice, whenever there is proof by the petition for probate or by other affidavit that any or all of such persons, interested as aforesaid, are nonresidents of the District of Columbia, or whenever they or any of them have been returned 'Not to be found' under paragraph (a) of this section, may be by a publication in which the return date named is not less than 30 days after the date of the first appearance of the publication, and which shall be published once in each of three successive weeks in some newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia, and a copy of this published notice shall be mailed to the last-known address of each of the persons, interested as aforesaid, who is not shown to have been returned served personally under either paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) of this section. The court may by general rule prescribe the form of such notice by publication, and may order such other publication as the case may require."

SEC. 2. Section 131 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (title 19, sec. 305, D. C. Code, 1940), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 131. PROBATE.—When notice as prescribed in section 130 has been completed in any case the court shall proceed, if no caveat be filed, to take the proofs, or to consider the proofs theretofore taken, of the execution of the will. All the witnesses to such will who are within the District and competent to testify must be produced and examined, or the absence of any of them satisfactorily accounted for."

AMENDMENT OF CODE OF LAWS OF THE DISTRICT TO CONFORM TO FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

The bill (S. 1129) to amend section 16-416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to conform to the nomenclature and practice prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure was con-

sidered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the acts of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1345, ch. 854, sec. 963), and of June 30, 1902 (32 Stat. 537, ch. 1329), otherwise known as section 16-416 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1940 edition, are amended to read as follows:

"All applications for divorce or for a decree annulling a marriage shall be made by complaint to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and the proceedings thereupon shall be the same as in equity causes, except so far as otherwise herein provided."

AMENDMENT OF CODE OF LAW OF THE DISTRICT WITH RELATION TO CAVEATS TO WILLS

The bill (S. 1132) to amend section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to the time within which a caveat may be filed to a will after the will has been probated, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 137 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (title 19, sec. 309, D. C. Code, 1940), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 137. Caveat: If, upon the hearing of the application to admit a will to probate, the court shall decree that the same be admitted to probate, any person in interest may file a caveat to said will and pray that the probate thereof may be revoked at any time within 1 year after such decree."

AMENDMENT OF CODE OF LAWS OF THE DISTRICT RELATING TO DEFENSE OF UNCONTESTED ANNULMENT CASES

The bill (S. 1133) to amend section 16-418 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, to provide that an attorney be appointed by the court to defend all uncontested annulment cases was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1347, ch. 854, sec. 982), otherwise known as section 16-418 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1940 edition, is amended to read as follows:

"In all uncontested divorce or annulment cases, and in any other divorce or annulment case where the court may deem it necessary or proper, a disinterested attorney shall be assigned by the court to enter his appearance for the defendant and actively defend the cause, and such attorney shall receive such compensation for his services as the court may determine to be proper, such compensation to be paid by the parties as the court may direct."

SERVICE OF PROCESS IN THE DISTRICT ON CERTAIN AGENTS, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1123) to amend section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for service of process on agents or employees of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation, conducting a business in the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Colum-

bia with an amendment on page 2, line 21, after the word "court", to insert a colon and a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1537 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. of C. Code, 1940, title 13, sec. 103), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1537. Service on a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, and foreign corporation: In any action against a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation doing business in the District of Columbia, all process may be served on the agent of such nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation or the person doing or conducting the business of such nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation; or, in case such agent of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation is absent and cannot be found by leaving a copy at the principal place of business in the District of Columbia of such nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation; or, if there be no such place of business, by leaving the same at the place of business or residence of such agent in said District of Columbia; and such service shall be effectual to bring the nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation before the court: *Provided*, That such service of process shall be effectual to bring the nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, or organization before the court only as to suits growing out of contracts entered into or to be performed in whole or in part, in the District of Columbia, or growing out of any tort committed in the said District of Columbia.

"When a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation shall do business in the District of Columbia, without having any place of business or resident agent therein, service in the District of Columbia upon any officer or agent of such nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation shall be effectual as to suits growing out of contracts entered into or to be performed, in whole or in part, in the District of Columbia or growing out of any tort committed in the said District of Columbia.

"When a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, or organization is served in the manner provided in the foregoing provisions of this section, then notice of such service and a copy of the summons and complaint shall be sent within 10 days by registered mail, return receipt requested, by the plaintiff or his attorney, to the defendant nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, or organization, at the defendant's last known address; and the plaintiff, or his attorney, shall file with the clerk of the court in which the action is pending an affidavit of compliance herewith and, either, a return receipt purporting to be signed by the defendant or defendants, or a person qualified to receive his or their registered mail, in accordance with the rules and customs of the Post Office Department; or, if acceptance was refused by the defendant or defendants, or his or their agent, the original envelope, bearing a notation by the postal authorities that receipt was refused, and an affidavit by or on behalf of the plaintiff that notice of such mailing and refusal was sent within 10 days to the defendant or defendants by ordinary mail. The foregoing papers shall be filed within 30 days

after the return receipt or other official proof of delivery or the original envelope bearing a notation of refusal, as the case may be, is received by the plaintiff. Service of process shall be complete 10 days after such papers are filed. The court in which the action is pending may order such continuances as may be necessary to afford the defendant a reasonable opportunity to defend the action, and no judgment by default in any such action shall be granted until at least 20 days shall have elapsed after completion of service of process as hereinabove provided."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 1537 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia,' approved March 3, 1901, as amended, so as to provide for service of process on agents of a nonresident individual, partnership, association, group, organization, or foreign corporation, conducting a business in the District of Columbia."

INCREASE OF FUNERAL EXPENSE ALLOWANCE FROM DECEDENT'S ESTATE IN THE DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1130) to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from \$600 to \$1,000 which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 356 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (title 18, sec. 520, D. C. Code, 1940), lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 are amended by striking out the words "after the payment of funeral expenses according to the condition and circumstances of the deceased, not exceeding \$600" and inserting in lieu thereof "that in the payment of funeral expenses the court shall make a reasonable allowance for such funeral expenses according to the condition and circumstances of the deceased, not exceeding \$1,000."

Sec. 2. Section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act approved June 30, 1902 (title 20, sec. 605, D. C. Code, 1940), lines 5, 6, 7, and 8 are amended by striking out "\$300: *Provided*, That for special cause shown the court may make such additional allowance not exceeding \$300 as such special circumstances may warrant" and inserting in lieu the words "one thousand dollars."

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, on page 2, line 21, after the figure "\$1,000", and within the quotation marks, the word "and" has been inadvertently omitted. I therefore move to amend the committee amendment by inserting the word "and" within the quotation marks after the figure "\$1,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 21, in the committee amendment, after the figure "\$1,000", it is proposed to insert the word "and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

SETTLEMENT OF ESTATES OF DECEDENTS IN THE DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1131) to amend sections 260, 267, 309, 315, 348, 350, and 361 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide that estates of decedents being administered within the probate court may be settled at the election of the personal representative of the decedent in that court 6 months after his qualification as such personal representative, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the words "striking out the" to strike out "word 'thirty'" and insert "words 'within thirty days after the first publication'"; in line 8, after the words "in lieu thereof the" to strike out "word 'ten'" and insert "words 'within ten days after publication'"; and in line 15, after the word "title" to strike out "14" and insert "18", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 260 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the act approved June 30, 1902 (title 18, sec. 501, D. C. Code, 1940, line 11), is amended by striking out therefrom the words "one year" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "six months."

SEC. 2. Section 267 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 20, sec. 306, D. C. Code, 1940, lines 6 and 9), is amended by striking out the word "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "five" and by striking out the words "within thirty days after the first publication" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "within ten days after publication."

SEC. 3. Section 309 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 18, sec. 401, D. C. Code, 1940, line 2), is amended by striking out the words "three months" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "two months."

SEC. 4. Section 315 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 18, sec. 407, D. C. Code, 1940, line 3), is amended by striking out the words "three months" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "two months."

SEC. 5. Section 348 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 18, sec. 518, D. C. Code, 1940, lines 9, 15, and 19), is amended by striking out the words "nine months" where they appear three times in said section and inserting each time in lieu thereof the words "three months."

SEC. 6. Section 350 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 18, sec. 526, D. C. Code, 1940, lines 2 and 6), is amended by striking out the words "one year" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "six months" and by striking out the words "at least six months" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at least three months."

SEC. 7. Section 361 of said act approved March 3, 1901 (title 20, sec. 601, D. C. Code, 1940), is amended by striking the period at the end of said section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following words: "Provided, That said account may be rendered 6 months from the date of his letters."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

CONSTRUCTIVE SERVICE BY PUBLICATION IN ANNULMENT ACTIONS IN THE DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1134) to amend section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia to provide for constructive service by publication in annulment actions, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1206, ch. 854, sec. 105), otherwise known as the first paragraph of section 13-108 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1940 edition, is amended to read as follows:

And insert:

That the first paragraph of section 105 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1206, ch. 854), as amended (sec. 13-108, D. of C. Code, 1940 edition), is amended to read as follows:

And on page 2, line 1, after the word "service", to strike out "or" and insert "of", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 105 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1206, ch. 854), as amended (sec. 13-108, D. of C. Code, 1940 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"Publication may be substituted for personal service of process upon any defendant who cannot be found and who is shown by affidavit to be a nonresident, or to have been absent from the District for at least 6 months, or against the unknown heirs or devisees of deceased persons, in suits for partition, divorce, annulment, by attachment, foreclosure of mortgages and deeds of trust, the establishment of title to real estate by possession, the enforcement of mechanics' liens, and all other liens against real or personal property within the District, and in all actions at law and in equity which have for their immediate object the enforcement or establishment of any lawful right, claim, or demand to or against any real or personal property within the jurisdiction of the court:

The amendments were agreed to.

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

SETTLEMENT OF SMALL ESTATES IN THE DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1135) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to provide a family allowance and a simplified procedure in the settlement of small estates, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "any" to strike out "married", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended by adding to chapter 5 thereof a new subchapter 9 to read as follows:

"FAMILY ALLOWANCE AND ADMINISTRATION OF SMALL ESTATES"

"SEC. 394. (a) Upon the death of any person leaving a surviving spouse the said surviving

spouse shall be entitled to an allowance out of the personal estate of said decedent of the sum of \$500 for his or her use, and that of any minor children, to be paid in money or in specific property at its fair value as may be elected, and which allowance shall be exempt from any and all debts and obligations of the decedent, and subject only to payment of funeral expenses not exceeding \$200; and, if there be no surviving spouse, the surviving minor children if any there be shall be entitled to a like allowance, and which shall be payable, in the discretion of the probate court, to the person having their custody or to such other person as it shall designate, and shall be used by such person solely for said minor's care and maintenance. Said family allowance shall be in addition to the respective share or shares of the surviving spouse and children.

"(b) When any person dies, leaving a small estate consisting only of personal property of a value not in excess of \$500, and there be a surviving spouse or minor children entitled to the family allowance authorized in the preceding section, if such surviving spouse or minor children (acting through the person having their custody or a next friend) file in the probate court a petition, under oath, declaring: The time and place of decedent's death; the known next of kin; the known assets and by whom held; that petitioner has made a diligent search to discover all assets of the deceased; the amount of funeral expenses and to whom due; and that said assets do not exceed \$500 in value; the probate court, if satisfied that the allegations in the petition are true, shall pass a final order (1) declaring that no formal administration is necessary and no probate is required of any will; (2) fixing the amount of funeral expenses allowable, to whom due, and out of what property to be paid; (3) vesting title to the remainder of the property in the surviving spouse or minor children, as the case may be, in satisfaction of his, her, or their family allowance; and (4) directing the person or persons having possession of said property to pay over, transfer, and deliver the same as allotted. The probate court may also authorize in said order, or by further order, the sale of any of said property as the exigencies of the situation require.

"(c) (1) When anyone dies intestate, leaving a small estate consisting only of personal property of a value not in excess of \$500, and there be no spouse or minor children surviving, if the person entitled to be preferred in the appointment of an administrator files in the probate court a petition, under oath, declaring: The time and place of decedent's death; the known next of kin; that diligent search has been made for a will; the known creditors, together with the amount of each claim, including contingent and disputed claims; and funeral expenses; the known assets and by whom held; that petitioner has made a diligent search to discover all assets and debts of the deceased; that said assets do not exceed \$500 in value; and that there are no known legal proceedings pending in which the decedent is a party; the probate court, if satisfied that the allegations in said petition are true, shall pass a preliminary order declaring that no formal administration is necessary and instructing the petitioner to publish once in substantially the usual form notice to creditors to exhibit their claims duly authenticated, within 30 days after such notice, and which notice shall be inserted in one newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia as said court shall direct.

"(2) Whenever such a preliminary order has been passed and the notice has been published and the time provided in such notice has expired, the petitioner shall file, under oath, a statement, with the usual proof of publication attached, that the notice has been published, and that the said time has expired, and listing all then known

creditors, including contingent and disputed claims, and the amount of each claim. If satisfied that said statement is true, and after hearing and disposing of any objections filed in the probate court by anyone interested in the estate, the probate court shall pass a final order (1) directing the petitioner to pay from the estate all of said claims, in the order of priority provided by law, and (2) authorizing any person having possession of any property of the decedent's estate to transfer, pay over, and deliver the same in accordance with petitioner's directions, and (3) decreeing that, after the Register of Wills certifies upon said final order that he has seen the vouchers for the payment of said claims and is satisfied that said claims, as well as the fees hereinafter provided for, have been paid, then the remaining balance of the estate, if any, shall be vested as follows: First, in the adult surviving children equally, and, secondly, if there be no adult surviving children, then in those persons who would be entitled thereto under the statute of distributions (the share of any minor shall be payable, in the discretion of the probate court, to the person having custody or to such other person as it shall designate, to be used solely for the care and maintenance of such minor).

"(3) The probate court may also provide in its final order for sale of any property, upon such terms as it deems advisable, and for the distribution of the proceeds in accordance with its final order.

"(d) In the absence of fraud, no person who pays over, transfers, or delivers any property pursuant to the provisions of a final order entered under section 394 (b), or to the directions of a petitioner acting under authority of a final order under section 394 (c), shall be liable for the application thereof, nor shall any such person, nor any person who receives any property pursuant to the provisions of a final order entered under section 394 (b), or to the directions of a petitioner acting under authority of a final order under section 394 (c), be responsible for any claims on account of the payment, transfer, delivery, or receipt of such property; and the property distributed pursuant to a final order in either case shall be and become the absolute property of the respective distributees thereof.

"(e) No petitioner under this act shall be required to be represented by an attorney, or to give bond, nor receive any commission for performing any work or services hereunder.

"(f) The Register of Wills shall prepare, and make available, forms whereby the petition and final order under section 394 (b), and the petition, preliminary order, the statement, the final order, and the certificate of payment under section 394 (c), shall constitute in each case one connected instrument. In lieu of all other fees, costs, or charges, the Register of Wills shall receive a fee of \$5 for all services and work administered under this act, including the taking of all affidavits, plus a fee of 25 cents for each certified copy of the aforesaid instruments.

"(g) The discovery of any additional property of the decedent, after the filing of a petition in either case provided for in this act, shall be reported by the petitioner to the probate court as soon as discovered by him. The existence of said additional property shall not invalidate any proceedings under this act except when the additional property is discovered before the passage of the final order provided for, and either (1) is real estate or (2) increases the total value of the estate to more than \$500, in which case no final order shall be passed under this act and the court shall require regular administration. Where additional property is discovered after passage of the final order, if said property is entirely personal and does

not increase the value of the total estate to more than \$500, then such additional property may be distributed pursuant to a new petition under the appropriate section of this act; in all other cases such additional property may not be distributed under this act.

"(h) Any person who makes a false affidavit under this act, or who willfully violates any order of the probate court under this act or any other provision of this act, shall be liable to a fine of not exceeding \$500 for each offense.

"(i) All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act shall be, and they are hereby, repealed to the extent of such inconsistency but only to such extent.

"(j) This act shall apply to the estates of all persons dying after the date of the approval of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

INVESTIGATION OF CROP PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 36), to investigate certain matters relating to crop production and utilization.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the resolution. I should like to know why there was not included in the resolution provision for the investigation of the production and utilization of timber products, as well as grains, canes, fruits, vegetables, and livestock.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I will say in answer to the distinguished Senator that this resolution is in the identical form of the resolution under which a former subcommittee operated, which had for its purpose the investigation of the distribution and the broadened utilization of farm crops such as vegetables and grains. I know of no objection to broadening the resolution to include timber; but that was not included in the former resolution.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 25, after the word "livestock" where it occurs the first time, it is proposed to strike out "and livestock products" and insert "livestock products, and timber products."

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the production, means of production, and plans for production of all types of agricultural crops, with particular reference to the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's food, feed, and fiber production, including studies of the construction, location, management, and use of industrial plants for the processing of

various farm products. Also including studies in the field of the distribution of farm crops and the methods and costs of transferring the crops from the producer to the consumer. Also including special attention to new uses and the study and development of new uses and markets, both foreign and domestic, for farm crops, including further studies in the production, means of production, and plans for production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber, and the utilization of all natural materials for such purposes. Also including investigation of the organization or organizations now controlling or seeking to control for the future such alcohol and rubber production together with the use of patents and processes used in such manufacture whether developed or owned in whole or in part by foreign companies, corporations, individuals, or agents, and particularly to inquire into the plans and purposes and policies of our governmental agencies with reference to such utilization in the processing and production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber. And the subcommittee is specifically directed to make careful study in all fields of possible expanded use of farm production, looking to the fullest possible utilization of farm crops to prevent as far as possible the adverse impact of recurrent surpluses of farm production on our agricultural economy and on the other segments of the Nation's economic structure. For the purpose of this investigation, farm crops include grains, canes, fruits, vegetables, livestock, livestock products, and timber products.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$12,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The resolution (S. Res. 78) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ additional temporary assistants and increasing the limit of its expenditures, submitted by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina on February 28, 1949, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (e) (2) "the status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement" and subsection (e) (3) "the postal service generally, including the railway mail service and measures relating to ocean mail and pneumatic-tube service" of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized during the period beginning March 1, 1949, and ending December 31, 1949, to make such expenditures and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, clerical and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution (which shall not exceed

\$5,000) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

INVESTIGATION OF FINANCIAL CONDITION OF AIR-LINE INDUSTRY

The resolution (S. Res. 50) to investigate the financial condition of the air-line industry, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Colorado with respect to this measure, although my remarks do not exactly address themselves to it. I understand that it is the policy of the Senator from Colorado to defer action on all aviation bills. I further understand that some eight bills which have been introduced by the senior Senator from Nevada do not come under that category.

I wonder whether the Senator from Colorado has in mind taking up those eight bills soon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I say to the Senator from Nevada that it is our purpose and our plan to take up in the very near future the bills to which the Senator refers.

Mr. McCARRAN. I refer particularly to the Federal airport bills.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; they will be taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, to strike out all after the preamble and insert:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the Eighty-first Congress to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to (1) the financial stability and operational efficiency of the air-line industry; (2) all matters pertaining to the United States merchant marine; (3) all domestic land and water transportation to determine (a) whether existing conditions conform to the national transportation policy as declared in the Interstate Commerce Act, and (b) the effect of large expenditures of public moneys and private capital upon transportation charges and to what extent such expenditures are reflected in costs of production and prices to consumers; and (4) all matters relating to radio, telegraph, and telephone communications, including (a) the problems relating to American common carriers operating in the domestic and international fields, including the relationship of these problems to the national security of the United States; (b) the problems presented by requirements of international treaties and conventions in relation to such revisions as may be necessary to the Communications Act of 1934; (c) the problems arising from unprecedented demands for frequencies for such communication services as television; safety and special services, including aviation, railroads, busses, trucks, taxicabs; common-carrier uses; and industrial uses; and the policies which the Congress should adopt for the

granting of such allocations; (d) the manner in which the Federal Communications Commission exercises its licensing authority with respect to radio applications; (e) the extent to which the Federal Communications Commission examines the qualifications of applicants for licenses or renewals of licenses in order to determine that only qualified persons are licensed to operate radio stations or other licensed facilities; and (f) the extent to which the Federal Communications Commission examines the operation or proposed operation of radio stations in order to assure that such stations have been or will be operated in the public interest.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, and recommend such legislation as it may deem advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, (1) to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) 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.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$165,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was rejected.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution to investigate problems relating to the air-line industry, the United States merchant marine, domestic land and water transportation, and radio, telegraph, and telephone communications."

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS' CANTEEN SERVICE

The bill (S. 1185) to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a bill similar to this was reported during the Eightieth Congress by the Senate Finance Committee. I am not sure but what the bill then passed the Senate. However, it did not become law. The Veterans' Administration requested that the bill be reintroduced at this session of the Congress.

The bill simply would relieve the Veterans' Administration from the payment of the supervisory or administrative personnel of the Canteen Service. That is the chief purpose of the bill. Under the bill, the payment of the employees would be made out of the profits made by the Canteen Service.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs advised the committee last year that the bill was agreeable to all the veterans' organizations, and that there was no opposition to it at any point. Therefore, the bill was reported last year, and

may have passed the Senate, but it did not pass the House.

So, for the second time, the bill has been considered by the Senate Finance Committee, and has been unanimously reported.

There are one or two other features of the bill, but I have referred to its principal provision. It will save to the Veterans' Administration, out of their appropriated funds, a little more than \$1,000,000 a year. However, the Canteen Service makes a profit, and will continue to do so; and these payments will now be made out of the Canteen Service funds.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. On page 3, beginning in line 8, the wording is:

Such checks, money orders, and other similar instruments may be cashed outright or may be accepted in payment for merchandise or services, and the difference between the amount of the purchase and the amount of the tendered instrument refunded in cash.

There is some question as to whether a limitation should be placed on that authority.

Mr. GEORGE. That question did arise; but we were advised, as I now recall, by the Administrator and by the witnesses who appeared at the hearing during the last Congress, not the present Congress, that such checks were generally in small amounts, or the difference payable to the customer was a small amount, and that it had been found practicable and convenient to allow the Canteen Service to cash the checks. We were advised that there was no danger in that provision. Someone questioned it when the bill was originally introduced, I may say to the Senator. A limitation could well have been placed upon the amount; but inasmuch as these check transactions are not usually in large amounts, it was thought that there would be no danger in leaving the provision without limit.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. In the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, those amounts would be only nominal, I understand.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is true. That was understood at the time.

I may say to the Senator that the Veterans' Administration very much desires to have the bill enacted, because it will relieve it not only of the payment of a considerable amount of money, but also of quite a great deal of detail work, which the Veterans' Administration would like to get rid of.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia would object to one or two amendments to limit the amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before amendments are suggested, the question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to present some amendments; and I send them to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, in line 4, after the word "instruments", it is proposed to insert "in nominal amounts;" and in line 10, after the word "accepted", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "subject to strict administrative controls."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that those amendments apply to checks which are cashed?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes; they do.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I have no objection to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1185) which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, at the end of the bill to insert:

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the 1st day of July 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now 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, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (d) and (e) of section 2 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 888, 38 U. S. C. 13a), are amended to read as follows:

"(d) To transfer to the Service without charge, rental, or reimbursement such necessary equipment as may not be needed for other purposes, and furnish the Service such services and utilities, including light, water, and heat, as may be available and necessary for its use: *Provided,* That reasonable charges, to be determined by the Administrator, shall be paid annually by the Service for the utilities so furnished.

"(e) To employ such persons as are necessary for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Service, and to pay the salaries, wages, and expenses of all such employees from the funds of the Service. Such personnel shall be excluded from the determinations and reports required by section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U. S. C. 947), with respect to personnel ceilings. Personnel necessary for the transaction of the business of the Service at canteens, warehouses, and storage depots shall be appointed, compensated from funds of the Service, and removed by the Administrator without regard to civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided,* That such employees shall be subject to the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, the Civil Service Retirement Acts, and laws administered by the Bureau of Employees Compensation applicable to civilian employees of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 888, 38 U. S. C. 13a), is amended by adding a new subsection (k) at the end thereof as follows:

"(k) To authorize the use of funds of the Service when available, subject to such reg-

ulations as he may deem appropriate, and without regard to the provisions of sections 3639 and 3651, Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (31 U. S. C. 521, 543), for the purpose of cashing checks, money orders, and similar instruments in nominal amounts for the payment of money presented by veterans hospitalized or domiciled at hospitals and homes of the Veterans' Administration, and by other persons authorized by section 3 of this act to make purchases at canteens. Such checks, money orders, and other similar instruments may be cashed outright or may be accepted, subject to strict administrative controls, in payment for merchandise or services, and the difference between the amount of the purchase and the amount of the tendered instrument refunded in cash."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 889, 38 U. S. C. 13c), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. To finance the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Service there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such amounts as are necessary to provide for (a) the acquisition of necessary furniture, furnishings, fixtures, and equipment for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of canteens, warehouses, and storage depots; (b) stocks of merchandise and supplies for canteens and reserve stocks of same in warehouses and storage depots; (c) salaries, wages, and expenses of all employees; (d) administrative and operation expenses and premiums on fidelity bonds of employees; and (e) adequate working capital for each canteen and for the Service as a whole. Amounts heretofore or hereafter appropriated under the authority contained in this act, as amended, and all income from canteen operations become and will be administered as a revolving fund to effectuate the provisions of this act, as amended."

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the 1st day of July 1949.

CANCELLATION OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN PORT OF SEATTLE AND UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 32) 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 considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Army, acting on behalf of the United States, is hereby authorized to negotiate for and enter into an agreement for such period and on such terms and conditions as he deems advisable for the continuing use by the United States of the property on which pier 39 and its appurtenant facilities are located and that the Attorney General, or his duly authorized representative, acting on behalf of the United States, upon notification that such an agreement has been entered into, is hereby authorized and directed to execute the necessary document or documents to release and cancel that certain agreement entered into on the 31st day of December 1923 by and between the Port of Seattle, a municipal corporation, and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board, acting by and through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States for the District of Columbia, which said agreement was recorded on the 17th day of March 1924 in the office of the King County auditor

in the State of Washington under volume 54 of Chattel Mortgages, page 614, and volume 887 of Real Property Mortgages, page 448, bearing file No. 1844599.

The preamble was agreed to.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, by request, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1411) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO MOUNT HOPE CEMETERY ASSOCIATION

The bill (H. R. 1401) relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Several years ago the Congress enacted a law transferring 4,000 acres of land to the Michigan State Department of Conservation for the purpose of permitting it to carry on certain demonstrations. The transfer was made with the provision that if the land were not used for the recreational and other purposes named in the act, title should revert to the United States.

It appears that the cemetery association has a cemetery immediately adjoining a portion of this 4,000-acre tract. There is a 10-acre lot which is desired by the cemetery association. The Michigan State Department of Conservation is willing to convey it. The only question is whether the use of this land for purposes of a cemetery might be regarded as within the original grant.

The purpose of the bill is merely to grant the consent of the United States

to the transfer of these 10 acres, subject to the same conditions of reversion if the use is not made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one question. I understood the last statement of the Senator to be that even though the 10 acres is conveyed by the State of Michigan, it will be subject to the same reversionary rights of the Federal Government. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I have no trouble with this case, because it is a case of a previous conveyance. I might have had trouble with it originally, as to the original conveyance, but certainly not now, with the reversionary right of the United States protected.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Wyoming will look at the last paragraph of the bill again and see whether his last answer is correct, and whether it does not waive all reversionary interests.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right. An amendment was adopted. The last sentence is:

Any conditions providing for a reversion of title to the United States that may be contained in the conveyance of such lands by the United States to the State of Michigan are hereby released as to the lands herein authorized to be transferred.

I am sorry; I was in error in my response to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask one or two questions of the Senator from Wyoming. In the first conveyance to the State of Michigan was there any consideration on which the transfer was based?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am unable to answer the inquiry of the Senator. The Senator from Michigan may possibly have the information.

Mr. FERGUSON. The best information I have is that there was not. I think there was a reason for deleting the reversionary clause, the reason being that the land was to be used for burial purposes. After interments have been made, it would not be desirable to take the land back for Federal purposes. The idea was that it should be used permanently for burial purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is why I raised my question. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he knows whether or not the State of Michigan will get any consideration for the conveyance of the 10 acres.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My understanding is it will not. But I point out that if the bill be not approved, it makes no difference to the Government of the United States, because the land is already conveyed to the State of Michigan. It will hold the land in any event, if the grant is not made. The bill provides merely that consent be given for the conveyance of the 10 acres, to be used for cemetery purposes. I think the Senator's objection, on principle, does not go to this type of transaction.

Mr. MORSE. I grant that it looks very much like a de minimis case. But

I think the Senator from Wyoming knows that it is possible to lose a principle, too, by the accumulation of enough de minimis cases. The principle soon disappears. I may ask whether what we are doing here is not merely transferring to the State of Michigan whatever reversionary rights we may have, for the benefit of a private cemetery association.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reversion is being waived for the benefit of the cemetery association.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not object, although I do wish to issue a caution that where I find there is anything but a de minimis case involved, I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1401) relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the word "released," to insert "as to the lands herein authorized to be transferred."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO CHURNTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 164) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown elementary-school district, California, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I request an explanation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the land in the vicinity of the Shasta Dam reclamation structure in the State of California was acquired several years ago by the Bureau of Reclamation. I believe, from private sources. The Bureau of Reclamation has no use for the land. It is highly desired, however, for public-school purposes, and the effect of the bill is to transfer the title to the school district in return for a consideration to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, so we do not have to provide for a donation of public land, but an authorization to convey the title for a consideration to be fixed in accordance with the present valuation of the land by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I point out that the consideration could be 50 cents or a dollar or 1 cent. There is nothing in the proposed act anywhere, that places upon the Secretary of the Interior any obligation when fixing the fair value of the land. Again, we are dealing with a matter that is not of any great importance. But I should like to suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that he accept the following amendment:

Provided, That the school district concerned shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the United States Department of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator, if consent is granted to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 8, after the word "conclusive" it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following proviso:

Provided, That the Churntown elementary-school district of California shall pay 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the United States Department of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO THOMAS A. PICKETT

The bill (S. 392) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thomas A. Pickett, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Thomas A. Pickett, of Berkeley, Calif., a patent in fee to the following-described allotted lands situated in the State of Montana: (1) Lots 9 and 10 of section 3, the east half of section 10, the east half of the northeast quarter, and the east half of the west half of the northeast quarter of section 15, township 2 south, range 30 east, Montana principal meridian, and (2) the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 12, and the south half of the southwest quarter of section 14, township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO GEORGE PETERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 716) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Peters, which had been reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to George Peters, of Wyola, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The north half of the north half of section 29, the north half of the north half of the south half of the north half of section 29, and all of section 20, township 4 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

And insert:

That upon the filing of a written application by George Peters, Crow Indian allottee No. 1292, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell to a Crow Indian, under existing regulations, the homestead and other land of said George Peters, described as all of section 20; the north half of the north half; the north half of the north half of the south half of the north half of section 29, township 4 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing

eight hundred and forty acres, the status of such land with respect to taxability to remain unchanged.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the filing of a written application by George Peters, Crow Indian allottee No. 1292, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell to a Crow Indian, under existing regulations, the homestead and other land of said George Peters, described as all of section 20; the north half of the north half; the north half of the north half of the south half of the north half of section 29, township 4 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 840 acres, the status of such land with respect to taxability to remain unchanged.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of George Peters under existing regulations."

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this resolution brings to the attention of the Senate another of the deportation suspension measures. They come about by reason of the specific law enacted by Congress which provides that when the Department of Justice suspends deportation of any alien in the United States, it must come to Congress for approval. Both Houses of Congress consider the suspension cases. They come, however, largely to the Senate because the Senate has a staff that can be assigned to a study of the subject, while the House of Representatives does not have a staff sufficient to give proper study to it.

I draw to the attention of the Senate the fact that we are doing everything within our power to study the deportation suspension cases. Up to date we have held up approximately 10 percent of the names sent to us by the Department of Justice. I am not saying that 10 percent is to be regarded as a criterion. We may some day disapprove the whole list which is sent to us, or we may cut it down to 1 percent. But we do assign members of the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary to a careful study and screening of each case. When the report comes from the Department of Justice, we have demanded of the Department that they give us a detailed explanation of the reason for the suspension. If such detailed explanation meets with approval and seems to have nothing objectionable in it, we as a rule approve the suspension. If there is anything in it that seems questionable at all we hold it up.

I should like to have the Senate to understand how we deal with these cases, because they are numerous. Here are two resolutions, one following the other,

and a few moments ago we approved another resolution which went through the committee, dealing with suspension of deportations. I draw the matter to the attention of the Senate because it is of grave concern to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I say grave concern, because we find on investigation that there are thousands of these cases, and in all probability we shall be compelled to deal with somewhere in the neighborhood of 15,000 such cases during this year, which is a matter of grave concern to the whole Nation. But I wanted to explain to the Senate how we deal with them, why the cases are here, in order that the Senate may know, in the approval of these measures as they come along, that the Committee on the Judiciary is doing its very best to see to it that no alien is detained in this country, or his deportation suspended, unless there is good reason for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 2, to strike out "pass" and insert "favor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favor the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-5348029, Adamiszyn, Mary (nee Grazio Maria Mitola alias Mitale).
 A-4476899, Ali, Wahed Mohamed, or Mohamed Ali or Wahed or Wohaed Ali.
 A-2771648, Amezcua, Guadalupe, or Guadalupe Chavez De Samaniego.
 A-6581279, Andavazo, Felix.
 A-9728106, Andresen, Hans Kristian.
 A-6314071, Arabanos, Georgia.
 A-5007171, Arena, Francesco.
 A-6712870, Avalos, Tomasa, or Tomasa Avalos de Urquiza.
 A-6199320, Balletti, Cecelia Margaret (nee de Cruz).
 A-5431512, Bardi, Massimo, or Sam Bardi.
 A-4699363, Bevilacqua, Anna (nee Maldera).
 A-6142598, Breslin, Pacita Blanch (nee Pacita Mercedes Blanch).
 A-6240752, Bryant, Lilla Rachael (nee Weingarten or Hays).
 A-3874697, Burghen, Anna Maria (nee Andrews).
 A-6455114, Cabrales-Flores, Rafael.
 A-4374492, Cocolis, Gerassimos Demetrios.
 A-6539706, Cusenza, Violet Matilde (alias Violetta Matilde Bileci).
 A-9500533, Da Silva, Vincente St. Aubyn (alias Vincent Da Silva).
 A-6618909, De Chaldes, Olga Encinas, or Olga Encinas or Olga Encinas De Chalez.
 A-6088306, De Guzman, Manuel Fenix.
 A-6088305, De Guzman, Nancy Schaefer.
 A-6088309, De Guzman, Lillian Schaefer.
 A-2085545, De Marquez, Josefa Aguilar (VDA) (alias Josefa Aguilar De Marquez alias Josefa Aguilar).
 A-4323280, Demidovich, Mike or Michailo, or Michail Dimidovich.
 A-6336480, Eney, Richard John, or Chiang Sheng Dai.
 A-3644552, Ernest, Jean, or Jan Gluckman or Glicman.
 A-4771499, Fantuz, Richard Joseph, or Richardo Joseph Fantuz.

A-5457910, Fung, Shiu Fine, or Shiu John Fung or Shiu John.
 A-5804059, Giessler, Otto Alwin, or Otto Giessler.
 A-7738794, Gonzalez, Maria Del Carmen Uribe Echevarria.
 A-9539472, Gonzales, Heladio.
 A-6251915, Gonzalez, Miguel.
 A-6261916, Gonzalez, Ruben.
 A-6666785, Gonzalez, Simon, or Simon Gonzalez-Villanueva.
 A-6665517, Mendiola, Paula, or Paul Mendiola de Gonzales or Pauline Mendiola.
 A-5697168, Gronwoldt, Walter George.
 A-6551423, Haberer, Florentina, or Florentina Nuguid.
 A-9664258, Hadjipetros, Sotirios, or Sordi or Steve Hadjipetros.
 A-5020056, Haller, Gottlieb Heinrich Gustav, or Gustav Haller.
 A-3565724, Hamilton, Anna (nee Buczma).
 A-6172375, Hamm, Juliana Rodil.
 A-2663801, Haro, Jose Ysabel Flores (alias Jose Flores).
 A-4715960, Hernandez, Francisco.
 A-8679233, Hernandez, Benigno.
 A-6679234, Hernandez, Francisco.
 A-6639350, Hernandez, Norberto Roberto (alias Norberto Hernandez alias Roberto Hernandez alias Robert Hernandez).
 A-6639351, Hernandez, Roberto.
 A-6382878, Holsman, Marta Hugentobler (nee Marta Hugentobler).
 A-5786464, Hoon, Chan Ngon (alias Mrs. Davis Owyang).
 A-2038760, Hoyer, Kurt Emil.
 A-3602671, Hunt, Henry.
 A-6301859, Hyatt, Lewis.
 A-6045907, Ichak, Ali, or Ichak Ali.
 A-5599244, Illich, Yova, or John Illich.
 A-5573460, Jacob, Sandor, or Alexander Jacob or Jacobs.
 A-3148155, Joeng, Soe Siong, or Su Siong Jung.
 56208/196, Joyner, William Harry.
 A-2086707, Karavolos, Stephanos Theodore.
 A-5448558, Kennett, Eunice Lorraine (nee Hultgreen).
 A-5334990, Kent, Walter.
 A-3192801, Khan, Aziz.
 A-5019347, Klevers, Eric Joseph, or Erich Klevers.
 A-5654293, Knowlton, Jessie Marie (alias Jessie Marie Aspden, nee Lawrence).
 A-2855065, Koldrovich, Vladimir Ludovico.
 A-4776975, Laggan, Catherine Feeney.
 A-1030731, Lazarich, Mirko.
 A-5584293, Leon, Josephine (alias Josephine Leon Vicochea or Dicochea, alias Josephine Garcia).
 A-6300095, Liddicoat, Harold Raymond.
 A-2162658, Lombardo, Francesco.
 A-5610107, Lopez, Luis, or Louis Lopez or Luis Lopez Garcia.
 A-6400801, Lopez-Cabrera, Ezequiel.
 A-9553892, Loucas, George Anthony (alias Georgios Antonios Loucas).
 A-1598756, Madonna, Giuseppe (alias Giuseppe Clemente).
 A-4555403, Magner, James Thomas.
 A-4067230, Mancini, Adelio.
 A-5825606, Mandel, Margaret Fanny (alias Margaret Sanders or Margaret Schoene or Margaret Barozzi).
 A-5261900, Masu, John (alias Giovanni Masu).
 A-5010273, De Mendoza, Marcelina Rivera.
 A-6208054, Menzies, Colin John.
 A-4136618, Miller, Fred, or Frederick Moller or Friedrich Karl Ernst Moller.
 A-5107301, Mi-Loffe, Eric Goffe.
 A-4066323, Mitola, Antonio, or Anthony Patrick Mitola.
 A-3382835, Mitola, Maria Rosa, or Rose Mitola (nee Del Vecchio).
 A-1274580, Monte, Caroline, or Caroline Demallos (nee Caroline Lannutti).
 A-6251165, Monterrubio, Bienvenida (nee Bienvenida Vasquez Tirado).

- A-4289029, Montes-Lopez, Andres, or Andres Montes.
 A-1627591, Morales, Maria de Jesus, or Mary Morales.
 A-6240784, Morden, Sarra, or Sarra Mesh.
 A-4363956, Mueller, Hans Heinrich Alfred.
 A-2862095, Mueller, John Hans, or Hans Otto Eugen Mueller or Hans Mueller.
 A-7583119, Naef, Emil Joseph.
 A-6815661, Ngai, Shun Him.
 A-6815662, Ngai, Siu Kum.
 A-2146542, O'Donnell, Francis Albert, or Frank Albert O'Donnell or "Inky".
 A-3407260, Olivieri, Anthony (Antonio) (alias Francesco Porro).
 A-6302145, Ossin, Sarah (alias Sarah Kovtun Ossin).
 A-5942218, Osterlund, Holger Torvald.
 A-4123010, Palomba, Giovanni, or Palombo (alias John Palombo).
 A-6563748, Palomino, Julian, or Julian Palomino Quinones.
 A-1886219, Parenteau, Narcisse (alias Joseph Exidas Narcisse Parenteau).
 A-6153664, Pasatiempo, Remedios Navarra.
 A-1011989, Pera, Anna.
 A-6245339, Pericharos, Christos (alias Christ Pericharos).
 A-6090963, Pick, Charles Robert.
 A-2795198, Pitsiladis, Efstratios, or Charles Peterson or Charles Pitsiladis.
 A-3176245, Porvari, Olavi Veli.
 A-4384519, Ramos, Juan Jose, or John Joe Ramos (alias Jose Aguilar).
 A-6357059, Rodriguez, Sabino, or Sabino Lozoya or Sabino Rodriguez Lozoya.
 A-3146287, Rogga, John, or John Rouga.
 A-5097023, Romej, Jan Ludwik, or John Ludwik Romej.
 A-6047568, Rost, Harry (alias Harry Hyman Rashback).
 A-2514884, Sabbe, Margaret Marie (alias Margaret Marie Rosselle or Margaret Marie Billiet).
 A-2750510, Sainz-Gutierrez, Santiago.
 A-6704617, Sallin, Catherine.
 A-5836582, Samuels, Jensenia Irene.
 A-3477565, Santoro, Emilia (alias Emilia Zanone).
 A-5249171, Sarkissian, George (alias George Sarkisian, alias Hachig or Hatchig Sarkissian or Sarkisian).
 A-397443, Sharkey, Mary Jane (nee Mary Jane Ramsey).
 A-5452595, Silbert, Mary (nee Finegood).
 A-3444818, Silva, Manuel Y Cruces, or Manuel Silva.
 A-6075260, Simmons, Pearl Salud (nee Tibig).
 A-9769910, Singh, Mahadeo Javert Rampersaud.
 A-3678239, Sokolow, Sol, or Zyskind Sokolow or Sokol or Zyskind Sokolow, or Janowicz or Janowitz or Yanowicz.
 A-3930421, Spels, Stellos Napoleon, or Steve Napoleon Spels.
 A-6517996, Sporup, John Soren Nielsen, or John Nielsen.
 A-7703588, Soroosh, Gholam Hossein.
 A-4761287, Soulyie, Gertrud Mae, or Seiweh (nee French alias Schultz).
 A-3776190, Sousa, Mary Agnes.
 A-5951396, Squires, Elizabeth Oonagh (alias Elizabeth Perdue).
 A-6551397, Squires, Penelope Oonagh (alias Penelope Perdue).
 A-6261575, Stamatiades, Nefelia (nee Vasilas).
 A3174351, St. Hilaire, Melvin, or Melville or Joe St. Hilaire.
 A-6277447, Taylor, Beth (alias Beth Engelsen).
 A-4491271, Thederahn, Walter Herman, or Walter Smith or Schmidt.
 A-5378679, Uusmaa, Vladimer (alias Vladimer Vel Uusmaa).
 A-7798513, Valencia, Baudelio (alias Baudelica Valencia Gonzalitz).
 A-3716183, Wang, James Shu Woo, or Wang Shu Woo or James Wang.
 A-6458405, Wands, Laraine Fay, or Loraine Fay Wands.
 A-3497722, Whitaker, Laura Myrtle (nee Owen).
 A-1275082, Williamson, Williamina, or Mina Williamson.
 A-4495642, Wolinsky, Abraham.
 A-6364147, Wright, Graham Patrick.
 A-6292364, Zakrzewski, Genowefa, or Genowefa Szczepanska.
 A-6292365, Zakrzewski, Jadwiga.
 A-3154916, Zannis, Christos.
- SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS
- The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered, and agreed to, as follows:
- Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:*
- A-6749936, Alcalá-Martinez, Jesus, or Jesus Martinez or Jesus Alcalá.
 A-6313380, Ayala-Serrano, Irene.
 A-6449001, Alexander, Chi Ngo, or Chen Chi Ngo.
 A-6373549, Ayala, Juan Hernandez, or Juan Ayala Hernandez (alias Dan Hancock alias M. C. Stokes).
 A-9579672, Bacich, Anton Sime.
 A-2879588, Battaglini, Quirino Gene.
 A-5652053, Beda, Sabetay.
 A-6249257, Bellios, Paraskevi Costalia.
 A-5166885, Bendfeldt, August Johannes.
 A-6326675, Berliner, Kenneth Michael (alias Kenneth Michael Hovde).
 A-3563940, Binicos, Ioannis Simeon, or John Sam Binicos.
 A-3158850, Blake, Clara, formerly Sinclair formerly Bott (nee Brewster).
 A-6745477, Bohn, Cecilia Sophia, or Cecilia Sophia Syre.
 A-6428294, Boone, Patricia B., or Patricia Imelda Boone (nee Bibby).
 A-9574254, Boonstoppel, Johannes, or John Jacob Boonstoppel.
 A-6441010, Booth, Margaret Kato Walker.
 A-5134452, Bosi, Enricko, or Henry Peter Bosi.
 A-9810588, Bruggencate, Albertus Ten.
 A-3726769, Callejas, Manuel Peldro.
 A-6754664, Changeux, Daniel Robert.
 A-5763706, Chau, Shing Leung, or Spaulding Chau.
 A-6256341, Cirincione, Maria Teresa.
 A-6256342, Cirincione, Carmela Marie.
 A-6790777, Corazza, Gilberto Leo (alias Gilberto Corazza or Corazza or Gilbert Lee Corazza).
 A-6092372, Cortes, Caroline Napoleon, formerly Caroline Napoleon Denard.
 A-1370087, Costas, Juan Antonio Lopez, or Juan Lopez Costas or Juan Lopez.
 A-6172681, Cotsonis, Potoula George, or Potoula Laloussis.
 A-4851448, D'Agostino, Arcangelo, or Angelo D'Agostino.
 A-6218566, Dantes, John, or Ioannes Yusel Dantes.
 A-7589086, Davis, John Champneys.
 A-6371776, Derro, Giovanna (nee Totino).
 A-6391245, D'Orsogna, Marcello.
 A-6427491, Estridge, Edward Nathaniel.
 A-3442924, Farese, Biagio.
 A-4135957, Faustini, Sebastiani, or Benny or Beniamino Faustino.
 A-4173534, Fook, Ling Bing, or Bing Fook Ling.
 A-6075351, Francisco, Rogelio Chumbeque.
 A-9770636, Furman, Franciszek Felix, or Franciszek Furman or Frank Furman.
 A-9659926, Galanos, Nocolaos.
 A-5929794, George, Eileen.
 A-4669615, Gessner, Friedrich Albert Heinrich Robert, or Fred Horn.
 A-5146721, Glick, Dorothy, or Dorothy Bloom or Debora Blimbaum.
 A-3323609, Goffredo, Pantaleo, or Leo Goffredo.
 A-7653000, Goldstein, Katherine Doris (nee Katherine Doris Victorson).
 A-6517959, Gunther, Esperanza Eroles (nee Esperanza Eroles).
 A-7592298, Hansen, Marjorie McGuire.
 A-1074698, Helloo, Vartanoush (nee Markarian Rose or Vartanoush Krikorian).
 A-6040369, Hodge, Lawrence.
 A-6024985, Hodge, Maude Iola.
 A-5878163, Hsueh, Wei Fan (alias Wilfred Hsueh).
 A-6590350, Huggins, Frederick Oscar.
 A-4833110, Hantwarg, Rubin or Huntverg or Reubin Hunter or Robert Miller.
 A-2698572, Ionno, Pellegrino.
 A-6428323, Jacobs, Margaret Genevieve (nee Bibby alias Genevieve Jacobs).
 A-4301234, Jaeger, George Friedrich Willy (alias George Waldo).
 A-6249467, Jarrin, Fanny Lucila or Mosquera.
 A-6060836, Jarrin, Nelson Anibal, M. D.
 A-6291689, Jarrold, James Michael.
 A-5922766, Kellgren, Adam.
 A-6755482, Kerketzes, Ioannis, or Joannis Stilianos or John S. Kerketzes.
 A-4699864, Klapprat, Robert, or Klapprat or Klappert or Kappert.
 A-7558796, Klason, Joanna Elizabeth.
 A-9776542, Kritikos, Ioannis Stavros (alias John Steve Kritikos).
 A-5946937, Kuzemka, Nikolaj or Nikolaj or Nick Kuzema or Joseph Meski.
 A-6530599, Kuzninska, Jacek Richard.
 A-6277981, Kyriazis, Christ Constantine.
 A-6414794, Lamer, Mirko.
 A-6251150, Lamer, Leonore.
 A-6281356, Lara-Medrano, Jose.
 A-7686310, Larson, Alice Mary Margaret (nee Seyer).
 A-5234163, Laufer, Edith (nee Luberoff).
 A-5886897, Leer, Cornelius.
 A-2794013, Lemanis, Konstantine George, or Costas Lemanis.
 A-6526015, Leni, Nunziata.
 A-4882931, Leshley, William Alexander.
 A-6633954, Leung, Vicente.
 A-6300096, Liddicoat, Doreen Violet.
 A-4441129, Lundsteen, Ernest Hubert.
 A-3837986, Lyons, Thomas Joseph.
 A-4535362, Madsen, Charles Marinus.
 A-5668197, Majka, Jan or John Majka.
 A-4940423, Majka, Katarzyna Rose (nee Banek).
 A-6810821, Maldonado, Petra, or Petra Maldonado de Montes.
 A-4947209, Mancusi, Mario, or Mike Mancusi.
 A-6075160, Martin, Gladys Constance.
 A-6108461, Medina, Jose Julio Juill Renteria, or Luis Medina Renteria or Jose Luis Renteria Medina.
 A-5765526, Melanoff, Rose or Loza (nee Vassiloff or Vassideva).
 A-6245144, Mobilie, Catherine Z., or Catherine Vomyla or Aitkermis Mombllin.
 A-3691575, Mohamed, Dost, or Johnnie Mohamed.
 A-9552718, Monterroso, Herman, or Herman Monterrossa.
 A-1858603, Morze, Charity Alma, or Charity Alma Fifield.
 A-3640890, Mulhern, Joseph or Mulkerinus.
 A-1231306, Napoli, Antonio.
 A-9701787, Olsen, Ingolf.
 A-9550196, Olsen, Rolf.
 A-6624314, O'Neal, Etienne Emerson.
 A-6239403, Paille, Jack Jean Paul, or Jack Paille.
 A-1029502, Perel, Nechemia, or Norman Earnest Pearl.
 A-5105586, Petibon, Yves, or Maurice Petibon.
 A-6701961, Pfeifer, Karoline Maria (alias Karoline Mary Pfeifer).
 A-6594725, Papandreopoulos, Elias Polyhios.

A-7041843, Pun, Chin Yuen, or Chin Yuen Pon, Pon Yuen Chinn.
 A-6300094, Rankin, Jillian Kay.
 A-6252336, Renteria, Manuel, or Manuel Renteria Portilla.
 A-5712529, Reynolds, Henrietta Pauline (nee Adams).
 A-7010074, Richter, Rolf Hans.
 A-7010073, Richter, Lucie Gertrud, or Gertrud Lucie Richter.
 A-6650790, Robertson, Clifford James Charles.
 A-7528781, Roehmann, Dagobert (alias Dagobert Waldow).
 56169/182, Ruello, Antonio.
 A-4005355, Samad, Iris Daphne (nee Vanputten).
 A-6125773, Sanchez-Barcenas, Jose Inez (alias Inez Sanchez-Barcenas).
 A-6077519, Schaefer, Adelaida Santos.
 A-6077574, Schaefer, Jr., John Santos.
 A-4984498, Sartuche, Bertha Reyes (alias Bertha Sanchez Sartuche alias Bertha Reyes alias Bertha Sanchez).
 A-1707593, Sauter, Anna, or Anna Manderseidit or Anna Jetter.
 56112/24, Scordilis, Panagiotis Stylianos.
 A-2298613, Seiter, Christian Joseph, or Chris or Christ Seiter.
 A-6633431, Serrano-Berrera, Jose Mauricio.
 A-1384811, Simon, Malvina E. (nee Abraham, alias Malvina Ester Esch, alias Malvina Schwartz and Malvina Eisenbach).
 A-2700886, Skuza, Frank, or Franciszek Skuza.
 A-1545593, Spencer, Charles Joseph.
 A-7001121, Spencer, Mildred Vivian Margaret.
 A-5139588, Stankiewicz, Josef, or Joseph Stank.
 A-6233624, Stevenson, Walter George.
 A-6239754, Stolz, Chen Li Ying (nee Chen Li Ying).
 A-6345672, Stoyas, Athena, or Athena Moonos or Athena Papanghelidau.
 A-7791546, Stroud (de), Maria Voltas.
 A-6494368, Tedesco, Saviour.
 A-6296116, Thomasson, Ivan Samuel.
 A-5593901, Tietge, Paul (alias Paul Klein).
 A-5629597, Trapani, Gaetano.
 A-6357984, Tratarou, Pantelis, John.
 A-6350818, Tratarou, Athenoula.
 A-3073862, Traynor, Harry Joseph.
 A-6692815, Trilling, Erin, or Erin Shikaloff.
 A-3428895, Tuerk, Arthur Erdmann.
 A-6020295, Turnbull, Idalia Constanca "Dally."
 A-1164142, Tye, Ong Hee.
 A-4973977, Valliant, John Peden.
 A-6709145, Vanskike, Verla Cora, formerly Strickland (nee Thomas).
 A-6754859, Vanskike, Lois Isable Gladys, formerly Strickland.
 A-6755531, Vanskike, Allan Robert, formerly Strickland.
 A-5870852, Vanterpool, Viola Anastacia, or Viola Anastacia Fahir or Viola Anastacia Foy.
 A-2830324, Vasillos, Christos.
 A-4036671, Vassura, Anthony or Antonio.
 A-3182536, Vassura, Josephine (nee Girolimini).
 A-6007554, Vieira, Joao.
 A-5546430, Villanova, Manuel (alis Manuel Villanova Dominguez or Manuel Ribas).
 A-4328843, Vogt, Gustav (alias Augusta Conrad alias Paul G. Leonard).
 A-2632561, Wang, Mabel Chih-Lan Chen, or Mabel Gee Lan Chan.
 A-5748097, Werner, Margaret (nee Carmichael), or Mrs. Howard Charles Werner.
 A-5100607, Wexelman, Sarah, or Sarah Dvora Wexelman.
 A-7022757, Wexelman, Mortimer.
 A-6433846, Wiesner, Lucille M. (nee Bibby).
 A-2454595, Wing, Edward Yee; Yee On Woon.
 A-6720886, Yankopoulos, Alexander Anastasiou.

CLAIMS OF J. N. JONES AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 146) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J. N. Jones, and others, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of United States district courts to hear, determine, and render judgment on tort claims against the United States which accrue prior to January 1, 1945, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the following-named persons, all of Malheur County, Oreg., against the United States for damages incurred by them when their properties were flooded as the result of a break on May 7, 1942, in the reservoir gates which controlled the flow of water into canals of the Vale-Oregon Irrigation district; the projects in such district being then under the exclusive control of the United States: (1) J. N. Jones; (2) May Delsole, successor in interest and heir at law of L. P. Delsole; (3) Anna Curry, administratrix of the estate of Fred Curry; (4) John U. Hoffman; (5) Orrin Curry; (6) Tom Joyce; (7) W. W. Seaward; (8) Gilbert Masterson; (9) Drexell Williams; (10) John Joyce and Kate Joyce; and (11) Mary Robertson, successor in interest and heir at law of W. A. Robertson.

Sec. 2. In the determination of such claims, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any negligent or wrongful acts or omissions of any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person in accordance with the law of the place where the acts or omissions occurred.

Sec. 3. Suit upon such claims may be instituted by or on behalf of the claimants listed in section 1 at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claims and review thereof, and payment of any judgments thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

H. LAWRENCE HULL

The bill (S. 147) for the relief of H. Lawrence Hull was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to H. Lawrence Hull, of Newport, Oreg., the sum of \$551.66, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of property damages sustained by him when a United States Army vehicle struck and destroyed two gasoline pumps owned by him on December 2, 1943, at Newport, Oreg.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

JAMES A. STAPLETON, RUTH BURK, AND MILDRED OVREN

The bill (S. 195) for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred

Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Will the Senator kindly withhold his objection until we can have House bill 1113 substituted for Senate bill 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 1113?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1113) for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, at the time of renegotiation of contract between this company and the office of the division engineer, price adjustment division, a refund of \$28,000 was proposed which was accepted by the contractor. Upon review, this settlement was criticized as unduly severe by the Chief of the Settlements Section, Army Price Adjustment Board. The settlement could not be set aside because of the statutory provision making such an agreement final and conclusive. The Department of Justice, in a letter dated August 23, 1948, states:

In view of the fact that the renegotiation agreement referred to was entered into in the formative stages of enforcement of the Renegotiation Act, it would appear that the claimant company suffered an injustice in the consideration of its case and was not accorded the same treatment which other contractors similarly situated subsequently received. In the light of the unusual circumstances of the case, it does not appear that the proposed relief would establish a precedent which might adversely affect existing collection policy in renegotiation matters.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 195 is indefinitely postponed.

STONE & COOPER COAL CO., INC.

The bill (S. 227) for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,289.59, to Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc., of Augusta, Maine, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation cost in excess of normal rates of transportation prevailing prior to January 1, 1942, on coal received on and after May 18, 1942, to June 1, 1944, in and around New York Harbor area and in New England, which period was not included in the regulations of the Office of Price Administration on bituminous coal

from district No. 3 in northern West Virginia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 683) to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the employees responsible for the excess or erroneous payments represented by the sums herein stated be, and they are hereby, relieved of financial liability therefor and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to take action to grant the said relief: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed to bar recovery of the amounts herein specified from the persons to whom and through whom such amounts have been paid:

First. H. H. Milks, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of \$19.36, which amount was expended in August 1944, under symbol 11559.

Second. G. O. Haynes, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of \$7.58, which amount was expended in September 1943, under symbol 11559.

Third. M. Meyers, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of \$10.50, which amount was expended in January 1943, under symbol 11561.

Fourth. H. L. McCoy, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of \$5.27, which amount was expended in October 1944, under symbol 100-3225.

Fifth. D. M. Wolfe, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of \$20.47, which amount was expended in February 1946, under symbol 200-3225.

Sixth. C. J. Reichert, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, New York branch of central office, in the sum of \$98.39, which amount was expended from January 1 through October 31, 1943, under symbol 11564.

Seventh. M. E. Head, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Lyons, N. J., in the sum of \$32.25, which amount was expended in September 1942, under symbol 11564.

Eighth. John H. Ale, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Dayton, Ohio, in the sum of \$26.56, which amount was expended in November 1943 and September 1944, under symbols 11568 and 104-3225.

Ninth. Eugene H. Dibble, Jr., certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Tuskegee, Ala., in the sum of \$51.64, which amount was expended from June 1 through August 31, 1942, and in June 1943, under symbol 11569.

Tenth. R. D. Beer, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Hines, Ill., in the sum of \$14.37, which amount was expended in December 1943, under symbol 11571.

Eleventh. Guy F. Palmer, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Dearborn, Mich., in the sum of \$53.48, which amount was expended in May 1942, October 1942, and July 1943, under symbol 11571.

Twelfth. W. A. Birmingham, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Batavia, N. Y., in the sum of \$56.50, which amount was expended from April 1 through July 31, 1942, under symbol 11564.

MICKEY BAINE

The bill (S. 948) for the relief of Mickey Baine was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mickey Baine, of Nashville, Tenn., the sum of \$4,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States (1) for compensation for personal injuries, property damage, and loss of earnings suffered by him, and (2) for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred in 1943 in Nashville, Tenn., when his automobile was struck by a United States Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2680 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

The bill (S. 1168) to amend section 2680 of title 28, United States Code, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the definition of "Federal agency" in the Federal Tort Claims Act was so broad as to include the Panama Railroad Company, a company which was originally incorporated by an act of the Legislature of the State of New York in 1849, and reincorporated by Public Law 808 of the Eightieth Congress, as "an agency and instrumentality of the United States, and as an adjunct of the Panama Canal."

The varied activities of the company, which include the operation of a railroad across the Isthmus of Panama with terminals in the Republic of Panama, the operation of a steamship line between the Isthmus and American ports, the operation of hotels and commissary stores, and the operation of related commercial enterprises, are not those to which the principle of governmental immunity to suit should be applied. The company has long been registered as a foreign corporation in Panama and has designated agents in Panama to receive service of process in suits brought against it in the courts of the Republic of Panama.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1168) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2680 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(m) Any claim arising from the activities of the Panama Railroad Company."

REIMBURSEMENT FOR LOSSES SUSTAINED FROM FLOOD

The bill (H. R. 555) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District

of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SYLVIA M. MISETICH

The bill (H. R. 572) for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTHUR G. ROBINSON

The bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF HILDA LINKS, E. J. OHMAN, AND FRED L. KROESING

The bill (H. R. 581) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LUCILLE DAVIDSON

The bill (H. R. 591) for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES W. KEITH

The bill (H. R. 592) for the relief of James W. Keith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EUGENE J. BEARMAN

The bill (H. R. 618) for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH B. MURPHY

The bill (H. R. 659) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN J. O'NEIL

The bill (H. R. 729) for the relief of John J. O'Neil was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY JANE HARRIS

The bill (H. R. 739) for the relief of Mary Jane Harris was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

B. JOHN HANSON

The bill (H. R. 745) for the relief of B. John Hanson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. C. OWEN, R. C. OWEN, JR., AND ROY OWEN

The bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen was announced as next in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the

bill, particularly in the light of the objection made by the Secretary of the Treasury, on page 4 of the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, by way of explanation, the position taken by the Treasury Department is somewhat mystifying to the committee, in view of the fact that in the Eighty-first Congress the Department sought and obtained introduction of a bill, Senate bill 196, for the relief of one of its own employees who was responsible for the total loss of a far more substantial number of internal-revenue stamps under circumstances which at least raised the question of gross negligence, aside from the fact that none of the missing stamps were ever recovered, nor was there more than a reasonable hypothesis on which to base an explanation of their disappearance. The claimants in this case, through no fault or negligence on their part, have suffered an out-of-pocket loss which is definitely determinable, and the Government has correspondingly been unjustly enriched.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no objection. There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION, 1949

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour is terminated, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the first deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, would there be any objection to continuing to completion the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada ask unanimous consent that that be done?

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not object, unless it will take too long. I am sure the Senator from Nevada wants the Senate to get to the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill, in which every Senator is interested.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will agree to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, and the clerk will continue the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the agreement provide that we shall proceed to a conclusion of the call of the calendar, with no time limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was that the call be continued, and no objection was raised.

Mr. WHERRY. Just what is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That the call of the calendar shall be continued.

Mr. McCARRAN. That we may proceed to the conclusion of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

MRS. WESLEY BERK

The bill (H. R. 1043) for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BERNICE GREEN

The bill (H. R. 1061) for the relief of Bernice Green was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES LEON KEATON

The bill (H. R. 1066) for the relief of James Leon Keaton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF THE COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY, PA.

The bill (H. R. 1959) for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the sum of \$29,147.50 to Allegheny County, Pa., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by a fire which completely destroyed a building known as "Agricultural Hall," located in South Park, Allegheny County, Pa., on February 16, 1944, while being occupied and used by and exclusively under the control of the War Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection.

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

RELIEF OF THE LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JOSEPH DE SOUZA, JR.

The bill (H. R. 2708) for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph De Souza, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEES, EXPENSES, AND COSTS OF JURORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 635) to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States Courts and before United States Commissioners, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "witness", to strike out "attending", and insert "attending", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1821 of title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1821. Per diem and mileage generally; subsistence. A witness attending in any court of the United States or before a United States commissioner or person taking his deposition pursuant to any order of a court of the United States, shall receive \$4 for each day's attendance and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the same, and 7 cents per mile for going from and returning to his place of residence. Witnesses who are not salaried employees of the Government and who are not in custody and who attend at points so far removed from their respective residence as to prohibit return thereto from day to day shall be entitled to an additional allowance of \$5 per day for expenses of subsistence

including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance: *Provided*, That in lieu of the mileage allowance provided for herein, witnesses who are required to travel between the Territories, possessions, or to and from the continental United States, shall be entitled to the actual expenses of travel at the lowest first-class rate available at the time of reservation for passage, by means of transportation employed: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Alaska."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

FEES, EXPENSES AND COSTS OF JURORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1042) relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "\$4", and insert "\$5", so as to make the bill read: *Be it enacted, etc.,* That the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of section 1871 of title 28 of the United States Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedures," are hereby amended to read as follows:

"For actual attendance at the place of trial or hearing and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and from such place at the beginning and end of such service or at any time during the same, \$7 per day, except that any juror required to attend more than 30 days in hearing one case may be paid in the discretion and upon the certification of the trial judge a per diem fee not exceeding \$10 for each day in excess of 30 days he is required to hear such case.

"For the distance necessarily traveled to and from a juror's residence by the shortest practicable route in going to and returning from the place of service at the beginning and at the end of the term of service and for all additional necessary daily transportation expense, 7 cents per mile, except that if daily travel appears impracticable, subsistence of \$5 per day shall be allowed. Whenever in any case the jury is ordered to be kept together and not to separate, the cost of subsistence during such period shall be paid by the United States marshal upon the order of the court in lieu of the foregoing subsistence allowance.

"Jury fees and travel and subsistence allowances provided by this section shall be paid by the United States marshal on the certificate of the clerk of the court, and in the case of jury fees in excess of \$7 per diem, when allowed as hereinabove provided, on the certificate of the trial judge."

Sec. 2. The act entitled "An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors," approved June 25, 1948 (ch. 652, 62 Stat. 1016), is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

LAURA SPINNICHIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 652) for the relief of Laura Spinnichia, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, before the word "Hall", to strike out "McDonald" and insert "MacDonough."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

**RELIEF OF THE LEGAL GUARDIAN OF
ROSE MARY AMMIRATO, A MINOR**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, after line 9, to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. Private Law 447, Eightieth Congress, is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAIM OF MRS. FLORENCE BENOLKEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 189) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Florence Benolken, which had been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "compensation for" to insert "any and all;" and on line 8, before the word "advised", to strike out the word "erroneously", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Florence Benolken, of Omaha, Nebr., for compensation for any and all losses sustained by her as a result of having been advised by representatives of the War Department that she was not entitled to have her household goods shipped at Government expense from Seattle, Wash., to Omaha, Nebr., subsequent to the death in October 1942, of her husband, Lt. Francis John Benolken, while serving on active duty in the Army of the United States.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any negligent or wrongful acts or omissions of any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person in accordance with the law of the place where the acts or omissions occurred.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted by the claimant within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "Twentyeth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

BADGE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The bill (S. 646) granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296, relating to the badge of the American Legion, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date of December 9, 1919, being patent No. 54,296, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of 14 years from and after the date of approval of this act, with

all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as "the badge of the American Legion."

**BADGE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION
AUXILIARY**

The bill (S. 647) granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398, relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date of June 1, 1920, being patent No. 55,398, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of 14 years from and after the date of approval of this act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as "the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary."

**BADGE OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN
LEGION**

The bill (S. 676) granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187, relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date of May 8, 1934, being patent No. 92,187, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of 14 years from and after the date of approval of this act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as "the badge of The Sons of The American Legion."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 734) to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished dependents in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, at the request of my colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection of the Senator from Georgia, the bill will be passed over.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF GRADE OF GENERAL
OF THE AIR FORCE**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 796) to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes, which has been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "herewith" to strike out "designated" and insert "redesignated", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the United States Air Force the grade of General of the Air Force.

SEC. 2. The grade of any individual transferred in the grade of general of the Army from the Regular Army to the United States Air Force, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947 (act of July 26, 1947; 61 Stat. 695), is herewith redesignated "General of the Air Force."

SEC. 3. Nothing herein shall be construed as appointing any individual to a new or different office or to alter or prejudice the status of any individual concerned so as to deprive him of any pay or allowances, rights, benefits, or privileges to which he may be entitled under existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

**APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS ON THE
ACTIVE LIST OF THE PHILIPPINE
SCOUTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1181) to authorize the appointment of officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts in the Regular Army, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the date "1933" to insert "and who are or become citizens of the United States prior to appointment hereunder", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That until a date 1 year following the date of enactment of this act, and within the authorized active list commissioned officer strength of the Regular Army, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint officers on the active list of the Philippine Scouts, who were appointed therein prior to June 30, 1933, and who are or become citizens of the United States prior to appointment hereunder, in the Regular Army in the same commissioned officer grades as are held by such officers in the Philippine Scouts at the time of appointment.

SEC. 2. The names of officers so appointed shall be entered on the Army promotion list in their permanent grades, precedence within grades being fixed in accordance with their relative permanent grade seniority among themselves and among Army promotion-list officers at the time of appointment.

SEC. 3. All active Federal service performed as commissioned officers of the Philippine Scouts by officers appointed under this act shall be creditable as active commissioned service as officers of the Regular Army for all purposes: *Provided,* That their positions on the promotion list shall be determined as provided in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 4. The acceptance of appointments in the Regular Army under this act shall operate to vacate the military status in the Philippine Scouts theretofore occupied by each of the appointees.

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

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this bill puts back into the Regular Army of the United States those officers who had previously been on assigned duty to the Philippine Scouts, who are no longer an organization of the United States. It retains for them the benefits they would have had, and keeps them on active duty in our forces, because they can no longer be assigned to the Philippine Army.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

**ACQUISITION OR CONSTRUCTION OF
STRUCTURES, EQUIPMENT, AND IM-
PROVEMENTS IN THE CANAL ZONE**

The bill (S. 1136) to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the report states the reason for the enactment of the bill. It provides for a recodification of the present laws. I do not believe there is anything of great importance in the bill. It was explained to our committee as a recodification of the laws. It grants no additional authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in chapter 1 thereof three new sections numbered 16 to 18, and reading as follows:

"16. Acquisition or construction of structures, equipment, and improvements: The Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized, within the limits of available funds, to purchase or otherwise acquire equipment, and within the Canal Zone to purchase or otherwise acquire, construct, repair, replace, alter, or enlarge any building, structure, or other improvement, when in his judgment such action is necessary for the operation, maintenance, sanitation, or civil government of the Panama Canal or Canal Zone.

"17. Claims for losses of or damages to property: Authority is hereby conferred upon the Governor of the Panama Canal, or his designee for the purpose, to consider, adjust, determine, and settle claims for losses of or damages to property arising from the conduct by the Panama Canal of authorized business operations, or arising from the maintenance, operation, improvement, or enlargement of capacity of the Panama Canal or from the sanitation or civil government of the Canal Zone: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to claims cognizable either under section 10 of this title, as amended, or under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

"Any award made to any claimant pursuant to this section shall be payable out of any moneys appropriated or made available for the maintenance and operation, sanitation, and civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone; and the acceptance by the claimant of any such award shall be final and conclusive on the claimant, and shall constitute a complete release by the claimant of such claim against the United States.

"18. Disaster relief: In the event of emergency arising because of disaster or calamity by flood, hurricane, earthquake, fire, pestilence, or like cause, not foreseen or otherwise provided for, and occurring in the Canal Zone, or occurring in the Republic of Panama in such circumstances as to constitute an actual or potential hazard to health, safety, security, or property in the Canal Zone, the Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to expend available funds and to utilize or furnish materials, supplies, equipment, and services for relief, assistance, and protection."

Sec. 2. Chapter 4 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, which chapter is now entitled "Business Operations" and consists of sections 51 and 52 of said title 2, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 4—BUSINESS OPERATIONS; SALES AND SERVICES

"Sec.

"51. Authorization for establishment and operation of various facilities.

"52. Organization and conduct of any such facilities by Panama Canal as 'business operations.'

"53. Receipts from such operations, sales, and services; expenditure and reinvestment; reports.

"54. Exception of Canal Zone postal service.

"Sec. 51. Authorization for establishment and operation of various facilities: (a) In connection with the operation, maintenance, sanitation, and civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, the President is authorized to establish, maintain, and operate, through the Panama Railroad Company, or otherwise, docks, wharves, piers, drydocks, shops, yards, marine railways, salvage and towing facilities, dredging facilities, construction facilities, fuel-handling facilities, motor-transportation facilities, civil air terminals, power systems, water and sewer systems, warehouses, storehouses, hotels, a printing plant, living quarters and other buildings, and any other necessary facilities and appurtenances, for the purpose of providing, at reasonable prices, fuel, electric power, water, equipment, supplies and materials generally, repairs, labor, transportation, quarters, space in buildings, wharf and like services, hotel and restaurant services, and services generally, including recreational services, and for the purpose of assembling, assorting, storing, repairing, and selling scrap and other byproducts of manufacturing and shop operations, and materials, supplies, and equipment purchased or acquired for the construction, improvement, operation, maintenance, sanitation, or civil government of the Panama Canal or Canal Zone and which are obsolete, unserviceable, or no longer needed. The sales, services, equipment, supplies, and materials hereinbefore referred to may be made or furnished to vessels, to agencies of the Government of the United States, to the Panama Railroad Company, to employees of the Government of the United States or of the Panama Railroad Company, and to any other governments, agencies, persons, corporations, companies, or associations eligible to make or receive such purchases, services, supplies, or materials under the laws prevailing at the time and the policies heretofore or hereafter adopted consistently with such laws.

"(b) In the event the President has heretofore elected, or shall at any time hereafter elect, to maintain and operate through the Panama Railroad Company any of the facilities and appurtenances referred to in this section or section 52 of this title, theretofore maintained and operated by the Panama Canal, the President is authorized to transfer to the Panama Railroad Company all or as much as may be determined to be necessary of the personnel, property, records, related assets, contracts, obligations, and liabilities of or appertaining to the said facility and its appurtenances, and such transfer shall be deemed to have been accepted and assumed by the Panama Railroad Company without the necessity of any act or acts on the part of the said corporation except as otherwise stipulated in provisions of law applicable to the said corporation.

"52. Organization and conduct of any such facilities by Panama Canal as 'Business operations': The President may cause any or all of the facilities and appurtenances referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) of section 51 of this title to be organized and conducted by the Panama Canal as 'business operations', and in such case the aggregate net profit if any accruing from the conduct of such business operations shall annually be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

"53. Receipts from such operations, sales, and services; expenditure and reinvestment; reports: The moneys received by the Panama Canal from the operations authorized by sections 51 and 52 of this title, and from pilotage, quarantine, immigration, and like services, from rentals, from damage claims, and from any and all other sales made and services rendered, but not including tolls, taxes, court fees, or fines, may be expended or reinvested under the several heads of appropriation for the Panama Canal, without being covered into the Treasury of the United

States except as provided in section 52 of this title; but, except as otherwise provided in this section, such funds shall be subject to the provisions of law relating to public funds of the United States. Monthly reports of such receipts and expenditures shall be made to the President and annual reports shall be made to the Congress.

"54. Exception of Canal Zone Postal Service: The provisions of sections 51 to 53 of this title shall have no application to operations of the Canal Zone Postal Service."

Sec. 3. Title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in article 1 of chapter 6 thereof a new section numbered 85 and reading as follows:

"85. Special training of employees: The Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized, within the limits of appropriations made therefor, to provide for special training in the United States or elsewhere of any employee of the Panama Canal when in the judgment of the Governor such special training will be of material benefit to the work of the Panama Canal and the special training of such employee would be more advantageous than the hiring of other available personnel having the specialized skill or experience desired. During the period of such special training the employee may be paid his regular compensation and his travel expenses in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, subject to recovery by the United States of such costs or an equitable portion thereof, as determined by the Governor, in case the employee fails to complete such training or is separated from the service except for reasons beyond his control within one year following the completion of the period of training."

Sec. 4. Title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in article 3 of chapter 6 thereof a new section numbered 124 and reading as follows:

"124. Employees injured prior to September 7, 1916; appliances; lump-sum payments: The Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to purchase artificial limbs or other appliances for persons who were injured in the service of the Isthmian Canal Commission or of the Panama Canal prior to September 7, 1916, and to make payments in lump sums not exceeding the amounts authorized by the act of September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, ch. 15), to alien cripples who are now a charge upon the Panama Canal by reason of injuries sustained while employed in the construction of the Panama Canal."

Sec. 5. Title 6 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in chapter 27 thereof a new section numbered 906 and reading as follows:

"906. Clothing and money for discharged prisoners: On the discharge of a prisoner from any penal institution in the Canal Zone such prisoner may, in the discretion of the Governor of the Panama Canal, be furnished with such suitable clothing as may be authorized by the Governor, and an amount of money not exceeding \$20."

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF LAWS OF THE CANAL ZONE REGARDING ADMINISTRATION OF ESTATES

The bill (S. 1137) to revise and codify laws of the Canal Zone regarding the administration of estates, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (43 Stat. 1122), is amended by adding in article 1 of chapter 6 thereof a new section No. 84, reading as follows:

"84. Payment for accumulated or accrued leave upon death: Upon the death of any

officer or employee of the Panama Canal or the Panama Railroad Company on the Isthmus of Panama, any compensation which may be payable on account of his accumulated and current accrued leave, under the conditions of employment prescribed by authority of section 81 of this title, as amended, shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries, if any, lawfully designated by the employee under the retirement act applicable to his service; and

"Second, if there be no such designated beneficiary, to the estate of such deceased employee: *Provided*, That any such payment shall be subject to the deduction, as provided in section 83 of this title, of all amounts due from the employee for supplies and services to the extent only, however, that other compensation due to the employee is insufficient for such purpose."

Sec. 2. Title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in chapter 9 thereof two new sections numbered 181 and 182, respectively, and reading as follows:

"181. Regulations relative to alcoholic beverages: The President is granted continuing authority to make regulations in respect to the sale and manufacture of alcoholic beverages within, and the importation thereof into and exportation thereof from, the Canal Zone, including the authority to prescribe licenses and fees for the sale and manufacture of such beverages.

"182. Violation of regulations; punishment: Any person who shall violate any provision of such regulations shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$500, or by imprisonment in jail for not more than 6 months, or by both, and in addition the license of such person may be revoked or suspended as the President may by such regulations prescribe."

Sec. 3. Section 303 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended to read as follows:

"303. Revocable licenses covering lands outside of town sites: Whenever the Governor of the Panama Canal deems such action to be necessary to, or in the interests of, the Government of the United States and of the efficient operation, maintenance, sanitation, government, and protection of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, the Governor is authorized, either in person or through such officer as he may designate, to issue revocable licenses covering the use of tracts of land situated outside of town sites in the Canal Zone. The terms and conditions of licenses issued under authority of this section shall be as prescribed by the Governor, except that the said licenses shall be revocable at the pleasure of the Governor and that, upon revocation of a license hereunder, the licensee shall, immediately or upon such reasonable notice as the Governor may prescribe, vacate the licensed area, remove therefrom all improvements which he may have placed upon the licensed area, and restore the licensed area to a condition satisfactory to the Governor, and shall not be entitled to indemnification for the value of such improvements; *Provided, however*, That licenses heretofore issued by authority of the Governor, and still in force, covering the use of tracts of land for agricultural purposes are ratified and confirmed in accordance with the terms and conditions applicable to them, respectively, and that upon the revocation of any of such licenses the terms and conditions applicable to which are such as to provide for compensation to the licensee in the reasonable value of the improvements made by him on said tract, to be determined in such manner as the Governor may direct, the compensation is authorized so to be determined and to be paid out of any moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated for such purpose, except that no compensation shall be paid in the

case of any license which is revoked on account of a material breach by the licensee of the terms and conditions applicable to his license, or where the licensee shall have abandoned the license, or in case of the death of the licensee."

Sec. 4. Section 225 of title 3 of the Canal Zone Code is amended to read as follows:

"225. Continuance after original license period: The right to continue to do business for the calendar year, and the successive calendar years, after the calendar year during which the original license was issued shall be contingent upon compliance with such provisions of this chapter as are applicable to corporations licensed under this chapter, upon the payment of a license fee of \$10, payable in advance, on January 1 of each year, and upon the designation of a new process agent before March 1 if the process agent theretofore designated has ceased during a preceding calendar year to reside within the Canal Zone."

Sec. 5. Title 4 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by inserting therein a new chapter No. 27A, embracing sections 1470a to 1470f, and reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 27A—DISPOSITION OF ESTATES WITHOUT ADMINISTRATION

"Sec.

1470a. Setting aside estates not exceeding \$1,000 in value; inclusion of application in petition for probate or letters.

1470b. Same; separate petition prior to hearing of petition for probate or letters.

1470c. Same; petition after filing of inventory.

1470d. Same; notice of hearing.

1470e. Same; decree setting aside.

1470f. Same; denying petition and instead acting on petition for probate or letters.

"Sec. 1470a. Setting aside estates not exceeding \$1,000 in value; inclusion of application in petition for probate or letters: If the decedent leaves a surviving spouse or minor child or minor children, and the net value of the whole estate, over and above all liens and encumbrances of record at the date of death and not including the property excepted from administration under section 649 of title 3, does not exceed the sum of \$1,000, the person petitioning for the probate of the will or for letters of administration may add an allegation to that effect to the other allegations of the petition, with a specific description of all of the decedent's property, a list of all the liens and encumbrances of record at the date of death, and an estimate of the value of the property, and may include, in the prayer, an alternative prayer that if the court finds that the net value of the whole estate, over and above all liens and encumbrances of record at the date of death and not including the property excepted from administration under section 649 of title 3 does not exceed \$1,000, the same be set aside to the surviving spouse, if there be one, and if there be none, then to the minor child or minor children of the decedent. When such allegation is included in the petition, the petition shall be verified, and the notice of hearing shall include a statement that a prayer for setting aside the estate to the surviving spouse or minor child or minor children, as the case may be, is included in the petition.

"CROSS-REFERENCE

"Settlement by public administrator without regular administration of estates less than \$250, see section 1703 of this title, as amended.

"1470b. Same; separate petition prior to hearing of petition for probate or letters: If the person petitioning for probate of the will or for letters of administration does not include such an allegation as is provided for by the next preceding section, the surviving

spouse, if there be one, and if there be none, the guardian of the minor child or minor children, may, at any time prior to the hearing of such petition, file a verified petition setting forth the matters mentioned in the next preceding section, and pray that the estate be set aside for the use of the surviving spouse or minor child or minor children. If the hearing of the original petition is set for a day more than 10 days after the filing of the petition herein provided for, the latter shall be set for hearing at the same time as the former; if not, it shall be set for hearing at least 10 days after the date on which it is filed, and the former petition shall be continued until such date.

"1470c. Same; petition after filing of inventory: If the decedent leaves a surviving spouse or minor child or minor children, and upon the filing of the inventory of the estate it appears that the net value of the whole estate, over and above all liens and encumbrances of record at the date of death and not including the property excepted from administration under section 649 of title 3, does not exceed the sum of \$1,000, the personal representative of the decedent or the surviving spouse or the guardian of the minor child or children may file a verified petition showing the value of the estate to be no greater than as aforesaid, and the clerk shall fix a day for the hearing thereof.

"1470d. Same; notice of hearing: When a petition is filed under section 1470b or section 1470c of this title, the clerk shall give notice of the hearing for the period and in the manner required by section 1463 of this title.

"1470e. Same; decree setting aside: If, upon the hearing of any petition provided for by this chapter, the court finds that the net value of the estate, over and above all liens and encumbrances of record at the date of the death of the decedent and not including the property excepted from administration under section 649 of title 3, does not exceed the sum of \$1,000, and that the expenses of the last illness, funeral charges, and expenses of administration have been paid, it shall, by decree for that purpose, assign to the surviving spouse of the decedent, if there be a surviving spouse, or, if there be no surviving spouse, then to the minor child or children of the decedent, if any, the whole of the estate, subject to whatever mortgages, liens, or encumbrances there may be upon said estate at the time of the death of the decedent. The title thereto shall vest absolutely in the surviving spouse, if there be a surviving spouse, or if there be no surviving spouse, in the minor child or children subject to whatever mortgages, liens, or encumbrances there may be upon said estate at the time of the death of the decedent, and there must be no further proceedings in the administration, unless further estate be discovered.

"1470f. Same; denying petition and instead acting on petition for probate or letters: If the court finds that the net value of the estate exceeds \$1,000, or that there is neither a surviving spouse nor minor child, it shall act upon the petition for probate or for letters of administration in the same manner as though no petition to set aside the estate had been included, and the estate shall then be administered in the usual manner."

Sec. 6. Section 1703 of title 4 of the Canal Zone Code is amended to read as follows:

"1703. Estates less than \$250: Whenever the public administrator shall file with the clerk of the district court a statement that the value of any estate, of which he has taken charge, is less than \$250, there shall be no regular administration on such estate unless additional estate be found or discovered; and the public administrator may, after the payment of the expenses of the last illness of the deceased, and the funeral charges, pay out and deliver such estate to the surviving spouse of the decedent, if there be a surviv-

ing spouse, or, if there be no surviving spouse, then to the minor child or children of the decedent, if any, or, if there be neither a surviving spouse nor minor child, then to such creditors, heirs, or other persons as may appear in the judgment of the public administrator to be legally entitled thereto, and the title to such estate shall vest absolutely in the person or persons to whom the same is paid out and delivered as provided in this section."

Sec. 7. Title 5 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in article 8 of chapter 11 thereof a new section numbered 573 and reading as follows:

"573. Regulations for fire protection; violations: The Governor of the Panama Canal is granted continuing authority to make regulations for prevention of, and protection against, fires in the Canal Zone: *Provided, however,* That no regulation made under this section shall have force or effect within the boundaries of any military or naval reservation in the Canal Zone, unless prescribed with the concurrence of the officers commanding the military and naval forces in the Canal Zone, as to the reservations within their respective jurisdictions. Any person who shall violate any of the regulations prescribed under this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

Sec. 8. Title 5 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding in article 10 of chapter 14 thereof a new section numbered 812 and reading as follows:

"812. Injuring or tampering with motor vehicle, launch, or aircraft: Every person who, without the consent of the owner of any motor vehicle—

"(a) willfully injures or tampers with such motor vehicle or the contents thereof;

"(b) breaks or removes any part or parts of or from such motor vehicle;

"(c) climbs into or upon such motor vehicle whether it is in motion or at rest, with intent to commit any malicious mischief, or injury or other crime; or

"(d) manipulates or attempts to manipulate any of the levers, starting mechanism, brakes, or other mechanism or device of such motor vehicle while the same is at rest and unattended,

is guilty of a misdemeanor. As used in this section the term 'motor vehicle' shall mean and include any automobile, motorcycle, other motor vehicle, motorboat or launch, or aircraft."

Sec. 9. The following statutes or parts of statutes are repealed:

(a) Canal Zone Code, title 2, chapter 17, article 2, which article includes sections 331 to 333 of said title 2;

(b) Canal Zone Code, title 4, sections 1467 and 1468;

(c) The act of May 3, 1932, entitled "An act to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes" (ch. 162, 47 Stat. 145; 48 U. S. C. 1304a to 1304c);

(d) The act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act authorizing the President to make rules and regulations in respect to alcoholic beverages in the Canal Zone, and for other purposes" (ch. 657, 48 Stat. 1116; 48 U. S. C. 1314b to 1314d).

ENLISTED PERSONNEL EMPLOYMENT IN AVIATION TACTICAL UNITS OF THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND AIR CORPS

The bill (S. 1270) to repeal that part of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, and that part of section 13a of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended, relating to the percentage, in time of peace, of enlisted personnel employed in aviation tactical units of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be en-

grossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2660) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader at whose request he objected to the consideration of Calendar 185, House bill 2660, so that before the next call of the calendar I may take the matter up with the Senator who asked the Senator to object.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will come to my desk I shall be glad to give him the information. It might be possible to get the matter ironed out before the call of the calendar is completed.

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

The bill (S. 1432) to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this is the same as Calendar 192, House bill 3856, and I ask unanimous consent that the House bill may be substituted for the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Which bill is this?

Mr. WHERRY. It is order No. 186. The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the same as Calendar 192, which is House bill on the same subject.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to have an explanation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senate bill is similar to House bill 3856, which has already passed the House. It provides for the appointment of a commission to take care of remodeling and rehabilitating the White House. The Committees on Public Works of both the Senate and the House looked into the matter, and the bill makes provisions similar to that made for other commissions having to do with buildings of the type of the White House. The Jefferson Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, and historical monuments of that kind are always operated by commissions.

The commission in question is assigned five specific functions, which are

set forth in the committee report. The commission is to be composed of two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and two members to be appointed by the President of the United States.

The five specific functions as set forth in the report are:

(1) To approve all construction plans for the renovation and modernization of the Executive Mansion;

(2) To determine the methods for selecting, and approve the selection of, the general contractor and the subcontractors who will perform the construction work, subject to such conditions and limitations as may be contained in appropriations made for such work;

No appropriations have been made up to this time.

(3) To supervise generally the progress of such construction work;

(4) To take measures to assure that all lumber, fixtures, and other materials removed from the Executive Mansion in the course of the work are carefully examined for the purpose of safeguarding and segregating any of such materials which are of such historical importance that they should be permanently preserved * * *;

(5) To submit to the Congress and the President from time to time, but at least once annually, a report on the progress of the work under its supervision.

Mr. President, the House has passed H. R. 3856 dealing with this subject. The Senate bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Public Works. It was approved by members of both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 3856?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in addition to what the able Senator from New Mexico has said, let me advise my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] that the President of the United States is extremely anxious that the bill be passed. The passage of the bill would relieve him of all responsibility, and place the responsibility for the renovation of the White House in the hands of the Commission, which shall have the power to employ contractors, subcontractors, and architects, and to do anything and everything necessary to rehabilitate the Executive Mansion. I think the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me that from the reports we have had resulting from the present examination made of the White House, it needs rebuilding at the earliest possible time. It is a highly dangerous structure for anyone to attempt to live in.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request made by the Senator from New Mexico, but I should like to ask him a question, if he will yield for that purpose?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I notice the bill provides for two members of the Commission to be appointed by the President from the executive branch or from private life. Under the bill he could appoint two members of the Commission from either the executive branch or

private life, or one from each. I wonder if a limitation should be placed in the bill to the effect that one appointment should be made from the executive branch and that the other appointment should be made from private life.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have no information respecting what the President would do about that. My opinion is that the work is of such great importance, and that the situation is so serious that the President would be desirous of obtaining the best available person to act on the Commission. My opinion is that he would endeavor to secure the services of the best engineers and architects to help the two Members appointed from the House and the two Members appointed from the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In view of the importance of the matter, Mr. President, I withhold any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 3856?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3856) to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1432 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1432 is indefinitely postponed.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE, SHAWNEETOWN, ILL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 755) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "June 26, 1946" and insert "the date of approval of this act."; and in line 12, to strike out "Sec. 3. This act shall be effective from June 26, 1947.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the proviso to the first section of the act entitled "An act to revive, reenact, and amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, its successors, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Shawneetown, Gallatin County, Ill., to a point opposite thereto in the county of Union, State of Kentucky,' approved July 18, 1939," approved June 26, 1946, the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River, at or near Shawneetown, Ill., authorized to be built by the county of Gallatin, State of Illinois, by an act of Congress approved July 18, 1939, which act was extended by an act of Congress approved July 2, 1940, and was revived, reenacted, and amended by an act of Congress approved June 26, 1946, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from the date of approval of this act.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE APPLICABLE TO ALASKA

The bill (S. 70) 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, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a new section be inserted in the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended, immediately following section 5 of title I thereof, to read as follows:

"5a. That the rules heretofore or hereafter promulgated and made effective by the Supreme Court of the United States under authority of title 28, United States Code, section 2072, or under authority of any other statute, regulating the forms of process, writs, and motions, and the pleadings, practice, and procedure, in actions of a civil nature in the district courts of the United States, and regulating appeals therefrom, shall apply to the District Court for the Territory of Alaska and to appeals therefrom."

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27), favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is this concurrent resolution similar to other concurrent resolutions concerning which inquiry has been previously made today?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; this is another of the same type of concurrent resolution. Mr. President, I ask the attention of every Member of the Senate to the statement I shall now make respecting these measures. Similar measures are coming to the Senate nearly every week, are being acted on, and are being placed on the calendar. They are measures which are of grave concern to the Committee on the Judiciary and especially of grave concern to the chairman of the committee, because I realize the seriousness of holding within this country persons who should not be here. With that in mind we are watching the situation as closely as our facilities will permit. We are demanding of the Department of Justice that it give us detailed statements in the case of each suspension. When we have such a detailed statement we then make a further study. But even with that precaution I am not at all certain that we are sufficiently cautious.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point concerning which I wish to ask the Senator. I am in full accord with the basic legislation involved. But the Senator from Nevada has over and over again stated that there was a lack of facilities or personnel or something with which to do what the basic legislation really provides should be done. Can the Senator sug-

gest what more is needed in order to do what the Senator would like to have done?

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that, so far as the Senate Judiciary Committee is concerned, we are quite well staffed. Our staff goes into these questions in detail. But the House Committee on the Judiciary is not sufficiently staffed, and it brings matters of this kind quite frequently to the attention of the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. So we go into such matters with great caution and great care, but even then, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska, I am not always entirely content.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the procedure, the Attorney General states, in effect, that certain aliens in this country are not compelled to leave it.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. He suspends deportation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I speak of. I have tried to put it into simple language. Then the matter comes before the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the committee reviews what the Attorney General has done, and the committee either approves or disapproves the action of the Attorney General?

Mr. McCARRAN. We not only review what he has done, but we go as much further as we have facilities with which to go into the matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose the committee should say it believes the deportation is advisable. What happens then?

Mr. McCARRAN. Then we hold it. It does not come before the Senate. We hold it, and the suspension does not go into effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, the only individuals who can remain in the country are those whose stay in the country is approved both by the Attorney General and the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. And the Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. And the Congress. Therefore, unless the Congress approves what the Attorney General has done the persons in question are automatically deported.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator one more question. Does the committee or members of its staff see these individuals personally, or how does the committee secure evidence on which it decides whether the individuals should be deported or should not be deported?

Mr. McCARRAN. We do not see the individuals personally. It would be impossible for us to see them. That would require a staff much greater than we have, and I do not know then how far we would have to go. We take the report from the Department of Justice. We call on the FBI for all information they may have. We resort to every other means known to the Immigration Bureau, and then make our report to the full Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. The committee reviews all the things it knows of that affect the case, and determines whether or not justice or injustice is being done?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I had in mind to ask some of the questions the distinguished Senator from Maryland has asked. I should like to ask one or two more questions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. About how many such cases has the Committee on the Judiciary held up?

Mr. McCARRAN. Up to date we have held up approximately 10 percent of the cases submitted to us by the Department of Justice. When I say 10 percent, we may in some cases drop down to 5 percent, or we may go as high as 20 percent. Some day we may refuse to adopt the report from the Department of Justice with respect to all of them. I do not know. But we cannot be too cautious in this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. How many hundred cases would the Senator say have come before the Judiciary Committee for consideration?

Mr. McCARRAN. To date, about 800.

Mr. WHERRY. Of that number, approximately 80 have been held up.

Mr. McCARRAN. Between 80 and 100.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator satisfied with the facilities, personnel, appropriations, or whatever is necessary to do what the Senator himself feels should be done in the review of these cases? I do not mean to cast any reflection on the Department of Justice, the FBI, or any other agency. I have the greatest confidence in the Senator from Nevada. Apparently he is somewhat reluctant to feel that what has been done is all that should have been done.

Mr. McCARRAN. To be perfectly frank, if we had a staff of 100, I do not know that we could go as far as we should go in each one of these cases. But we go as far as we can, and before a case is submitted to the Judiciary Committee we are satisfied that the suspension should be sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-9743510, Aasmo, Kristian Ingvard.
A-1537001, Anderson, Mary Elvera (nee Soderman, formerly Sjoblom).
A-3734119, Araya, Luis Alberto y Franc, or Luis Alberto Araya.
A-5987595, Arias-Perez, Jose Angel.
A-1901927, Augustatos, Panagis, or Peter Statos.
A-7028110, Ballester, Amparo Teresa Asela (alias Amparo Iturbil Ballester).
A-3172055, Bartkowiak, Peter (alias Hans Halbe).

A-5220001, Bausback, Robert; Robert Hill.
A-9575542, Berkhout, Willem.
A-2588586, Bogdanovic, Savo, or Nicholas Pechar.
A-3793346, Borgwardt, Hans Karl.
A-2890486, Borrell, Teresa Adell (nee Gelma).
A-6451024, Black, Cristeta Bracamonte.
A-4451159, Braxton, Bedena Mae (nee Jackson).
A-5277574, Breed, Lois Hannah (nee Lois Hannah Carson).
A-6010603, Browne, Wolsely, or Woseley Browne.
A-5911494, Bubaris, Gus, or Constantine Bubaris.
A-6635469, Castillo, Margarita de Nino, or Margarita Castillo-Guzman.
A-6645953, Castillo-Nino (Nino-Castillo), Maria Teresa.
A-6732046, Caudillo, Tula Bonnie or Buenaventura.
A-4196469, Chai, Yung Shu, or Ashun Yung.
A-5780020, Chairman, Imre Von Csernyak, or Irving Chairman.
A-5553362, Chiamp, Vincenzo, or James Chiamp.
A-4314275, Chaitowich, Louis, or Louis Kaplan.
A-6244381, Constantinidis, Aristides (alias Aris Contis).
A-6221542, Cooper, Prisca Edrozo.
A-1405762, Dadines, Gustus or Gus or Constantinos.
A-4859572, Dalsass, Vigilio.
A-5696856, De Garcia, Reina Flores, or Reina Flores or Reina V. Florez or Reina Flores Garcia.
A-1319885, Dove, Alec George.
A-4479978, Dumo, Caridad Inigo, or Caridad Inigo.
A-6458415, Fenner, Edward George.
A-6458414, Fenner, Ronald James.
A-2383471, Freitas (de), Robert Montello.
A-4641707, Gabriel, John Riaza, or John Riaza.
A-6289030, Galocky, Peter, or Peter Galocki or Szalaky.
A-6682329, Gallant, Marie Doris.
A-6682330, Gallant, Marie Aline.
A-5078290, Gaug, Elizabeth (nee Bergman).
A-4899082, Gobel, Andrew, or Andreas Hupka.
A-4266209, Goldschmidt, Paul Andrew.
A-2984527, Gonzales, Juan Cruz.
A-5965015, Goster, Anton, or Anton Goester.
A-6339993, Gutierrez-Telleria, Joaquin.
A-6057291, Henning, Charlotte (nee Meske-witz or Moskowitz).
A-3622165, Hing, Frank, or Fon Hing.
A-9527867, Hinojosa, Salvador De La Rosa.
A-4740106, Hodge, James Milton.
A-2744180, Horque, Abdul, or Abdull Ali or Michael Banali.
A-5789523, Ippolito, Lorenzo or Lawrence.
A-3009283, Karaylannis, Athanasios, Joamis, or Thomas Karras.
A-4790517, Karlisen, Gustav Adolf, or Gus Karlisen.
A-4385826, Khan, Mohammed Yousof, or Mohammed Khan or Joseph Martin.
A-6163659, King Socorro Salvador.
A-6537545, Lambert, Peter William.
A-3244422, Larsen, Harry William.
A-5279913, Lazarowitz, Liza, or Liza Pol-lack or Liza Spector.
A-5341670, Liu, Pin Pin or Lau (nee T'an).
A-5946657, Macris, Demetrios (Demitrios) George, or James Demetrios (Dimitrios Macris or James Morris or James Makers).
A-1293850, Mair, Esther Julia (nee Arlaif formerly Beaubrun).
A-6756642, Martinez-Cuellar, Joel.
A-6342234, Mecham, Elisha James.
A-6199462, Mecham, Peggy Lynn.
A-6199463, Mecham, Eldon James.
A-6290925, Morris Edward Nemiah, or Ed-ward Samuel Morris or Vincent Lawrence.

A-4648305, Moy, Mabel Mary, or Mabel Chung Moy or Mabel Mary Song or Geung Keu Sing.
A-5348214, Munoz-Melendez, Lorenzo.
A-6528174, Nino-Arroyo, Felipe.
A-5670657, Nolfi, Nicola Mario.
A-8069739, Nunez, Nicolas, or Nicolas Nunez Valencia.
A-6516676, O'Dwyer, Elizabeth (nee Semev-sky or Elizabeth Semevsky Roberts).
A-6145883, Ortaliz, Jose Montilla.
A-6145884, Ortaliz, June Ann.
A-6145891, Ortaliz, Rosina Lou.
A-6047308, Pedroza, Gilberto.
A-6047309, Pedroza, Francisca.
A-5322856, Phillips, Clarence Daniel.
A-3138310, Prатели, Gino.
A-6056513, Ramirez-Mendoza, David.
A-6243348, Rebolgar, Jesus Garcia, or Jessie Rebolgar or Jesus Rebolgar Y Garcia.
A-5648666, Reno, Mildred Agnes (nee Deneau).
A-6087331, Rivera, Maria Lorenza Gonzalez (nee Mejia).
A-3610681, Rodriguez, Antonio Manuel Ruiz.
A-6581448, Rodriguez, Lucio Socorro, or Lucio Rodriguez-Velo.
A-6187293, Roesier, Norbert Leonhard Hugo.
A-5377064, Rohan, Shella (nee McLaugh-lin).
A-5840169, Rose, Frederick Winston, or Winston Rose.
A-9530108, Rubin, Tore Gustaf Borje.
A-5290628, Saklias, Stavros, or Steve Saklias.
A-9706709, Schoneveld, Willem.
A-2851871, Shall, Mary Raffaella (nee Zaf-fino).
A-1748967, Shafer, Armed.
A-1253293, Shiffriss, Oved.
A-1521407, Shiffriss, Shoshana (nee Sho-shana Zelmans).
A-6185203, Soriano, Vera Semenova (nee Doroshenko).
A-6346405, Stocks Alexander Albert.
A-2593026, Strupp, Adele (nee Eckstein alias Adele Elizabeth Strupp).
A-6378219, Tischner, Kenneth James, for-merly Kenneth James Quigly.
A-9607272, Valantasis, Georgios and George Kostl Valantasis, or Valantassis.
A-6249025, Van Dillen, Mathilde Alexan-drine (nee Schoorel).
A-6177707, Van Dillen, Paul.
A-6145990, Vasquez, Jose Garcia.
A-6145981, Vasquez, Elizabeth Beedle.
A-5553142, Von Rabenau, Alexander Con-stantine (alias Alexander Olivera alias Alex-ander A. Rabenau).
A-4205188, Wang, Hsi, or Harry Wang.
A-4205176, Wang, Djao Szi, or Lily Wang.
A-6099150, Widerynski, Maria Antonietta.
A-6551114, Zerda, Dolores Phyllis.
A-6551115, Zerda, Dale Melford Aldeous.

CARE AND CUSTODY OF INSANE PERSONS CHARGED WITH OFFENSES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 936) to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Com-mittee on the Judiciary with an amend-ment, to strike out all after the enact-ing clause and insert:

That title 18, United States Code, chapter 313, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sections:

"§ 4244. Mental incompetency after arrest and before trial.

"Whenever after arrest and prior to the imposition of sentence or prior to the expira-tion of any period of probation the United

States Attorney has reasonable cause to believe that a person charged with an offense against the United States may be presently insane or otherwise so mentally incompetent as to be unable to understand the proceedings against him or properly to assist in his own defense, he shall file a motion for a judicial determination of such mental competency of the accused, setting forth the ground for such belief with the trial court in which proceedings are pending. Upon such a motion or upon a similar motion in behalf of the accused, or upon its own motion, the court shall cause the accused, whether or not previously admitted to bail, to be examined as to his mental condition by at least one qualified psychiatrist, who shall report to the court. For the purpose of the examination the court may order the accused committed for such reasonable period as the court may determine to a suitable hospital or other facility to be designated by the court. If the report of the psychiatrist indicates a state of present insanity or such mental incompetency in the accused, the court shall hold a hearing, upon due notice, at which evidence as to the mental condition of the accused may be submitted, including that of the reporting psychiatrist, and make a finding with respect thereto. No statement made by the accused in the course of any examination into his sanity or mental competency provided for by this section, whether the examination shall be with or without the consent of the accused, shall be admitted in evidence against the accused on the issue of guilt in any criminal proceeding. A finding by the judge that the accused is mentally competent to stand trial shall in no way prejudice the accused in a plea of insanity as a defense to the crime charged; such finding shall not be introduced in evidence on that issue nor otherwise be brought to the notice of the jury.

"§ 4245. Mental incompetency undisclosed at trial.

"Whenever the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall certify that a person convicted of an offense against the United States has been examined by the board of examiners referred to in title 18, United States Code, section 4241, and that there is probable cause to believe that such person was mentally incompetent at the time of his trial, provided the issue of mental competency was not raised and determined before or during said trial, the Attorney General shall transmit the report of the board of examiners and the certificate of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to the clerk of the district court wherein the conviction was had. Whereupon the court shall hold a hearing to determine the mental competency of the accused in accordance with the provisions of section 4244 above, and with all the powers therein granted. In such hearing the certificate of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall be prima facie evidence of the facts and conclusions certified therein. If the court shall find that the accused was mentally incompetent at the time of his trial, the court shall vacate the judgment of conviction and grant a new trial.

"§ 4246. Procedure upon finding of mental incompetency.

"Whenever the trial court shall determine in accordance with sections 4244 and 4245 of this title that an accused is or was mentally incompetent, the court may commit the accused to the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative, until the accused shall be mentally competent to stand trial or until the pending charges against him are disposed of according to law. And if the court after hearing

as provided in the preceding sections 4244 and 4245 shall determine that the conditions specified in the following section 4247 exist, the commitment shall be governed by section 4248 as herein provided.

"§ 4247. Alternate procedure on expiration of sentence.

"Whenever the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall certify that a prisoner whose sentence is about to expire has been examined by the board of examiners referred to in title 18, United States Code, section 4241, and that in the judgment of the Director and the board of examiners the prisoner is insane or mentally incompetent, and that if released he will probably endanger the safety of the officers, the property, or other interests of the United States, and that suitable arrangements for the custody and care of the prisoner are not otherwise available, the Attorney General shall transmit the certificate to the clerk of the court for the district in which the prisoner is confined. Whereupon the court may in its discretion cause the prisoner to be examined by a qualified psychiatrist designated by the court and one selected by the prisoner, and shall, after notice, hold a hearing to determine whether the conditions specified above exist. At such hearing the designated psychiatrist or psychiatrists may submit his or their reports, and the report of the board of examiners and other institutional records relating to the prisoner's mental condition shall be admissible in evidence. All of the psychiatrists and members of the board who have examined the prisoner may be called as witnesses, and be available for further questioning by the court and cross-examination by the prisoner or on behalf of the Government. If upon such hearing the court shall determine that the conditions specified above exist, the court may commit the prisoner to the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative.

"§ 4248. Termination of custody by release or transfer.

"Whenever a person shall be committed pursuant to section 4247 of this title, his commitment shall run until the sanity or mental competency of the person shall be restored, or until the mental condition of the person is so improved that if he be released he will not endanger the safety of the officers, the property, or other interests of the United States, or until suitable arrangements have been made for the custody and care of the prisoner by the State of his residence, whichever event shall first occur. Whereupon the Attorney General or his authorized representative shall file with the court which made said commitment a certificate stating the termination of the commitment and the ground therefore: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall preclude a prisoner committed under the authority of section 4247 hereof from establishing his eligibility for release under the provisions of this section by a writ of habeas corpus. The Attorney General or his authorized representative shall have authority at any time to transfer a prisoner committed to his custody under the authority of section 4246 or section 4247 hereof to the proper authorities of the State of his residence."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 313 of such title, immediately preceding section 4241, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4244. Mental incompetency after arrest and before trial.

"4245. Mental incompetency undisclosed at trial.

"4246. Procedure upon finding of mental incompetency.

"4247. Alternate procedure on expiration of sentence.

"4248. Termination of custody by release or transfer."

SEC. 3. The Attorney General may authorize the use of any unexpended balance of the appropriation for "Support of United States prisoners" for carrying out the purposes of title 18, United States Code, sections 4244 to 4248, inclusive, or in payment of any expenses incidental thereto and not provided for by other specific appropriations.

SEC. 4. If any provision of title 18, United States Code, sections 4244 to 4248, inclusive, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the said sections and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

PROCESSING OF VISA CASES INVOLVING ALIEN FIANCÉS AND FIANCÉES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 160) to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés, and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] would have any objection, in line 12 on page 2, to changing the date from January 1, 1949, to April 1, 1949. There are some very important cases in my State involving men who want to be married. They served in Germany or Austria.

Mr. McCARRAN. As I understand, the proposed amendment would allow an extra 4 months.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The joint resolution has been passed by the House. It would probably have to go to conference. I have no objection to such an amendment.

Mr. LANGER. If it should go to conference, I do not think that would make any difference.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection, if the Senator wishes to offer that amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 12, after the word "before" it is proposed to strike out "January" and insert "April."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were, on page 2, line 12, after the numerals "1949" to strike out "and were unable to come to the United States for reasons beyond their control"; in line 14, after "United States" to strike out "before July 1, 1949" and insert

"within five months after the effective date of this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT BENEFITS TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 493) to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill, particularly with reference to why the Virgin Islands are not required to match grants-in-aid, as the States are required to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when the Vocational Education Act was passed containing a provision for vocational education for returning veterans, the Virgin Islands were unintentionally omitted. All the other island possessions and Territories of the United States are included. There are about a thousand veterans among the Virgin Islanders who, the committee believes, are entitled to the same consideration which is given to veterans in all the other possessions and States of the United States. The committee is merely correcting what it believes to be an unintentional omission. There is certainly no reason why there should be any discrimination against veterans in the Virgin Islands. The bill was unanimously recommended by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Virgin Islands shall be entitled to share in the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, approved August 1, 1946, and any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, upon the same terms and conditions as any of the several States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and annually thereafter, the sum of \$40,000, to be available for allotment to the Virgin Islands under such act and the modifications hereinafter provided.

Sec. 2. Sums appropriated under authority of section 1 of this act shall be allocated for vocational education in (1) agriculture, (2) home economics, (3) trades and industries, and (4) distributive occupations, in the proportions specified by the Vocational Education Act of 1946, except insofar as the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, deems it necessary to modify said proportion to meet special conditions existing in the Virgin Islands.

Sec. 3. The provisions of sections 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to the use and payment of sums under said Act, shall apply to sums appropriated under this act with such modifications as the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, shall deem necessary to meet the special conditions existing in the Virgin Islands.

CONVEYANCE TO PINELLAS COUNTY, FLA., OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

The bill (S. 166) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this bill is the same as House bill 1998, No. 217 on the calendar. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 1998?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1998) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 166 will be indefinitely postponed.

CHANGE OF NAME OF CULBERTSON DAM ON THE REPUBLICAN RIVER IN NEBRASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 270) to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to "Trenton Dam" which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment at the top of page 2, to insert:

The body of water arising behind such dam shall hereafter be designated and referred to as "Swanson Lake" in commemoration of Carl H. Swanson.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the dam under construction on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska, heretofore known, designated, and referred to as "Culbertson Dam," shall hereafter be designated and referred to as "Trenton Dam." Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under and by the name "Culbertson Dam" shall be held and considered to refer to such dam under and by the name of "Trenton Dam." The body of water arising behind such dam shall hereafter be designated and referred to as "Swanson Lake" in commemoration of Carl H. Swanson.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to 'Trenton Dam' and to name the body of water arising behind such dam 'Swanson Lake.'"

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR USE OF CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section

511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of what is involved? The chairman of the committee, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, is present. I do not want to have the joint resolution go over unless there is reason for objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the joint resolution was introduced by the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It was reported favorably from that committee by unanimous vote, after public hearings, and passed the House without objection. The joint resolution has the approval of the United States Maritime Commission and the Treasury Department.

The purpose of this resolution is to amend section 5 of Public Law 384, Eightieth Congress, approved August 8, 1947, relating to the merchant marine construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, by striking out "March 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1951."

The reason for the joint resolution is to hold the funds together, so that investment may be made. Unless this measure is passed, the funds will be dissipated, which will necessitate the payment of taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

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

LONG-RANGE PROVING GROUND FOR GUIDED MISSILES

The bill (H. R. 1741) to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, we all know that guided missiles were used in the last war. Mr. Hitler used them—the V-1, and V-2 buzz bombs shot from the Continent of Europe to London and other cities.

Since the termination of the war valuable data have fallen into the hands of various governments. Our Government considers it wise, in order to maintain its defenses, to continue testing the various guided-missile weapons to see whether or not they are adaptable to modern warfare. It is necessary to have a range on which the tests can be made.

We have held extensive hearings on the subject. We have even brought scientists all the way across the country from the Pacific coast. This is a national defense measure. It is asked for by the President and by the Department of National Defense. There is no objection to it. In drafting the legislation we have tried to frame it so as to locate and operate the proving ground at such a place and in such a manner that it will not interfere with the normal activities of the people of the United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland whether the committee was unanimous?

Mr. TYDINGS. The committee was unanimous.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any available United States property where this proving ground could be located, or is it necessary to acquire new land?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator that it would be a little difficult for me to answer that question publicly. However, some United States property is available, and complete arrangements have been made to do the job in the most economical way it can be done. I think I speak for the entire committee in making that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 6, after the word "amended," to strike out the comma and the words "in administering the provisions of the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654, 43 U. S. C., Supp. 315q)." and insert "Prior to the acquisition under the authority of this section of any lands or rights or other interests pertaining thereto, the Secretary of the Air Force shall come into agreement with the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to the acquisition of such lands, rights, or other interests."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 4. The Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are hereby authorized to contribute to the support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons to the extent they may deem necessary or advisable, including, but not limited to, the allocation for such support of funds available to them for such purposes.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Defense may, at his discretion, transfer and reallocate to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force all, or any part of the authority granted herein, and, in connection with such transfer or reallocation, may transfer all or any part of the funds available for the establishment or support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons.

And insert:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in his discretion, to transfer to the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Navy, and to retransfer from either of such Secretaries to the other or to the Secretary of the Air Force, all, or any part of, the authority granted by sections 1 and 2 of this act; and, in connection with any such transfer or retransfer, to transfer all or any part of the funds available for the establishment and support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles and other weapons. The Secretary of Defense is fur-

ther authorized to permit, to the extent that he may deem appropriate, the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to contribute, with or without reimbursement, to the establishment and support of the joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles by the loan, assignment, or transfer of personnel, supplies, equipment, and services.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PERSECUTION OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES

The resolution (S. Res. 102) favoring the protest in the United Nations of the persecution of certain clergymen in Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that these actions should be strongly protested in the United Nations or by whatever other means may be appropriate.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Ordass in Hungary, of Archbishop Stepinac in Yugoslavia, and of Protestant clergymen in Bulgaria, evidences the abridgment and violation of fundamental human freedoms guaranteed in the treaties of peace and reaffirmed in the United Nations Charter: Now, therefore, be it

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EMERGENCY NEEDS OF CRIPPLED CHILDREN

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 212) authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, by way of explanation, let me say that the additional amount which the joint resolution would authorize for the care and hospitalization of crippled children throughout the country is only \$1,500,000. It has been found necessary to take care of a large number of children who suffered from infantile paralysis during the last year; and the proposed increase over the appropriation already authorized is only \$1,500,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

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

NELLIE M. CLARK

The bill (H. R. 1094) for the relief of Nellie M. Clark was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF H. M. MCCORVEY

The bill (H. R. 1164) for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. LEROY HANN

The bill (H. R. 1176) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JUDGE E. ESTES

The bill (H. R. 1280) for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH ROWLAND

The bill (H. R. 1286) for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-7793367, Acevedo, Ramona nee Diaz Galletty.

A-6683184, Adam Emmanuel Konstantinos or Emanuel Constantinos Adam.

A-5880692, Altmann, Anton Frederick (Friedrich).

A-6758166, Alves, Domingos Esteves.

A-6115712, Anguiano-Alcazar, Felix alias Agustin Valencia alias Agustin Valencia Anguiano alias Felix Anguiano alias Felix Anguaino.

A-3224363, Andersen, Knud Kaspar.

A-2940833, Anderson, Axel Hjalmar alias Axel Hjalmar Carlsson.

A-9577267, Apeessos, Ioannis Pndelis alias John P. Apeessos.

A-6679669, Appelthaler, Katerina.

A-6679668, Appelthaler, Kurt Robert.

A-2211955, Arellano, Domingos Ramos.

A-1393347, Arellano, Soledad Valadez or Soledad Maria Valadez.

A-6071241, Arellano, Innocencio.

A-6071239, Arellano, Domingo, Jr., or Dominic Arellano.

A-6071240, Arellano, Juan or John Arellano.

A-3779214, Arit, Hans Erich Lothar.

A-1153452, Arrighi, Alessandro or Alexander or Alessandro Arrigo.

A-6301280, Bagniewski, Wanda Stanislaw or Wanda Stanislaw Kiernik.

A-6821666, Bastide, Genevive Marcelle.

A-2118744, Bau, Siu-Tsung or Marguerite Janet Bau Chang.

A-3419857, Baum, Betty.

A-3151534, Baumann, Henrik Chaskiel or Henry Baumann.

A-6026888, Beitelstein, Anton, Anton Stein, Tony Stein, or Anton Beitelstem, Anton Beitelstein.

A-7765476, Berard, Jorge Vandesmet.

A-5920168, Berke, Ivera Romalia.

A-6434078, Bernheimer, Ludwig.

A-5153633, Bianchi, Luigi.

A-5932160, Blake, Eulalie Constanca or Eulalie Constanca Turnbull.

A-6760216, Blake, Helena Ketruda or Helena Ketruda Powell.

A-3113337, Bober, Maria Theresia Gerber.

A-6466991, Borraccia, Lorenzo.

A-6288235, Bronner, Eugenia Michael formerly Eugenia Gavriloff, nee Losseff.

A-6288068, Bronner, Helen Tamara Marlanna formerly Helen Tamara Marianna Gavriloff.

A-6316110, Brouwer, Frans Hieronimus Borgman.

- A-6625552, Brown, Doris nee Singh.
A-2673048, Brown, Morris Simon alias Movsa Braunreit.
A-6701608, Burgers, Willem Adolph Johan.
A-6645933, Butterlick, Janet Barry or Janet Barry Mack.
A-7651629, Candia, Jose alias Jose Candia Urguidi or Jose Urguidi or Joe.
A-9769688, Carro, Alfredo or Alfred Carro.
A-3299176, Castillo, Geronimo or Giro Castillo.
A-6336616, Chalmers, Bromley Russell Scott.
A-6336617, Chalmers, Jill.
A-7041842, Chin, Yuen Chew or Chin Yuen Chew or Chew Yuen Chinn.
A-5138325, Chui, Wan; Chui Wan; Hang Kin Chui; Hankin Hunt.
A-1581731, Ciesla, Ludwik.
A-5179937, Valdes, Maria Hortensia Clemente y Sanches McDonald; or Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez McDonald Valdes nee Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez; Maria Hortensia Clemente Sanchez or Maria Hortensia Clemente McDonald.
A-5611302, Cohen, Joseph.
A-4880986, Cohen, Gertie Gertrude.
A-2554813, Conradt, Ernst Heinrich Wilhelm or Ernst Henry Conradt.
A-6262074, Cucullu, Francesca R.
A-2113086, DaGoutis, Louise Emilie nee Masse.
A-6404432, Davis, Diane May.
A-6404433, Davis, Eileen Marie.
A-6404431, Davis, Philip Bennet.
A-2945357, Dawson, Harriet Mae or Hattie Mae Lloyd or Harriet Mae Gibson.
A-4746398, De Escalante, Alicia Adriana Vara or Alicia Adriana Vara-Solis DeCordero.
A-3197506, De Gomez, Rita Avena alias Rita Avena.
A-6079055, Dimakos, Christos alias Christos Demakos.
A-4665465, DiPietro, Sebastiano or Pietro Petrillo or Grido Cardella.
A-9836789, Drioli, Salvatore.
A-9671716, Elvir, Cesar Augusto.
A-4785369, Engles, Elsie Violet nee Elsie Violet Huffman.
A-5906567, Fahie, Adeline nee Nibbs.
A-3481412, Fahie, Joseph Alfred.
A-5832029, Fahie, Rebecca.
A-3193626, Fekete, Agnes Elizabeth nee Pauza now Kourcosk or Korscak.
A-6774677, Frank, Annie or Ann Frank or Ann Burtnik Frank or Annie Burtnik Frank.
A-6716135, Frazer, Joseph Wellington.
A-6464484, Frenkel, Mayer.
A-6020425, Gabriel, Manuel Gimenez.
A-6405609, Gallegos, Manuel or Manuel Medina.
A-3750703, Garcia, Juan or John Garcia.
A-6063595, Garcia, William Joseph.
A-5140522, Garlipp, Franz Hermann or Frank Herman Garlipp.
A-5048436, Ghinelli, Germano or Jerry Ghinelli.
A-6051631, Gobb, Marguerite Elinor nee Aaron also known as Marguerite Elinor Aaron.
A-6500830, Gomez, Maria Pilar alias Olivia Gomez alias Maria Olivia Gomez Pedroza or Maria Pillas Gomez Quesada.
A-6288439, Greaves, Anne Marie nee Anne Marie Erneste Pierre Monlouis-Eugene.
A-6630058, Gson-Niebling, Goesta Bertil.
A-3053878, Hanko, Joseph Ewald or Joseph or Jozef Hanko.
A-6413603, Harvie, Meryl Lorraine or Meryl Lorraine Grayson.
A-6369265, Hernandez-Gutierrez, Jose Maria.
A-4463931, Halmberger, Rudolf Gustave or Rudolf Halmberger.
A-6590997, Huggins, William Archibald.
A-6425288, Jacobs, Olive Jane.
A-6446194, Joanta, Florence nee Florence Antonescu.
A-9505156, Johansen, Kristian Rudolf.
A-4624493, Kimbell, Ofelia Aycardi nee Aycardi.
A-9706894, Kokolis, Jonnes Peter; or Kokolis, John Peter alias John Nicholas Kokolis or Ioannis Kokolis or Ioanis Giannaris or Ioannis Panagiotis Kokolis or Ioanis Koukalis.
A-6489767, Kostrzak, Lita Foerster nee Lita Foerster.
A-6440727, Kovar, Anton or Anton Joseph Kovar.
A-6208118, Kromhout, Arle Jan.
A-4549342, Laeske, Hedwig Anna formerly Browne nee Bardeleben.
A-6484122, Lansford, Ethel Matilda formerly Ethel Matilda Molohon nee MacDonald.
A-2773539, Lee, Ruth Mo or Ruth Lo-Tak Mo.
56122/739, Lencovich, Joseph Peter.
A-1304739, Lepore, Salvatore alias Samuel or Sam Lepore alias Samuel Le Poce.
A-4769421, Lettsome, Edward or Edward Letsome.
A-1424552, Levitsky, Thomas.
A-6261599, Longos, Katina.
A-1322447, Lopez-Martinez, Juan.
A-2365797, de Lopez, Maria Valadez-Romero.
A-4388670, Lo Surdo, Sebastiano.
A-2145986, Lucas, Lieselotte or Lieselotte Muenzer or Lotte Muenzer or Munzer.
A-6706860, Luschning, Klaus Oswald or Klaus Carnival.
A-4584463, Mac Clymont, David or Thomas Wood.
A-5777765, Mahlman, Bruno William or Bruno William Dietrich Mahlman.
A-4052648, Malerba, Domenico or Domenick Malerba.
A-6095324, Mantzuranis, Evagelia or Evagelia Mantzurani or Evagelia Stratigakis.
A-6645782, Mar, Judy alias Judy Muck.
A-6645783, Mar, James alias James Muck.
A-6566614, Mariades, Helene Agouras formerly Helene Andrea Agouras.
A-6612108, Marquez, Arturo.
A-6612107, Marquez, Maria Del Carmen.
A-6694634, Martinez, Cruz.
A-6689502, McDougall, Joseph Ignatius.
A-3024922, McGill, John Joseph.
A-6603045, Mendoza, Julio.
A-6608918, Mendoza, Jose Salome.
A-9578104, Montgomery, Clem.
A-5694677, Muller, Mathias or Mathew Muller.
A-5694675, Muller, Barbara nee Messner.
A-3869778, Munoz, Maria Amparo Gegunde Gomez nee Maria Gegunde.
A-2481845, Munroe, Harold Bruce.
A-9801088, Newton, Arthur.
A-4026037, Nimeneh, Thomas Kun or Thomas Nimeneh or Thomas Nimeneh-Bey or Thomas Kun Nemerea or Keen Nimeneh or Sam Nimeneh or Keen Nimeh.
A-4651936, O'Dwyer, Elizabeth nee Ahern alias Elizabeth Organ.
A-6611843, Ottley, Robyn Josephine.
A-9836874, Paiceira, Vicente or Vicente Paiceira Perez.
A-2201575, Palermo, Rosario or Richard Ross Palermo or Ross Palermo.
A-3140422, Palermo, Salvatore or Samuel Palermo.
A-3236433, Palermo, Vincenzo or James Palermo.
A-3140520, Palermo, Anna.
A-9769380, Pane, Antonino or Anthony Pane or Antonio Pane.
A-6256122, Papadakis, Georgia N.
A-4642742, Parasiliti, Nicola Sebastiano Collazzo or Nicola Sebastiano Parasiliti Collazzo or Nicholas Parasi or Benny Pernite or Nicholas Benny Pernite.
A-6374752, Paul, Alvin Colton Thomas Theophilus.
A-6331342, Piekarz, Hersz.
A-6633957, Pilostomos, Christos Antonios.
A-7598205, Questel, Francois Marie Edouard, or Edouard Questel.
A-5369159, Ramos, Anastacio.
A-3586557, Ramos, Anacleta.
A-5711339, Rando, Bartolo.
A-4798904, de Rangel, Rita Morales or Rita Arroyo.
A-7703612, Rehen, Estrid Viola Margareta or Estrid Viola Margareta Tengwall nee Sundberg.
A-9582529, Reinsma, Otte or Otto Reinsma.
A-6290531, Reiter, Fanny nee Diamond or Fany Reiter.
A-4030409, Resch, Frank or Frank Reck or Franz Resch.
A-6608814, Reynolds, Bernard Douglas.
A-5917858, Robles, Isidro.
A-6001963, Roberts, Norma Elizabeth or Norma E. Roberts or Norma Roberts.
A-7757524, Rodgers, Naomi Elizabeth.
A-6113669, Roman-Rodriguez, Antonio.
A-3680851, Rostar, Victor.
A-6373974, Rothstein, Izidor.
A-6373973, Rothstein, Helena.
A-6611826, Rudd, James Sidney.
A-3667351, Ruiz-Carillo De Quintero, Maria or Dolores Cardenas-Soto.
A-2548950, Rullo, Hazel Ann nee DeLisie.
A-9776541, Russo, Salvatore.
A-5155756, Sagert, Clarence James.
A-5573562, Schenk, Otto alias Otto Lehman.
A-5151143, Schneider, Richard Georg.
A-4728863, Schoenberg, Wilhelm Heinrich August or William Schoenberg.
A-6376906, Semega, Maria nee Maria Palovcik.
A-5314309, Shee, Ong Kwok or Ong Kwock Shee or Roy Ong.
A-6378087, Shumis, Artemis Troyannou or Artenoula Trogiannou or Artemis Troiannou or Artemis Troyannou.
A-1963646, Sirianos, George or Georgios Theodore Sirianos.
A-6446698, Smedley, Shane Karen Douglas.
A-4699538, Sommer, Oscar Felix or Oskar Felix Sommer or Felix Sommer.
A-5465763, Stevens, Annie Isabella.
A-6772017, Sturmer, Gerlinde Maria.
A-4433087, Tackolander, Leonard Helge alias Leonard Quire.
A-5880975, Tatem, Edmund Adolphus.
A-7539649, Tomas-Morelly, Jose or Jose Tomas, Junior.
A-5357499, Tornow, Marie nee Wejnis or Marie Fischer.
A-6345256, Trapatsa, Chryssoula.
A-9836782, Ullah, Anfar.
A-6346062, Vafides, Olga nee Rafaeledes.
A-9727432, Valjas, Artemi.
A-6459280, Vasquez, Jorge Carrion alias Robert Franco.
A-1114647, Vestes, Stratos or Ernest Vestes alias Efstiatios Vestis.
A-6690309, Villegas, Ramon alias Ramon Villegas-Ortiz.
A-6785838, Wallace, Ezra.
A-1052865, Wasserman, Benjamin or Bernard Wasserman or Benjamin Wasserman.
A-5750607, Wayditch, Julia alias Julia Bornyaszi Oroszy.
A-4392874, Whearty, James Patrick or James Wheatley.
A-6431871, Willman, Philip John Archibald.
A-4777885, Wilson, Arthur Rutherford.
A-7799625, Wilson, Walter Allen.
A-6078139, Wright, Lourdes Dizon.
A-6757818, Yang, Chao-Chen.
A-6739338, Yang, Dzing-Tsch Shun.
A-2963630, Yuelling, Joseph or Yoeseff.

MAMIE L. HURLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an

amendment, at the end of the bill, to change the period to a colon, and insert:

Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARION T. SCHWARTZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1169) for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$4,000" and insert "\$1,671."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

FIRST-CITIZENS BANK & TRUST CO., ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) for the relief of the First-Citizens Bank and Trust Co., administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, in line 9, after the word "entitled", to strike out: "together with interest on such sum at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from August 19, 1938; and (2) the sum of \$1,555.55 representing actual court costs incurred by the said First-Citizens Bank and Trust Company in presenting such claim to the Court of Claims"; and in line 14, after the word "such", to strike out "sums," and insert "sum", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., of Raleigh, N. C., as administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr., deceased, (1) the sum of \$9,860.35, the amount to which the Court of Claims found the said First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., entitled, the payment of such sum being in full satisfaction of the claim of the said First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., against the United States for compensation for work performed by the late C. A. Ragland, Sr., under contracts numbered 1-1P-5554 and 1-1P-5688, on projects 1T1 and 2E2, Shenandoah-Great Smoky Mountains Parkway.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose is to provide for the payment to the First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., of Raleigh, N. C., as administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr., the sum of \$9,860, to which the Court of Claims found the trust company to be entitled, after consideration as authorized by Senate Resolution 256 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The matter was before the Seventy-eighth Congress, at which time the parties were authorized to sue in the Court of Claims, and the Court of Claims has approved this judgment.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

ELLEN HUDSON, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 42) for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson, which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, in line 5, after the name "Ellen Hudson," to insert "of 804 South Verdugo Road, Glendale, California"; and in line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$7,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ellen Hudson, of 804 South Verdugo Road, Glendale, Calif., as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson, deceased, the sum of \$7,500, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Walter R. Hudson as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle, near Pittman, Nev., on April 4, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

BARBARA O'BRIEN FARQUER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 408) for the relief of Barbara O'Brien Farquer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William E. O'Brien, deceased, late of Detroit, Mich., the sum of \$10,232, in full settlement of all claims of the said estate against the United States on account of the death of the said William E. O'Brien, on November 20, 1943, as a result of injuries sustained when an airplane in which he was sitting was struck by an Army airplane at the Detroit City Airport, Detroit, Mich.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of William E. O'Brien."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 526) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CLAIM OF HARRY W. SHARPLEY, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 595) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, at the end of the bill to change the period to a colon, and insert:

And provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CARL E. LAWSON AND THE FIREMAN'S FUND INDEMNITY CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1271) for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the word "California", to strike out "and to pay the sum of \$1,038.79 to the Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., of San Francisco, Calif.,"; and in line 11, to strike out "and for reimbursement to the Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co. for expenditures."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read a third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO REVISE THE ALASKA GAME LAW

The bill (H. R. 220) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF SALE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS IN UTAH

The bill (S. 576) to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask for an explanation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, this bill authorizes the tribal council or tribal business committee of the Ute Indian Tribe, in Utah, located on the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to sell some lands, within the townsite limits of Duchesne, Randlett, and Myton, Utah, which were set aside some years ago for the Indians when those lands were opened for settlement. The lands were not sold, but later they were turned over to the Indians. The lands are needed now by Myton, Duchesne, and Randlett, Utah, for airport purposes.

This bill authorizes the tribal council or the tribal business committee of the Ute Indians, representing the Indians who are concerned in this matter, to sell the lands on such terms as the tribal committee deems satisfactory, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative.

The lands probably do not amount to more than 150 or 200 acres, and the value probably does not exceed \$4,000 or \$5,000. In other words, the bill simply authorizes the Indians to dispose of their own property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, in line 2, after the figure "29", to strike out "lots 1 and 2, the east half", and insert "lot 1 and the northeast quarter"; and in line 6, after the word "meridian" and the period, to insert:

Title shall be conveyed by issuance of patent in fee to the purchaser where approved surveys have been made and, in the absence of such surveys, by deed signed by the chairman and the secretary of said committee and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Uintah and Ouray tribal business committee of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah for and on behalf of said tribe is hereby authorized, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative, to sell and convey to any purchaser deemed satisfactory to said committee any of the lands of said tribe situated within the town-site limits of Duchesne, Randlett, and Myton, Utah, and any of the following-described lands situated adjacent to the town site of Myton, Utah, to wit, the north half of the northwest quarter of section 29; lot 1 and the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter and the northeast quarter of section 30; the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter or lot 4 of section 19, of township 3 south, range 1 west, of the Uintah special meridian. Title shall be conveyed by issuance of patent in fee to the purchaser where approved surveys have been made and, in the absence of such surveys, by deed signed by the chairman and the secretary of said committee and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative.

All such sales shall be made upon such terms as said committee shall deem satisfactory and may be made pursuant to bids or at private sale and all funds derived from

such sales shall be subject to disposition of said tribe.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

CHILDREN BORN OUT OF WEDLOCK

The bill (S. 1122) relating to children born out of wedlock was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the enactment of this bill has been requested by the District of Columbia Bar Association, the officials of the District of Columbia Juvenile Court, and the District of Columbia Welfare Agency. They feel that enactment of the bill is necessary.

The bill has to do largely with the procedure in illegitimacy actions. It provides, for example, for an increase from 14 to 16 years, as respects the age at which the support of minor children shall cease—in other words, an increase of 2 years.

It also provides that the mother may bring action, even if not a resident of the District of Columbia, so long as the father is a resident of the District of Columbia.

The bill further provides for extradition, but only in case the parentage is either admitted or proved.

It also provides what some of us thought was a rather unusual and drastic step, something which is not provided in my State, certainly, namely, a provision to the effect that a mother may sue someone other than her husband for the support of an illegitimate child. Normally, as the Senators know, if a child is born in lawful wedlock it is presumed to be legitimate, and no action can be brought against some other man for support of the child. Because of that provision we held up consideration of the bill for some time.

I have been contacted by practically every welfare agency in Washington, by some of the officers of the juvenile court, and especially by Miss Rita Morris, who is chairman of the committee on relations with the juvenile court of the District of Columbia Bar Association. They have told me that in the District there exists an unusual situation which justifies the additional provision. I am told there is an almost unlimited number of cases where, the lawful husband having left, the wife, who may not believe in divorce, is apparently living with someone as her common-law husband. After three or four or five children have been born he may leave, and under the present law those children become a burden upon the District. I understand from talking to various people that the burden thus imposed upon the District is very heavy; that it is unnecessary, and can be remedied to a great extent by means of the pending bill.

The bill also provides a number of other things, such as proper legitima-

tion of a child born of unlawful wedlock, and many other minor details. I might say we have amended the bill substantially since it was submitted to us by the bar committee.

Mr. LANGER. May I ask the Senator if there is any provision in the bill whereby an illegitimate child, recognized in writing by the father, can inherit equally with another child?

Mr. McCARTHY. The father may adopt the child, but if he does not do so, there is no such provision in the present law, as I understand, and there is none in the pending bill. I may be in error about that. The Senator will understand I am not an authority on District law. I must depend largely upon our staff and upon the local bar association. I do not believe there is anything in the present District law to provide that such a child shall inherit, unless he is adopted. However, the bill does provide for the adoption of such child and the issuance of a certificate of legitimacy.

Mr. LANGER. But there is no provision, even though the court finds that a certain man fathered the child, and even though the father recognizes him, whereby the child may inherit; is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. This is a common-law jurisdiction, as the Senator knows, and the child normally inherits through the mother. I must admit I am no authority on the matter. The committee's counsel tells me the child would inherit through the mother, in such a case, but not otherwise. In other words, let us assume the father and mother have never married. If the father admits in writing, or if the court determines, that he is the father of the illegitimate child, under those circumstances I understand there is no provision for inheritance.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the Senator that in a great many States, where the father recognizes the child, the child inherits. I wondered why the committee did not include such a provision in the pending bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Frankly, the committee did not discuss that provision at all, and I doubt whether it would be proper. The committee could not very well do what the Senator suggests in drafting this proposed legislation, which is more or less a bill to provide quasi-criminal procedure for bringing a father back and making him support the child, and providing a method of starting a lawsuit. We did not try to do anything such as the Senator suggests. I am sure, if the Senator from North Dakota should care to introduce such a bill, it would be carefully scrutinized. In an offhand way, I may say I am inclined to think I should support such a measure. If a father admits the child is his, or if a court has found it is his, I can see no objection at all to providing that the child shall inherit.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. I say, if the Senator should introduce such a bill, my present inclination would be to favor it.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be pleased to prepare such a bill, and I will show it to

the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1122) relating to children born out of wedlock, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 3, line 18, after the word "evidence", to insert "to impeach the complaining witness"; on page 4, line 22, to strike out "complainant" and insert "mother"; on page 7, line 11, after the word "discretion", to insert "after notice by registered mail to the defendant at his last-known address, and after hearing,"; and in line 15, after the word "empowered", to insert "after such notice and hearing"; and on page 10, after line 5, to strike out: "Sec. 15. (a) Marriage of natural parents; legitimacy. Any child heretofore or hereafter born out of wedlock shall be legitimated by the intermarriage of his natural parents. A child so legitimated shall be entitled to the same rights and privileges which he would have enjoyed if born after marriage, his status being the same as if he were born in wedlock."; in line 13, to strike out "(b) NEW BIRTH RECORD" and insert "SEC. 15. NEW BIRTH RECORD UPON MARRIAGE OF NATURAL PARENTS."; in line 17, after the word "parents", to insert "of an illegitimate child"; and in line 18, before the word "child", strike out "the" and insert "said", and after the word "child", insert "and paternity of the child has been judicially determined or acknowledged by the husband before the Health Officer of the District of Columbia", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the support and maintenance of bastards in the District of Columbia," approved June 18, 1912 (37 Stat. 134), as amended February 22, 1921 (41 Stat. 1144), and March 16, 1926 (44 Stat. 208), be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

SEC. 2. Title: This act may be cited as "An Act Relating to Children Born Out of Wedlock."

SEC. 3. Jurisdiction: The juvenile court of the District of Columbia is hereby given jurisdiction of all cases arising under this act. Proceedings shall be instituted in the name of the District of Columbia and prosecution upon information shall be by the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia or any of his assistants.

SEC. 4. Time of bringing complaint: Proceedings to establish paternity and provide for the support of a child born out of wedlock may be instituted after 4 months of pregnancy or within 2 years after the birth of the child, or within 1 year after the putative father has ceased making contributions for the support of such child: *Provided, however*, That the time during which the defendant shall be absent from the jurisdiction shall be excluded from the computation of the time within which complaint may be filed.

SEC. 5. Complaint: Any unmarried woman who is at least 4 months pregnant or who has been delivered of a child born out of wedlock, or any married woman who is at least 4 months pregnant with a child, which if born alive, may be born out of wedlock, or who has been delivered of a child born out of wedlock and who was not living with nor cohabiting with her husband during the period of time in which such child could have been con-

ceived, may go before an Assistant Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia at the juvenile court and accuse any man of being the father of her child and request his arrest. In case of death, disability, or incompetence of the mother, the complaint may be made by the custodian, guardian, or next friend of the child. The complainant shall be examined under oath by an Assistant Corporation Counsel concerning the married or single status of the mother when the child was begotten, when and where it was born, if born, and such other information as may be deemed necessary or pertinent for testing the truth of the accusation. If, upon examination, there appears reasonable cause to believe that the woman is at least 4 months pregnant or that the child, if born, is within the age limits provided in this act, or that the putative father has ceased making contribution for the support of such child within 1 year from the time of making complaint, and reasonable cause to believe that the accused person is the father thereof, the complaint shall be reduced to writing by such officer, verified by the complainant, and filed with the clerk of the court; and such verified complaint may be introduced in evidence to impeach the complaining witness in any subsequent proceedings therein.

SEC. 6. Apprehension of accused: Upon the filing of the complaint, the case shall be calendared forthwith for preliminary hearing. The clerk of the court shall issue a summons requiring the accused to appear in court on a day certain for such purpose, or, if deemed necessary, a warrant for the arrest of the defendant shall be issued, directed to the United States marshal or the Major and Superintendent or any member of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, requiring the accused to be arrested and brought before the court.

SEC. 7. Bond; commitment on failure to give bond; jury trial: The court may require the accused to enter into bond with surety in a sum not to exceed \$2,500, guaranteeing his appearance on the date set for hearing or trial. If the defendant shall fail to appear, the security for his appearance shall be forfeited and shall be applied toward the support of the child if so ordered by the court. If the defendant shall fail to post bond fixed by the court he shall forthwith be committed to the Washington Asylum and Jail, there to remain until the date set for hearing, or until he enter into the required bond or otherwise be discharged by due process of law. In all prosecutions under this act the defendant shall be entitled to, but may waive, trial by jury. In no event, however, shall final hearing take place until after the birth of the child.

SEC. 8. Blood tests: Whenever it is relevant to the prosecution or defense of an illegitimacy action, the court may, in its discretion, direct that the complainant, mother, child, and the defendant submit to one or more blood tests to determine whether or not the defendant can be excluded as being the father of the child, but the results of the test shall be admissible only in cases where defendant does not object to its admissibility.

SEC. 9. Exclusion of public: Upon trial of proceedings under this act, the court shall exclude the general public at the request of either party.

SEC. 10. (a) Judgement; prenatal and confinement expenses; maintenance: If the defendant, in open court, shall acknowledge the paternity of a child born out of wedlock, or if at the trial the finding of the court or jury be against the defendant, the court in rendering judgment thereon may enter an order for the payment of the prenatal medical care and costs of the mother's confinement and expenses of childbirth in such amount or amounts as it may deem reasonable, commensurate with the defendant's

ability to pay. The court shall also order the payment of annual amounts, equal or varying, for the maintenance and education of the child, commensurate with defendant's ability to pay, such payments to be made at such periods or intervals as the court directs. The court, in its discretion, may order payments to be made by the defendant at the precinct wherein he resides through the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia. Payments shall continue until the child reaches the age of 16 years unless the child prior thereto be legally adopted.

(b) Petition for modification of judgment; hearing: The court may from time to time, upon petition of any party in interest, change or modify its order directing the amount that defendant shall pay for the maintenance and support of the child. Hearing on such petition shall be held not less than 10 days following notice in writing by the clerk of the court to the parties in interest, mailed to or left at their last known place of residence.

(c) Death of child: In case of the death of the child before reaching the age of 16 years, the court, upon proof thereof, may order the payment of reasonable funeral expenses, and shall terminate the order for maintenance; and any arrears which may be owing at the time of death may, in the discretion of the court, be canceled.

SEC. 11. (a) Performance bond; commitment; probation: The court may require the defendant to give security not to exceed \$2,500 guaranteeing payments ordered by the court. The court may, however, in its discretion, suspend the requirement of security and place the defendant on probation to the court on condition that payments be made as ordered. In default of payments as ordered, the court may commit the defendant to jail for a period of not more than 1 year. At the expiration of the term of commitment the defendant may be discharged, but his liability to make subsequent payments or any payments in arrears in accordance with the judgment shall not thereby be affected. In lieu of commitment or as a condition of his release from jail, the court may suspend sentence and place the defendant on probation upon such terms as the court may direct. The amount of security, if forfeited, shall be disbursed as the court, in its discretion, may direct.

(b) Judgment; execution: In event of default of payments as ordered, the court may, in its discretion, after notice by registered mail to the defendant at his last-known address, and after hearing, reduce the amount of arrears to judgment. The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia is hereby empowered after such notice and hearing to reduce to judgment the arrears under any order hereafter entered for the support and maintenance of a child born out of wedlock, or for any amounts provided to be paid by the defendant under any section or sections of this act, and when docketed in the clerk's office of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia such judgment shall have the same force and effect as judgments of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and execution thereon may be effected in the same manner as upon judgments of the said district court.

SEC. 12. Voluntary acknowledgement of paternity by father: The putative father of a child born out of wedlock may enter into an agreement with the mother of the child, or with some other person on behalf of the child, for the support and maintenance of said child, and said agreement may be submitted at any time to the court for ratification and approval. When said agreement is ratified and approved, the court shall issue an order incorporating the terms thereof, the payments thereunder may be received and

disbursed by the court in the same manner as provided in section 13 of this act. The faithful performance under the terms of said agreement shall bar other remedies of the mother or any other person on behalf of the child for the support of the child, subject to the provisions of section 10 (b) of this act.

Sec. 13. (a) Concurrent jurisdiction in nonsupport cases: The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia is hereby given concurrent jurisdiction with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in all cases arising under the act of Congress of March 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 86), as amended June 18, 1912 (37 Stat. 136), and June 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 716) (title 22, sec. 903, of the D. C. Code, 1940 edition), and the court, in its discretion, may order payments to be made by the defendant at the precinct wherein he resides, through the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia.

(b) Failure to support illegitimate child; misdemeanor: The provisions of the said act of Congress of March 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 86), as amended, making it a misdemeanor to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance of minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances, shall also apply to any person who abandons or fails to support his illegitimate child when paternity has been established judicially or when paternity has been directly acknowledged by the putative father under oath, or indirectly acknowledged by voluntarily making contributions to the support of such child.

(c) Voluntary contributions for support: The juvenile court of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to approve voluntary agreements for the support and maintenance of wife or minor children and to accept payments made pursuant thereto and disburse the same to the person or persons for whom such contributions are paid, in the same manner as payments are accepted and disbursed under the provisions of the act of Congress of March 23, 1906 (34 Stat. 86), as amended.

Sec. 14. Liability of the father's estate: In the event of the death of the defendant after paternity has been established and prior to the time the child reaches the age of 16 years, any sum or sums due and unpaid under any order of the court at the time of defendant's death shall be a valid claim against the defendant's estate.

Sec. 15. New birth record upon marriage of natural parents: Whenever a certified copy of a marriage certificate is submitted to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia establishing that the previously unwed parents of an illegitimate child have intermarried subsequent to the birth of said child and paternity of the child has been judicially determined or acknowledged by the husband before the Health Officer of the District of Columbia, a new certificate of birth, bearing the original date of birth and the names of both parents, shall be issued and substituted for the certificate of birth then on file. The original certificate of birth and all papers pertaining to the issuance of the new certificate shall be placed under seal, and opened for inspection only upon order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Sec. 16. (a) Reports to Bureau of Vital Statistics: Upon entry of a final judgment determining the paternity of a child born out of wedlock, the clerk of the court shall forward a certificate to the bureau of vital statistics of the jurisdiction in which the child was born, giving the name of the person adjudged to be the father of said child.

(b) Upon receipt of the certificate as provided in section 16 (a) hereof, the Health Officer of the District of Columbia shall file said certificate with the original birth record, and thereafter may issue a certificate of birth registration including thereon the name of

the person adjudged to be the father of said child.

Sec. 17. Records: None of the records or proceedings in any case arising under this act shall be open to inspection by anyone other than defendant or counsel of record except upon order of the court. The court, upon proper showing may, in its discretion, authorize the clerk to furnish certified copies of any such records or portions thereof to the defendant, the mother, or custodian of the child, any party in interest, or their duly authorized attorneys, and the clerk is hereby authorized to furnish certified copies of such records or portions thereof upon request to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia for use as evidence in nonsupport proceedings as provided in section 13 of this act.

Sec. 18. Construction of statute; appropriations: This act shall be so interpreted as to effectuate the protection and welfare of the child involved in any proceedings hereunder, and appropriations to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized.

Sec. 19. Constitutionality: If any section, subdivision, or clause of this act shall be held to be unconstitutional or invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this act.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like merely to add a word or two for the benefit of the Senator from Maryland. I may say this was not my legislation. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH]. I merely reported it favorably, not because I was considered an authority on the factual situation, but only from a legal standpoint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

DISCLOSURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES CODES AND COMMUNICATIONS INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to Calendar 91, Senate bill 277.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 277) to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 277), which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "shall", to insert "knowingly and willfully"; on page 2, at the end of line 8, strike out "the United States or"; and in line 9, after the word "government", to insert "knowing the same to have been obtained by such processes", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever shall knowingly and willfully communicate, furnish, transmit, or otherwise make available to an unauthorized person, or publish, or use

in any manner prejudicial to the safety or interest of the United States or for the benefit of any foreign government to the detriment of the United States any classified information (1) concerning the nature, preparation, or use of any code, cipher, or cryptographic system of the United States or any foreign government; or (2) concerning the design, construction, use, maintenance, or repair of any device, apparatus, or appliance used or prepared or planned for use by the United States or any foreign government for cryptographic or communication intelligence purposes; or (3) concerning the communication intelligence activities of the United States or any foreign government; or (4) obtained by the processes of communication intelligence from the communications of any foreign government knowing the same to have been obtained by such processes, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

Sec. 2. (a) The term "classified information" as used herein shall be construed to mean information which, at the time of a violation under this act, is, for reasons of national security, specifically designated by a United States Government agency for limited or restricted dissemination or distribution.

(b) The terms "code," "cipher," and "cryptographic system" as used herein shall be construed to include in their meanings, in addition to their usual meanings, any method of secret writing and any mechanical or electrical device or method used for the purpose of disguising or concealing the contents, significance, or meanings of communications.

(c) The term "foreign government" as used herein shall be construed to include in its meaning any person or persons acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of any faction, party, department, agency, bureau, or military force of or within a foreign country, or for or on behalf of any government or any person or persons purporting to act as a government within a foreign country, whether or not such government is recognized by the United States.

(d) The term "communication intelligence" as used herein shall be construed to mean all procedures and methods used in the interception of communications and the obtaining of information from such communications by other than the intended recipients.

(e) The term "unauthorized person" as used herein shall be construed to mean any person who, or agency which, is not authorized to receive information of the categories set forth in section 1 of this act, by the President, or by the head of a department or agency of the United States Government which is expressly designated by the President to engage in communication intelligence activities for the United States.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this act shall prohibit the furnishing, upon lawful demand, of information to any regularly constituted committee of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States of America, or joint committee thereof.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1418) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]

asks that I make objection in his name; which I do.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill is passed over.

YUMA AUXILIARY PROJECT, ARIZONA

The bill (S. 690) to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the bill will be passed over. That completes the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I objected to the consideration of Calendar No. 221, Senate bill 690. Since that time an explanation has been given me by the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and I desire to withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 690) to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if he will give us an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the bill merely transfers the irrigation of 3,000 acres of land from one project to another. The land is already being irrigated by the Yuma project. By transferring it to the Gila project it will save a pump lift of approximately 20 feet. The water has to be pumped 72 feet, and by transferring it to the other project, the land can be irrigated with water lifted only 52 feet.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not familiar with the hearings, and I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if there was any objection in the hearing at all.

Mr. McFARLAND. There was no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the bill unanimously approved?

Mr. McFARLAND. It was.

Mr. WHERRY. There are no amendments to the bill, are there?

Mr. McFARLAND. There is one amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Does it run to the substance of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand, it is in the nature of a clarifying amendment which carries out the intent and purpose of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 690) to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment,

on page 6, beginning in line 21, to insert: "and such costs, less applicable credits, shall not be repayable to the United States: *And provided further*;"

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That all lands heretofore withdrawn under the reclamation law in connection with the Yuma project and set apart or otherwise dealt with as an auxiliary project under the provisions of the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. 868), as amended, are hereby severed from said auxiliary project, except those lands in the first Mesa unit of said auxiliary project which are north of the south line of the north half of the north half of the north half of sections 17 and 18, and north of the south line of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 9, township 10 south, range 23 west, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, which lands henceforth shall constitute the entire area of the Yuma auxiliary project. After application of the payments as provided in section 3 hereof, no costs heretofore allocated or charges heretofore assigned to the lands hereby severed from said auxiliary project shall be repayable to the United States.

SEC. 2. For a period of 5 years from the date of enactment of this act the owners of land with appurtenant water rights severed from the Yuma auxiliary project pursuant to the first section, the titles to which are deemed satisfactory by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) may exchange the same, acre for acre, for public lands and water rights within the Yuma auxiliary project as herein limited: *Provided*, That if any tract contains any fractional acreage, the area shall be computed to the nearest acre: *Provided further*, That such privilege of exchange shall be subject to the sale or other disposition or use by the United States of any of such public lands prior to the time an application for the exchange thereof shall have been made.

SEC. 3. The proportionate part of all payments heretofore made under the contract dated October 23, 1918, between the United States and Imperial Irrigation district, of California, which, under the act of June 23, 1926 (44 Stat. 776), as amended, would have been applicable as a credit to the public lands of the United States severed from the Yuma auxiliary project pursuant to the provisions of the first section of this act, shall be applied as of the date of enactment of this act to offset that portion of the cost, originally allocated to such lands, of those facilities previously constructed to be used jointly for the furnishing of water to the lands of the Yuma project and the Yuma auxiliary project.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate and enter into a suitable contract with an organization, as defined in section 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, satisfactory in form and powers to him, representing the water users of the Yuma auxiliary project as herein limited (hereafter referred to as the organization), for the repayment of certain costs in connection with the construction of works to enable the said project to obtain delivery of water appurtenant to the lands of its water users through the works of the Gila project; to carry such water through the works of the Gila project instead of the Yuma project when additional works for the purpose shall have been completed; and to extend and improve the existing distribution system of the Yuma auxiliary project so as more adequately to supply the needs of the water users. The contract, among other things, shall provide for the assumption of

liability by the organization for (1) the repayment of the cost of the additional works necessary to supply water to the Yuma auxiliary project through the works of the Gila project, together with an appropriate share of the cost of works common to the Gila project and the Yuma auxiliary project; (2) the repayment of the cost of extending and improving the Yuma auxiliary project distribution system; (3) the payment annually in advance of estimated charges for the operation and maintenance of the works of the Yuma auxiliary project and an appropriate share of the estimated charges for the operation and maintenance of the works common to the Yuma auxiliary project and the Gila project. The general repayment obligation of any organization entering into such contract covering the repayment of the construction, extension, and improvement costs herein enumerated may be spread in annual installments, without the payment of interest, over such reasonable period, not exceeding 60 years, as the Secretary may determine: *Provided, however*, That repayment of costs allocated on a per acre basis to lands not under water-right application under the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. 868), as amended, and the joint resolution of February 21, 1925 (43 Stat. 962), on the date of the contract may be deferred until after water-right application has been made: *Provided further*, That the liability of the organization with respect to the costs allocated to such lands shall be suspended upon the cancellation of any water-right application as to any payments for the calendar year following such cancellation, and shall remain suspended until a new water-right application shall have been made. The contract may provide for the appointment of the organization as fiscal agent of the United States for the purpose of collecting any sums of money which may become due the United States with respect to land and water rights or water-right applications under the act of January 25, 1917, as amended, and the joint resolution of February 21, 1925, and shall provide that payments made to the organization or any of its representatives for any purpose by any land and water right or water-right applicant shall not be applied to any tax or assessment of the organization if any obligations payable to the United States under the act of January 25, 1917, as amended, or the joint resolution of February 21, 1925, remain due and unpaid. Such contract shall further provide that any lien held by the organization on lands covered by any land and water right or water-right application shall be inferior to the rights of the United States with respect to charges upon such lands under the act of January 25, 1917, as amended, or the joint resolution of February 21, 1925, and to the lien thereon reserved by the United States pursuant to section 5 (b) of this act.

(b) Upon the execution of a satisfactory contract pursuant to subsection (a), subject to the availability of funds therefor, the Secretary is authorized to proceed with such construction, extensions, and improvements as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of such contract.

SEC. 5. (a) After a contract shall have been executed pursuant to section 4, land and water rights in the Yuma auxiliary project may be sold at private sale, pursuant to the provisions of the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. 868), as amended, and the joint resolution of February 21, 1925 (43 Stat. 962), for a purchase price of not less than (1) \$32 per acre for the land and (2) a sum for the water right consisting of not less than \$160 per acre for the cost of the reclamation works previously constructed exclusively for the Yuma auxiliary project. Such purchase price shall be in addition to any charges or assessments which may be levied by the organization to pay for the per acre construction, extension, and improvement costs allocable to

such land under any contract executed pursuant to section 4 of this act: *Provided*, That said purchase price shall not include any part of the cost of works of the Yuma project and such costs, less applicable credits, shall not be repayable to the United States: *And provided further*, That after a contract shall have been executed pursuant to section 4 and water is ready for delivery to the Yuma auxiliary project through the works of the Gila project, the water users of the Yuma auxiliary project shall cease to be liable for any charges for the operation and maintenance of the Yuma project, except such charges as may then be due and unpaid.

(b) To insure payment of any sums due or which may become due to the United States under land and water right or water-right applications under the act of January 25, 1917, as amended, and the joint resolution of February 21, 1925, the United States, as of the date of the application, shall have a lien for the entire amount of its charges which shall be prior to all other liens, mortgages, claims, or interests whatsoever. Upon default of payment of any amount so due, the United States is empowered to declare the whole of the unaccrued portion of the charges due and payable and may file suit to foreclose the lien for all accrued charges in any court of competent jurisdiction and sell said land to satisfy the obligation due the United States. This remedy, however, shall not be exclusive.

SEC. 6. All provisions of the act of January 15, 1917 (39 Stat. 868), as amended, and the joint resolution of February 21, 1925 (43 Stat. 962), not inconsistent with the provisions of this act shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 7. After a contract shall have been executed pursuant to section 4 and water is ready for delivery to the Yuma auxiliary project through the works of the Gila project, the Secretary is hereby authorized to dismantle the existing B-lift pumping plant of the Yuma auxiliary project and to dispose of any salable parts thereof, either by public or private sale. All moneys realized from the sale of such parts shall be paid into the reclamation fund and credit therefor shall be given to the organization representing the water users of the Yuma auxiliary project toward the construction costs assumed by it pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required for the purposes of this act.

CLAIMS UNDER TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 729. If the bill requires more than 4 or 5 minutes, I shall withdraw my request.

The bill has been reported today from the Committee on the Judiciary, and for that reason is not on the calendar. The time within which it should operate will expire on the last day of this month. Therefore I deem it necessary that the Senate act promptly on the bill.

The purpose of the bill is further 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. It involves persons who have claims for the return of property which is vested in the Alien Property Custodian. A similar extension was passed by the Eightieth Congress, and at that time it was thought to be sufficient to permit all those who might have claims to file them. If the time is not extended in this instance, there will be quite a number of persons

who have legitimate claims to be filed before the Alien Property Custodian whose time will expire very soon, and the claimants will therefore be deprived of the right of filing perhaps legitimate claims.

If the bill takes up any considerable length of time I shall not insist on action, but I hope that the bill may be considered for the next 2 or 3 minutes.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 729) 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.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "in the first sentence of" and to insert in lieu thereof "wherever it appears in".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "April 30, 1949" wherever it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "April 30, 1950".

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 2632, the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee if he does not feel we would save time if I should suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McKELLAR. There are quite a number of Senators present.

Mr. WHERRY. There are several Senators who wanted to be informed when the bill came up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Murray
Anderson	Hunt	Neely
Bricker	Ives	O'Connor
Bridges	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Donnell	Langer	Stennis
Downey	Lodge	Taft
Eastland	Long	Taylor
Ecton	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McFarland	Thye
Flanders	McGrath	Tobey
Frear	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Green	Malone	Watkins
Gurney	Martin	Wherry
Hayden	Maybank	Wiley
Hendrickson	Miller	Williams
Hill	Morse	Withers
Hoey	Mundt	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I announce that the following Senators are detained at a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations considering the civil-functions bill, which committee has permission to sit during the session of the Senate: The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

I also announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Finance, over which he is presiding. The Committee on Finance has permission to sit during the session this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before that is done I desire to make a short statement concerning the bill. It came from the House of Representatives containing a total appropriation of slightly less than \$472,000,000. Budget estimates of about \$90,000,000 more were sent to the Senate. The Senate did not allow all the \$90,000,000, but, as the result of the budget estimate, allowed additional \$53,000,000.

In addition to that, several other items were allowed. One was for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians. The committee felt a debt was owed to those Indians, and the amount of \$8,359,000 was added for the Indians.

Furthermore there were restorations of reductions made by the House to the amount of \$4,140,000.

For the legislative branch the committee added \$43,725. This was for widows of deceased Members, furniture, postage, and other miscellaneous items.

For the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures we added \$20,000.

For the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for Indians of Arizona and New Mexico, we added \$550,000.

For the care of tubercular Indians in Minnesota we added \$50,000.

For improvement of a small-boat harbor at Havre de Grace, Md., we allowed \$9,000.

That makes a total of remaining increase by the Senate committee of \$13,181,725.

Respecting the entire bill as it comes from the committee, there are two items of difference. The first is a difference in an item which the House put in the bill in reference to the employment in the Bureau of Reclamation of Messrs. Straus and Boke. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] presented an amendment dealing with that matter. The Senator has told me, however, that he will put that item in a legislative bill, so that question is not now before the Senate.

The other question, which is the principal one in dispute, has to do with an amendment which was presented by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to what is known as the New Johnsonville steam plant appropriation in the Tennessee Valley Authority. The New

Johnsonville steam plant will cost according to the budget estimate, \$3,000,000. The House appropriated \$2,500,000 for that plant. The Senate committee recommended \$2,500,000 for the plant. The Senator from Michigan offered an amendment providing that any taxpayer or consumer of electric energy may go before a court of three judges in the District of Columbia and test the constitutionality of the TVA Act.

I desire to say a word about that before I take my seat. The question of the constitutionality of the TVA and its operations was brought before the Supreme Court of the United States in what is known as the case of *Ashwander et al. against Tennessee Valley Authority et al.*, Two Hundred and Ninety-seventh United States Reports. I believe the case came before the Court in 1939, or perhaps it was 1940. It was brought out in that case, as will be recalled, that the TVA bought from the Alabama Power Co. its transmission wires and electric system, including a steam plant, by the way. Remember, that the purchase included a steam plant. All that matter was brought before the Court. I cannot say that the question of the steam plant was actually passed upon directly, but the Court found that the TVA had bought the transmission and distributing system from the Alabama Power Co., including the steam plant, and including various other things.

Chief Justice Hughes rendered the opinion of the Court. In that opinion the Court upheld the constitutionality of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, and it upheld the purchase by the Authority of the area of distribution, the distribution lines, and all the other properties which were included in that purchase. The purchase was a considerable one. Mr. Chief Justice Hughes in that opinion said:

The question here is simply as to the acquisition of the transmission lines as a facility for the disposal of that energy.

The Court held that the United States, having embarked in a constitutional venture, and the current having been generated by a Tennessee Valley Authority dam, the United States had the authority, through the Tennessee Valley Authority, to acquire such lines and such materials as wires and other distribution means as would enable it to sell the power to the best advantage.

That is all that is sought to be done by the provision in question. The Tennessee Valley Authority already has acquired a number of steam plants at other places. It owns a number of them, largely by purchase, however. But as between the purchase of such steam plants and the building of them there certainly cannot be raised a constitutional question, in my judgment. That, however, is neither here nor there.

Last year a similar measure came before the Senate, and then, as Senators will remember, a witness testified as to the unconstitutionality of the act. His name was Smith. It turned out that he was an agent of the power companies, drawing the nifty little salary of \$65,000

a year. He testified, as appears on page 262 of the record of last year's hearings:

My salary is \$65,000 a year by contract.

He lost, so far as the Senate was concerned. This year the private companies have brought in another man. If my memory serves me right, his name is Jackson. Mr. Jackson is a very celebrated constitutional lawyer of Cleveland, Ohio. He made exactly the same arguments Mr. Smith made the year before. The Senate did not approve of the argument a year ago and I hope the Senate will not approve of similar arguments this year. As a matter of fact, to my mind, it is perfectly clear that the real purpose of these agents of the private power companies is to bring about a lawsuit respecting the matter, which would probably delay the building of the steam plant for some time.

The purpose of a steam plant is to accomplish what is known in power parlance as "firming up the power." We cannot always tell about the flow of water. We cannot always be assured that the flow of water will generate a certain standard amount of power which can be sold to the best advantage. But with the steam plant added to the water plant, we can always furnish a determined amount of power to those to whom the power is sold. In other words, the Government can then sell power to the best advantage.

I should like to read what Mr. Justice Hughes said on this question, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court:

We come, then, to the question as to the validity of the method which has been adopted in disposing of the surplus energy generated at the Wilson Dam.

That is on the Tennessee River.

The constitutional provision is silent as to the method of disposing of property belonging to the United States. That method, of course, must be an appropriate means of disposition, according to the nature of the property, it must be one adopted in the public interest, as distinguished from private or personal ends, and we may assume that it must be consistent with the foundation principles of our dual system of government, and must not be contrived to govern the concerns reserved to the States.

As applied to this particular question, that language means this: The Government owns the water power; it should sell it to the best advantage; it can get more money for it by having a steam plant to firm up the power, so as to produce a regular flow of power to the customers. For that reason I do not believe we should insert a provision inviting any taxpayer to bring a suit in the Federal court in Washington—not in Tennessee or Alabama, where this project is situated, but in Washington, D. C. First, of course, it is legislation. In the next place, it is for the purpose of litigating so as to prevent the installation of the power.

We already have the power there. Whether it was right or wrong, that is a question which is past and gone. The project has been established. It is a fine piece of property, bringing the Government a good income. It is being success-

fully managed at this time, and I hope will continue to be successfully managed. Surely we ought not to insert a provision which would tie up, perhaps for years, the building of the steam plant for the purpose of disposing of this power in the best possible way and in the interest of the Government.

That is the only question that is now before us.

Mr. WATKINS rose.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Does the Senator desire to ask me a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to ask the Senator a question on another matter, with reference to an amendment which I propose to offer. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator. I shall wait until he has concluded his statement.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am through now.

Mr. President, my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has informed me that he expects to offer a legislative amendment to the bill. I had to tell my friend from Michigan, who is a member of the committee, that, while I dislike to make a point of order in connection with the amendment, I shall be obliged to do so if it is offered. I hope he will not press it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to permit me to offer an amendment in connection with the Indian matter about which I spoke to him, prior to the consideration of the committee amendments? I think my amendment will probably be noncontroversial, and can be gotten out of the way.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The only way that could be done would be by unanimous consent.

Let me say to the Senator from Utah that this is the fourth week I have sat here trying to get the first one of the appropriation bills for this year to the floor of the Senate. I have sat here every day watching for the past 4 weeks, and hoping that we could get started on the appropriation bills. The House has been unusually expeditious this year in passing appropriation bills, and the Senate has been unusually slow. I should like to have this bill passed today if it is humanly possible. I appeal to Senators for cooperation.

All Senators know that we must pass the appropriation bills. We must pass this bill and succeeding appropriation bills if the Government is to continue to operate. I believe that Senators will cooperate in passing the appropriation bills as rapidly as we can, in the interest of the Government. I hope the Senator from Utah will wait a little while before offering his amendment, and let us dispose of the committee amendments first. That is the usual procedure. Let the bill be read for committee amendments, and after they are disposed of the Senator can offer his amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator says, I shall be happy to wait and offer my amendment after the committee amendments are disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Legislative Branch—Senate," on page 1, after line 8, to insert:

For payment to Vera C. Bushfield, widow of Harlan J. Bushfield, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota, \$12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

For payment to Alice W. Broughton, widow of J. Melville Broughton, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina, \$12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to offer a clarifying amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not in order for the Senator to offer an amendment until the committee amendments are disposed of.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

The appropriation for administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, is made available for the employment of an additional clerk at the basic rate of \$1,500 per annum by each Senator from the States of California and Virginia, the population of said States having exceeded 10,000,000 and 3,000,000, respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 14, to insert:

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Hereafter the basic annual rates of compensation for two clerks at \$3,480 each contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, shall be one at \$4,260 and one at \$2,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 19, to insert:

Commencing March 1, 1949, the appropriation for "Salaries of officers and employees of the Senate" contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, shall be available for the compensation of laborer in charge of private passage at \$2,280 basic per annum in lieu of laborer in charge of private passage at \$2,120.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the Senate," on page 3, after line 1, to strike out the subhead "Vice President's automobile"; in line 3, before the word "For" to insert "Vice President's automobile"; and in line 4, before the figures "\$2,500", to insert "fiscal year 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 4, to insert:

Postage stamps: For additional amounts for postage stamps, for the following offices: Office of the Secretary, \$150; Office of the Sergeant at Arms, \$75; in all, fiscal year 1949, \$225.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 8, to insert:

Furniture: For an additional amount for furniture and repairs, fiscal year 1949, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Commencing January 20, 1949, the provisions of existing law relating to long-distance telephone calls for Senators shall be equally applicable to the Vice President of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1949, the appropriation "Miscellaneous items, contingent expenses of the Senate," shall be available for purchase of new or used typewriters at prices which do not exceed prices established under the provisions of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 4, after line 2, to insert:

For payment to Vera Bloom, daughter of Sol Bloom, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 13, to insert:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

For an amount which is hereby authorized to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, \$20,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Offices—Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration," on page 8, line 12, after the word "administration", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$14,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be available only upon determination by the Federal Security Administrator, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, that increased costs have resulted either from (1) increases in work load, or (2) increases in salaries of State employees, occurring after February 1, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 18, to insert:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY
PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION
Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion

For all expenses necessary for and incident to the renovation, repair, and modernization (without change of present architectural appearance of the exterior of the Mansion or the interior of its main floor) of the Executive Mansion, including the preparation of drawings and specifications, and the purchase of furniture, furnishings, and equipment, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or the civil service and classification laws, \$5,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any cost-plus-a-

fixed-fee general construction contract entered into in pursuance of this authority shall be awarded on competitive bidding among responsible general contractors upon the amount of the fixed fee to accrue from the performance of such contract: *Provided further*, That with the exception of the sub-contract to be made by the general contractor for the underpinning and foundation work and work incidental and appurtenant thereto, which may be a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract, all other subcontracts made by the general contractor shall be fixed price contracts awarded on competitive bids received from responsible subcontractors.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 17, to insert:

*General Accounting Office Building,
District of Columbia*

The contract authority provided under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, for the construction of a building for the use of the General Accounting Office, is increased in an amount not to exceed \$2,550,000 under the revised limit of cost of \$25,400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 10, to insert:

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Maintenance and operation of schools

For an additional amount for "Maintenance and operation of schools," \$3,000,000; and the limitation under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, on the amount available for administrative expenses, is increased from "\$100,000" to "\$175,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Federal Housing Administration", on page 10, line 13, after the word "to", to strike out "\$23,000,000" and insert "\$23,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 16, to insert:

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The second proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Federal Public Housing Authority" in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1947.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to speak to the amendment now before the Senate, which is the one relating to the Public Housing Administration. It reads as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The second proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Federal Public Housing Authority" in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1947.

Following that, the further amendment reads:

The second proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Public Housing Administration" in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1948.

Mr. President, the history of the proviso in the Government corporations appropriation for 1948 and 1949 whose repeal is now sought is relatively simple. It reverts to the early history and practices of the Housing Authority created

under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

The Housing Act of 1937 was designed to provide low-rent housing for families of low income who could not otherwise afford decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings. It authorized loans by the Housing Authority to local public housing agencies to aid in financing slum clearance and the development of low-rent housing projects. In order to bring rents in the completed dwellings within financial reach of families in the lowest-income groups, the Authority was empowered to make limited annual contributions, provided the community would also make contributions toward the operation of the projects.

Besides the locally owned projects which constitute the greater part of the low-rent program, the Housing Authority has had under its management some federally owned projects. The main group of these consisted of Public Works Administration projects, and they also included war-housing projects directly constructed and owned by the Federal Government, although it was determined that after the war they should be sold to local housing authorities for low-rent use.

Under the United States Housing Act, low-rent housing activities are primarily a subject for local determination and control, the Federal Government being limited chiefly to providing technical and financial assistance. Federal assistance can be provided only under conditions prescribed by the United States Housing Act. Among these conditions is a provision that the local authority shall provide, by cash, tax remission, or tax exemption, a local subsidy equal to at least one-fifth of the annual contribution to be provided by the Housing Authority.

According to a statement submitted to the House Appropriations Committee at its hearing on March 26, 1948, as shown at page 791, it was "the original policy of the Public Housing Administration to encourage localities to grant complete tax exemption for their low-rent housing projects."

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that statement. It was "the original policy of the Public Housing Administration to encourage localities to grant complete tax exemption for their low-rent housing projects."

In other words, the municipality was to waive all taxes on the property which was to be used for low-rent housing projects.

I read further from the statement submitted to the House Appropriations Committee in 1948:

It was only when a locality insisted upon receiving some payments in lieu of taxes that the PHA authorized the making of contracts providing for such payments. As a result of this original policy of case-by-case negotiations with the localities, the original contracts present a wide diversity of provisions as to payment in lieu of taxes. More than half of the original contracts contain no provision whatsoever for such payments, and only 7 percent of the contracts provided for payments equal to as much as 5 percent of shelter rent.

The statement in the House hearings continues:

The various localities throughout the country speedily came to feel that there had been an unfair discrimination between them; those cities which had insisted upon payments in lieu of taxes had received them, whereas those which had not insisted had received none.

In other words, the first bloom of enthusiasm with which the local authorities had entered contracts with the Housing Authority wore off. Because other cities had been given better deals, certain cities began to complain. A typical example was the local authority which entered a contract providing for payments in lieu of taxes in an amount corresponding to the tax on the real estate if the Federal Government had not come in and assisted in construction of a housing project. This was \$477. But later it sought a contract corresponding to a payment in lieu of taxes amounting to 10 percent of the shelter rent, or \$50,000. Mr. President, that municipality at first was perfectly satisfied to get \$477 in lieu of taxes; but when it learned that other cities were getting more, then it wanted the sum of \$50,000.

Mr. A. R. Miller, Assistant General Counsel for the Public Housing Administration, described the process in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee last year. He said:

We have contracts which were drawn at the time when the program was young and there was no experience, and the cities were enthusiastic. And they went further, it appears from their point of view, than they should have gone; and then, after that, when they found that the burden was excessive, they came to the Federal Government, to us, and said, "Here, we have made a contract which is too burdensome for us. Will you relieve us to some extent?"

As a result of such pleadings, the Housing Authority in 1942 began to revise its contracts, attempting a uniform policy of payments, in lieu of taxes, amounting to 5 percent of shelter rent. Since then, the Public Housing Administration has sought to have those payments increased to a uniform 10 percent, and that provision is the subject of authorizing legislation in Senate bill 138 of the Eighty-first Congress.

It will be observed that throughout the Housing Authority proceeded, in making payments in lieu of taxes, without an apparent doubt as to its legal authority to do so. The question of statutory authority to enter into any contract calling for payments in lieu of taxes on locally owned housing apparently was raised for the first time before the House Appropriations Committee in 1947.

At that time legal justification for such payments was requested from counsel for the Public Housing Administration. In a brief submitted to the House committee, section 13 (c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 was cited.

Mr. President, I refer now to page 243 of the 1947-48 hearings. This section reads as follows:

The Authority may enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any

State or political subdivision thereof with respect to any real property owned by the Authority. The amount so paid for any year for any such property shall not exceed the taxes that would be paid to the State or subdivision, as the case may be, upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation thereby.

That quotation is taken from page 895 of the Public Laws, volume 50.

Mr. President, this only allowed the authorities to make an agreement in relation to taxes on property owned by the Authority. The properties and buildings from which we are attempting to remove the limit and to change the contract to allow 10 percent of the rent are not owned by the Authority, and therefore there is no authority to enter into the contracts.

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

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

Mr. MAYBANK. But is it not a fact that the same municipal services are rendered to the housing developments, whether owned by the Authority or not, the same street system, police, light, school, and so forth?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is true. There is no doubt that the municipalities render certain services for the properties whether owned by the Authority or not. I take it for granted that the services rendered by the municipality in each case are identical, but, under the law, only on properties owned by the Authority did the Authority have power to enter into an agreement to pay any sum annually in taxes.

Bear in mind that the United States Housing Act deals both with locally owned and federally owned housing projects, and note that section 13 (c) says, "with respect to any real property owned by the Authority."

Counsel's brief states:

It is true that the United States Housing Act does not, in so many words, authorize Federal Public Housing Authority to approve payments in lieu of taxes when such payments are proposed in budgets submitted by local housing authorities to FPFA for approval.

The brief continues to support a position that despite the absence of such authorization, payments in lieu of taxes were legal because the act "makes no attempt to particularize the permissible expenditures of local authorities in their operating budgets."

What the FPFA attempted to do was not within the law itself, but outside the law, to allow the payments and to make the contracts. That is exactly what was prohibited by the legislation of 1947, and by the budget of 1948. The amendment now attempts retroactively to restore the provision and to compel the Federal Government to make payments which were illegally made in the first instance to municipalities.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator not admit that the payments have been made over a period of years in some instances?

Mr. FERGUSON. From 1942 to 1947.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator will further agree with me, will he not, that while the amounts are small, nevertheless the various cities counted upon those amounts in making up their budgets for the city governments?

Mr. FERGUSON. I assume the cities, after they obtained the contracts between 1942 and 1947, made up their budgets upon the assumption that they were going to receive certain taxes from the properties.

Mr. President, I have a city in my State, the city of Detroit, that will benefit by the adoption of the amendment. There is no doubt about it. I think it will benefit by about \$31,000. But that does not mean that we should adopt it, merely because I am from a State that would receive a portion of the taxpayers' money. I think the time has come when, even though we come from States that would benefit by doing something illegal, merely because our States would get some money, we should not hesitate a moment to stand on the floor of the Senate and protest the taking of money from the Federal Government even by our own citizens. Unless we can do that, we are going to have no limit to the budgets of the Federal Government.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. There are cities in Michigan that receive benefits, though, are there not?

Mr. FERGUSON. They will if the provision is included in the bill as passed. That is what I say.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I say if the bill is not passed. They already have original contracts, do they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they have some original contracts.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to make it perfectly clear, with the permission of the Senator from Michigan, that there is no project whatever in South Carolina, such as the Senator suggested with respect to the State of Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that.

Mr. MAYBANK. The provision is supported purely on the basis of its merits as an adjustment. The benefit to any city in the State of South Carolina does not enter into the matter at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to say to the committee and to the Senator from South Carolina, there are no projects in his State that would benefit by so much as one dollar. It is not a question of what we get for our own States, at all. It is a question of principle.

The House committee does not appear to have been impressed by this argument, however. It inserted in its report on the Government Corporations Appropriation for 1948 the following language;

Another policy of the FPHA permits local housing projects to make voluntary payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the rate specified in its contract up to 10 percent

of what is designated as shelter rent. This practice the committee feels to be of doubtful propriety and legality, and it has been provided in the bill that the funds appropriated for contributions cannot be used for payments to local projects making payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the rate specified in the original contracts with FPHA.

In adopting the proviso referred to in the House report it was apparent that there was considerable doubt as to the legality of any contributions for payments in lieu of taxes not mentioned in section 13 (c) of the United States Housing Act. As a concession to a practice which had been built up, however, funds were appropriated and authorization provided for payments corresponding to those provided at the inception of the assistance contracts between the Federal Government and the local authorities. The General Accounting Office has subscribed to this by refusing to approve payments since the beginning of fiscal 1948 on any contracts other than the first assistance contract between a local housing authority and the FPHA.

Mr. President, this can be boiled down to very simple language, when we come to vote upon the proposition. The Senate and House of Representatives, in 1947, said these contracts could not be increased, and they compelled everybody to go back to the original contract. We now find the Congress saying, "Oh, that was all right in 1947, and in 1948; it would not be allowed. But now we are going to allow it retroactively." It will cost the Federal Government I think between \$150,000 and \$160,000 each year, or a total of about \$300,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was \$104,000 for 1948, \$162,000 for 1949, making approximately the figure suggested by the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is about \$270,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the proposed legislation is sought to be added to the appropriation bill, but I am not making the point of order. I am saying it is a matter that should be determined by a simple majority of the Senate, rather than by a two-thirds majority, because I feel that we should treat the matter as if it were a bill. I understand there is a bill pending before the proper legislative committee which would allow the contracts to be made.

I hope that the Senate will vote retroactively to put back into the appropriation bill these and all the payments for the increase of the amount as provided for in line 18 to and including line 21, on page 10 of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment referred to, on which the Senator from Michigan asks for a yea-and-nay vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate for any great length of time in discussing this amendment. I will say that last month a bill

was introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I suggested to him at that time that since originally the amendment had been adopted as a rider to an appropriation bill, and since it was within the province of the Appropriations Committee, it be referred to that committee and not to the Banking and Currency Committee. I appreciate what the Senator from Michigan has said, that he would not make a point of order with reference to it, but it is a clear-cut instance of whether the Federal Government will keep its contracts with some 117 cities in the United States, contracts which have been made through the Public Housing Authority, and with the approval of the Congress, prior to the amendment to the Government Corporations Act for fiscal 1948 and 1949.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be attached to the few remarks I have made a memorandum from A. R. Miller, Assistant General Counsel, Public Housing Administration, together with a statement which sets forth the full facts. I wish to read briefly from the statement at this time:

There are 17 low-rent housing projects which have been affected by this ruling. A list of such projects and the amounts involved is attached hereto. (On all other projects the "original" contract has either not been revised, or, where revised, no change was made in the amount of payments in lieu of taxes authorized thereunder; such projects are therefore not affected by the provisos in the appropriation acts.)

The question is merely whether or not they had a contract prior to 1948 when the amendment was placed in the appropriation bill, or whether they did not have one. That is the issue here. If the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan is defeated, all we do is to give to 17 cities approximately \$300,000 over the past two fiscal years, which I think is due, and which my distinguished friend thinks is not due.

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

MEMORANDUM FROM PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION FOR THE DEFICIENCY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS RELATING TO THE PROPOSED REPEAL OF THE PROVISO IN THE GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATION ACTS FOR 1948 AND 1949

In the Government Corporations Appropriation Acts of 1948 and 1949, a proviso was added to the Public Housing Administration's appropriation for annual contributions to low-rent housing projects which reads as follows: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any public housing agency any contribution occasioned by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the amount specified in the original contract between such agency and the Federal Public Housing Authority."

These acts also provided that expenditures thereunder should be subject to audit and final settlement by the Comptroller General.

The Comptroller General interpreted the term "original contract" as used in the aforesaid appropriation acts as meaning the first or earliest assistance contract between the

local housing authorities and the PHA, and that, therefore, in determining the amount of the annual contribution which the PHA might make out of the moneys appropriated under such acts, the PHA could give credit to the local authorities only for payments in lieu of taxes specified in the earliest contracts, even though such contracts had been validly revised to authorize larger payments in lieu of taxes.

There are 17 low-rent-housing projects which have been affected by this ruling. A list of such projects and the amounts involved is attached hereto. (On all other projects, the "original" contract has either not been revised, or where revised, no change was made in the amount of payments in lieu of taxes authorized thereunder; such projects are therefore not affected by the provisos in the appropriation acts.) The way in which the aforesaid 17 projects are affected is as follows:

Under the assistance contract between the PHA and the local authority, the amount of the annual contribution payable by the PHA is reduced by any rental income which the project may have over and above its expenses. One of the expenses payable out of the rents is the payment in lieu of taxes. Therefore, the greater the amount of payments in lieu of taxes the less there will be available from the rental income to reduce the annual contribution payable by the PHA and, consequently, the greater the contribution the PHA would make.

In the 17 projects involved, the "original" or earliest contract provided either for no payments in lieu of taxes or for a small amount. In each of these cases the contracts were subsequently revised or amended so as to authorize as an expense of the project larger payments in lieu of taxes than those specified in the "original" contract. These revised contracts were all validly entered into in pursuance of the authority vested in PHA by section 14 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, and were in effect prior to the passage of the appropriation act for 1948, and are legally binding obligations of the PHA.

The effect of the proviso in the Appropriation Act was to require the PHA to refuse to make annual contributions based upon the larger payments in lieu of taxes specified in the revised contracts and thus to breach the valid revised contracts in existence between the PHA and the local authorities.

In addition to the above 17 projects, there are 4 projects on which the local authorities, pursuant to authorization given by the PHA in accordance with its policy then in effect, made payments in lieu of taxes in excess of the contract amounts (known as voluntary payments) prior to the passage of the Appropriation Act of 1948. The annual contributions for these four projects, however, were payable on July 17, 1948, out of the moneys appropriated by the 1948 Appropriation Act and were, therefore, subject to the proviso in question. The PHA was required therefore to deduct those amounts from the contributions paid by it to these four projects.

The repeal of the provisos as of the dates of their respective enactments would, therefore, accomplish two things: (1) it would permit the local authorities to make payments in lieu of taxes equal to the full amount set forth in the revised contracts and permit the PHA to increase the annual contributions paid to the projects to the same extent; and (2) it would validate the voluntary payments in lieu of taxes previously made and permit the PHA to increase the annual contributions on those projects accordingly.

The Congress will not be required to appropriate any moneys for the above purposes since there is enough left out of the moneys already appropriated by the Appropriation Acts of 1948 and 1949 for the payment of these additional amounts of contributions. As shown by the attached state-

ment, the total amount of additional contributions which the repeal of the provisos would permit the PHA to make, is approximately \$300,000.

A. R. MILLER,
Assistant General Counsel.

Projects on which part of the annual contribution was withheld because of the difference between the amount of payments in lieu of taxes authorized by the "original" contract and the amount authorized by the revised contract

	Fiscal 1948	Fiscal 1949
Baltimore, Md.....	\$627.00	(¹)
Detroit, Mich.....	15,304.39	\$16,451.26
Norwalk, Conn.....	383.52	
Atlanta, Ga.....	40,898.29	102,192.44
Annapolis, Md.....	2,023.53	2,332.76
Beverly, N. J.....	414.76	
Jackson, Tenn.....	1,028.80	
Nashville, Tenn.....	2,273.00	
Key West, Fla.....	1,601.00	
Los Angeles, Calif.....	4,655.00	4,877.49
New York, N. Y.....	24,412.09	24,523.90
Omaha, Nebr.....	6,451.49	2,999.54
Springfield, Ill.....	725.50	6,119.00
Trenton, N. J.....	842.80	
Frederick, Md.....	1,434.97	
McKeesport, Pa.....	1,792.21	
Denver, Colo.....		3,188.38
Total.....	104,898.35	162,684.77

¹ Where no amount is shown for fiscal 1949, it is due to the fact that the audit for that year has not yet been made. It is believed that when the audit is made the amount involved will be small, not more than \$10,000 in addition to the total of \$162,684.77.

Projects on which voluntary payments in lieu of taxes were made before the Appropriation Act of 1948 became effective

Augusta, Ga.....	\$6,771.03
Fall River, Mass.....	12,633.20
Laurel, Miss.....	6,086.62
McComb, Miss.....	3,242.40
Total.....	28,733.25

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hendrickson	Maybank
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Cain	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chapman	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Taft
Downey	Knowland	Taylor
Ferguson	Langer	Thye
Flanders	McCarthy	Tydings
Frear	McFarland	Watkins
Fulbright	McGrath	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Green	Magnuson	Withers
Gurney	Malone	Young
Hayden	Martin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 10, beginning in line 17, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I should like to

make a few remarks concerning the pending question.

The amendment is on page 10, beginning in line 17, and running through line 21. In 1947 fiscal and 1948 fiscal the Senate and House of Representatives inserted in an appropriation bill a provision that the FPFA amount in lieu of taxes had to be in accordance with original contracts. This is what happened: The local housing authorities wanted housing, they wanted low-rent housing. Many of them were willing to waive payments in lieu of taxes in order to get housing projects. They wanted to make contributions. Then, after they got a housing project, the FPFA would go to them and increase the amount of the payments in lieu of taxes.

When Congress really learned about that, in 1947 and 1948, we inserted in the appropriation bill a provision that they would get contributions only as provided for in their original contracts, not as provided in the changed contracts.

This year the Committee on Appropriations wants to insert in the bill the amendment from line 17 to line 21, which would retroactively provide for the payment of Federal money to municipalities which had already entered into contracts containing certain provisions and were able to persuade the FPFA to change the contracts.

If Senators are against changing what we did in 1947 and 1948 their votes should be "nay." If they favor the committee amendment, which would result in the payment to municipalities of about \$275,000 of Federal money which was not legally due to them, then Senators should vote "yea."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope and trust that the committee will be sustained and that the amendment will be agreed to. The communities affected were not paid because the Comptroller questioned the right to pay them after the House and Senate language was inserted in the 1948-49 appropriation bill, before they had entered into contracts and had been paid. In a way they were left out because of language inserted in an appropriation bill. I trust that the amendment will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee. Those who favor the amendment will make it known by saying "yea," those opposed by saying "nay," as their names are called. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained from the Senate on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness, and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business, and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], both of whom are

absent on public business, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is unavoidably detained, and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], both of whom are necessarily absent, would vote "yea" if present.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official committee business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—49

Anderson	Holland	Morse
Byrd	Humphrey	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kerr	Pepper
Downey	Knowland	Robertson
Eastland	Long	Russell
Ellender	Lucas	Sparkman
Frear	McCarran	Stennis
Fulbright	McClellan	Taylor
George	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	McGrath	Tydings
Green	McKellar	Watkins
Hayden	Magnuson	Withers
Hill	Maybank	
Hoey	Miller	

NAYS—33

Aiken	Gurney	Millikin
Brewster	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Butler	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cain	Kem	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thye
Donnell	Lodge	Tobey
Ecton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Flanders	Martin	Young

NOT VOTING—14

Baldwin	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Vandenber
Graham	Myers	Wagner
Hunt	Saltonstall	Wiley
Kefauver	Smith, N. J.	

So the committee amendment on page 10, lines 17 to 21, inclusive, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment is the paragraph following line 21 on page 10.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President—Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I remember correctly, that paragraph is part of the same amendment as the preceding paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it is a separate amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Parliamentarian is very good. I would not dispute him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, after line 21, which will be stated.

The next amendment was on page 10, after line 21, to insert:

The second proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Public Housing Administration"

in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, is hereby repealed as of July 1, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee about an amendment which we have not yet reached, for the purpose of clarifying his opening statement about that amendment. I understood the Senator from Tennessee to say, with respect to the provision of law that certain positions in the Reclamation Service would have to be held by engineers, that that was not involved in this bill, but would be handled in another bill.

Mr. President, I think it is absolutely true that the final determination will be made in connection with another bill; but I believe that my distinguished colleague from Tennessee will recall the voluminous testimony which we took before our committee on that very issue, and especially the testimony of the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. Before we reported the bill the committee struck out, on pages 25 and 26, the language which was inserted on the House side, which wiped out the engineering requirement and had the effect of restoring Commissioner Straus and Supervisor Boke to the pay roll. If the Senate adopts the committee amendment, we shall continue the prohibition against the payment of those two salaries, as provided in the appropriation act of last year. Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am afraid I made a mistake if I made the statement to which the Senator from Virginia refers—and, as I recall, I did make that statement. What I intended to say was that I understood the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] was not going to press his point of view before the Senate, but would take it up in connection with a subsequent bill. This amendment, of course, strikes out the House language.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. The statement which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has just made is absolutely correct. The bill is left in a form which is satisfactory to me. Under the Senate committee version, the prohibition against any man holding either of these two offices unless he is an engineer remains in the law. I informed the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that in view of the fact that the bill was favorable to my contention, I would not deluge the Senate of the United States with any statements on the Boke-Straus issue, and I do not intend to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This amendment has not yet been reached. The discussion is out of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. In that connection, Mr. President, my original statement should be corrected to conform to my last statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before I resume my seat, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia for the statement which he has just made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing Expediter—Salaries and expenses", on page 11, line 4, after the figures "\$4,800,000", to insert "of which \$3,600,000 is contingent upon the enactment of legislation continuing rent control beyond March 31, 1949: *Provided*, That if rent control and veterans-preference requirements under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are not extended by legislation beyond March 31, 1949, the said sum of \$3,600,000 is hereby made available on account and in part payment of liquidation expenses, including terminal leave, of the Office of the Housing Expediter."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it will be noted that the language beginning in line 4, is "of which \$3,600,000 is contingent upon the enactment of legislation continuing rent control beyond March 31, 1949: *Provided*, That if rent control and veterans-preference requirements under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are not extended by legislation beyond March 31, 1949, the said sum of \$3,600,000 is hereby made available on account and in part payment of liquidation expenses, including terminal leave, of the Office of the Housing Expediter." Since that time rent-control legislation has passed the Congress; and I ask that that much of the amendment, beginning with the word "of" in line line 4, to the end of line 12, be stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, with reference to the amendment which was last voted upon by a yea-and-nay vote, let me say that there are only 17 low-rent-housing projects which were affected by the ruling of the Comptroller General necessitated by the provisions which were inserted in the appropriation act in 1948.

Also, the effect of the amendment is to do only two things:

First, it would permit local authorities to receive payments in lieu of taxes equal to the full amount set forth in the revised contracts and permit the PHA to increase the annual contributions paid to the projects to the same extent.

Second, it would validate the voluntary payments in lieu of taxes previously made, and permit the PHA to increase the annual contributions on these projects accordingly.

I should like to have the RECORD show also that Congress will not be required to appropriate any money whatever for these purposes, since there is enough left of the moneys already appropriated under the appropriation acts of 1948 and 1949 for the payment of these additional amounts of contribution, as shown by a statement which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD. The total amounts are not very high.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement showing projects on which a part of the annual contribution was withheld because the difference between the amount of payments in lieu of taxes authorized by

the original contract and the amount authorized by the revised contract.

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

Projects on which part of the annual contribution was withheld because of the difference between the amount of payments in lieu of taxes authorized by the "original" contract and the amount authorized by the revised contract

	Fiscal 1948	Fiscal 1949
Baltimore, Md.....	\$627.00	(1)
Detroit, Mich.....	15,304.39	\$16,451.26
Norwalk, Conn.....	383.52	-----
Atlanta, Ga.....	40,898.29	102,192.44
Annapolis, Md.....	2,023.53	2,332.76
Beverly, N. J.....	414.76	-----
Jackson, Tenn.....	1,028.80	-----
Nashville, Tenn.....	2,273.00	-----
Key West, Fla.....	1,601.00	-----
Los Angeles, Calif.....	4,655.00	4,877.49
New York, N. Y.....	24,412.09	24,523.90
Omaha, Neb.....	6,451.49	2,999.54
Springfield, Ill.....	725.50	6,119.00
Trenton, N. J.....	842.80	-----
Frederick, Md.....	1,434.97	-----
McKeesport, Pa.....	1,792.21	-----
Denver, Colo.....	-----	3,188.38
Total.....	104,868.35	162,684.77

¹ Where no amount is shown for fiscal 1949, it is due to the fact that the audit for that year has not yet been made. It is believed that when the audit is made the amount involved will be small, not more than \$10,000 in addition to the total of \$162,684.77.

Projects on which voluntary payments in lieu of taxes were made before the Appropriation Act of 1948 became effective

Augusta, Ga.....	\$6,771.03
Fall River, Mass.....	12,633.20
Laurel, Miss.....	6,086.62
McComb, Miss.....	8,242.40
Total.....	28,733.25

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this statement shows that the low-rent public-housing projects which were actually affected, and therefore will be benefited, now that this amendment has been approved, are to be found in the States of Maryland, Michigan, Connecticut, Georgia, New Jersey, Tennessee, Florida, California, New York, Nebraska, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Colorado.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] with respect to the repealer of the so-called Straus-Boke rider, I think I ought to make the statement that it should not be assumed from what was said that the issue has been decided. It was not decided in the committee, rather because of a matter of convenience. The decision was postponed. In the course of the consideration of this bill, when we come to that amendment, I wish to make my position clear.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand, the first two lines under the heading "Housing Expediter—Salaries and expenses," on page 11, remain in the bill, with a period after "\$4,800,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 12 to insert:

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission established by the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 880), including personal services in the District of Columbia, travel expenses, printing and binding, and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$50,000: *Provided*, That section 6 of the aforesaid act of July 2, 1948, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "nine months" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "fifteen months," and section 13 of said act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "nine months' period" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "fifteen months' period."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to insert:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION
VESSEL OPERATING FUNCTIONS

Not to exceed \$4,568,000 of the unobligated balance on March 1, 1949, of the funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, shall remain available until June 30, 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "War Assets Administration—Salaries and expenses, special fund," on page 13, line 20, after the words "special fund," to strike out "\$12,500,000" and insert "\$13,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 19, to insert:

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the War Claims Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; printing and binding; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and advances or reimbursements to other Government agencies for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the functions of the Commission; \$100,000, to be derived from the war-claims fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, approved July 3, 1948): *Provided*, That the date fixed by section 8 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 for submission of the report required by said section is changed from "March 31, 1949," to "December 31, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 9, to insert:

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

For payment of claims, as authorized by the War Claims Act of 1948, from funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the war-claims fund created by section 13 (a) of said act, such sums as may be necessary, to be available to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment of claims under sections 4 (a), 4 (b) (2), 5 (e), 6 (b), and 7 of said act to the payees named and in the amounts stated in certifications by the War Claims Commission and the Federal Security Administrator or their duly authorized representatives, which certifications shall be in lieu of any vouchers which might otherwise be required: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for administrative expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Research Administration—Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases," on page 16, line 14, after the word "diseases," to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,350,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be made by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Senate and House Appropriation Committees covering expenditures from the fiscal year 1949 appropriations for this purpose."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Production and Marketing Administration—Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," on page 16, line 24, after the word "the" to strike out "Agricultural" and insert "Agricultural."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 9, to insert:

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION
LOANS TO FARMERS, PROPERTY DAMAGE

The funds appropriated under the head "Loans to farmers, 1948 flood damage," in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, shall remain available until June 30, 1950, in accordance with the terms and conditions specified under said head, to provide assistance to farmers whose property is destroyed or damaged as a result of floods, storms, or other natural calamity during the calendar years 1948 and 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Coast and Geodetic Survey—Salaries and expenses, field," on page 19, line 9, after the word "field," to strike out "\$290,000" and insert "\$366,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Bonneville Power Administration—Construction, operation, and maintenance," on page 20, line 5, after the figures "\$3,521,600", to strike out "and the limitations under said head on force-account activities and on salaries and expenses in connection with informational work are hereby repealed" and insert "and the limitation under said head on force-account activities is hereby amended to read as follows: '*Provided further*, That not exceeding 10 percent of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for wages for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except in case of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator.'"

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to offer a clarifying amendment to that section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this same amendment applies on pages 23 and 24, I ask unanimous consent that we may consider all three of those committee amendments together, because they all deal with the question of force account.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then I ask that all three amendments be reported together. All of them use the same language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, in lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to strike out "for wages."

On page 23, in line 23, and continuing to line 1 on page 24, it is proposed to strike out "for wages."

On page 24, in line 3, it is proposed to strike out "for wages."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the effect of the amendments is as follows: We intended to raise the authorization for force account from 8 percent to 10 percent. But when the language "for wages for construction" was used, in effect we raised it to 20 percent, because wages would be only one-half of the construction cost.

So by striking out the words "for wages," and leaving it "10 per centum * * * for construction," it will be 10 percent for the over-all job. Undoubtedly that was the intention of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Virginia to the committee amendment, in line 12 on page 20; and to the committee amendment in line 23, on page 23; and in line 1, on page 24; and also in line 3 on page 24.

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, beginning in line 5, on page 20.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Navajo and Hopi Service—Agency services," on page 20, line 25, after the word "services" to strike out "\$360,000" and insert "\$1,310,000," and in line 25, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That after the approval of this act no payment shall be made from this appropriation to Indians who are eligible for benefit payments under the Social Security Act.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That a detailed report shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior to the Senate and House Appropriation Committees covering expenditures from the fiscal year 1949 appropriations for the education of the Navajo and Hopi Indians.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in line 7 of the committee amendment, after the word "Indians" the following amendments:

EDUCATION OF INDIANS

For an additional amount for "Education of Indians," \$50,000.

Also, in line 10, to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$75,000."

And also, in line 13, to strike out "\$535,000" and insert "\$560,000."

I offer those amendments to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 21, after line 7 it is proposed to insert:

EDUCATION OF INDIANS

For an additional amount for "Education of Indians," \$50,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe such an amendment is not strictly in order at this time; but I ask unanimous consent that it be considered and adopted. We should permit it, and I am sure the committee would unanimously agree to permit the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment, following line 7, on page 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 7, to insert:

CONSERVATION OF HEALTH

For an additional amount for "Conservation of health," \$50,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the committee amendment on page 21, in line 10, I offer an amendment to strike out \$50,000" and insert "\$75,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment on page 21, in line 10.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Welfare of Indians," on page 21, line 13, after the word "Indians", to strike out "\$385,000" and insert "\$535,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That after the approval of this act no payment shall be made from this appropriation to Indians who are eligible for benefit payments under the the Social Security Act.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 21, in line 13, to strike out "\$535,000" and insert "\$560,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment in line 13.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say in explanation that those amendments are for the benefit of the North Dakota Indians at Turtle Lake and Fort Totten Reservations, who are very destitute, and have been supported by the neighboring towns.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 16, to insert:

ALASKA NATIVE SERVICE

Vessel conversion

For expenses necessary in converting and outfitting a vessel for use as a service and supply ship by the Alaska Native Service, \$700,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 22, to insert:

PAYMENT TO CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

For payment to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians in fulfillment of the terms of a contract between the United States of America and the said nations as authorized by the act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 483), and as ratified by the act of June 24, 1948 (Public Law 754), \$8,359,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available until expended for defraying the expenses, including printing and binding, of making the per capita payment authorized by the above acts: *Provided*, That in addition to the per capita payment, the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, is authorized to distribute per capita to the enrolled members of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, entitled under existing law to share in the funds of such tribes, or to their lawful heirs or devisees determined in the manner prescribed in section 4 of the aforesaid act of June 24, 1948, any or all the funds held by the Government of the United States for the benefit of said tribes.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

Pursuant to Public Law 852, Eightieth Congress, second session, approved June 30, 1948, the sum of \$25,000 is hereby made available out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, to remain available until expended, to be used to defray the expenses incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in revising the roll as provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Reclamation—Force-account work," on page 23, after line 2, to strike out:

That part of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads "not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed \$200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive" is hereby repealed.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That part of the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1949 which reads: "Not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under

the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed \$200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive." is hereby repealed and in lieu thereof the following provision is hereby inserted: "Not exceeding 10 percent of the construction appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation for any project contained in this act shall be available for wages for construction work by force account and on a hired-labor basis; except that not to exceed \$500,000 may on approval of the Commissioner be expended for wages for construction work by force account on any one project when the work is unsuitable for contract or where excessive bids are received; and except in cases of emergencies local in character, so declared by the Commissioner."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General fund—Construction," on page 24, line 12, after "Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada," to strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 14, after "Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado," to strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 16, after "Columbia Basin project, Washington," to strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missouri River Basin," on page 24, line 21, after "(58 Stat. 887)", to strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert "\$5,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reclamation fund—General offices, salaries and expenses (other than project offices)", on page 25, line 6, after the figures "\$260,000", to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That in addition to the amount appropriated under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, there shall be available for expenditure under said head any sums transferred thereto for work performed or to be performed for the benefit of specific projects or undertakings for which other funds or appropriations of the Bureau of Reclamation are available; and the first, fourth, and fifth provisos under said head are hereby repealed.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Provided, That the limitation of \$7,800,000 contained in the first proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, is hereby increased to \$8,410,000: *Provided further*, That the limitation of \$48,000,000 contained in the fourth proviso under this head in said act is hereby increased to \$53,376,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 20, to strike out:

Effective January 31, 1949, the proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads: "*Provided further*, That after January 31, 1949, no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Rec-

lamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation, or of any person who performs the duties of any such position, who is not a qualified engineer with at least 5 years' engineering and administrative experience: (1) Commissioner of Reclamation; (2) Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; and (3) Regional Director of Reclamation—" is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 26, line 13, after "Lewiston Orchards project, Idaho", to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 14, after "Provo River project, Utah", to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Military Establishment," on page 27, after line 9, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—MILITARY FUNCTIONS, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

The sum of \$2,000,000 of the appropriation "Expediting production of equipment and supplies for national defense, fiscal years 1942-46," shall remain available until June 30, 1949, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed thereunder prior to July 1, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 25, in line 21, the committee amendment is the controversial Straus-Boke amendment to which I desire to address myself briefly in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear.

As I said a few moments ago, there was no decision of this issue in the full Appropriations Committee. The Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee which considered the matter, did act; it recommended that the repealer contained in the House bill be stricken from the bill.

Mr. President, in order to understand what this is all about, one should read the rider contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill of last year. The following language is to be found on page 25, beginning in line 23:

Provided further, That after January 31, 1949, no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation, or of any person who performs the duties of any such position, who is not a qualified engineer with at least 5 years' engineering and administrative experience: (1) Commissioner of Reclamation; (2) Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; and (3) Regional Director of Reclamation.

It will be observed that the effect of that language applies only to the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. It will further be observed from that language that it provides only that no appropriation contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1949 shall be used to pay the salaries of certain officials who are not engineers. Obviously, the pro-

vision does not have any effect whatsoever after June 30, 1949. If it be argued that the purpose of the amendment was to change the qualifications of the position or office of Commissioner of Reclamation, it is plain that it is ineffective to do so. It merely provides that the person who was the incumbent Commissioner at the time when this rider was passed should not be permitted to draw a salary out of an appropriation contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act. It does no more; it does no less.

When that legislative rider undertaking to prohibit the use of these appropriations for the payment of salaries to the individuals in such positions who were not engineers was reported by the Appropriations Committee last year, minority views were filed by the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Wyoming, in which it was pointed out that the purpose of the rider was expressly to remove certain individuals from office. The minority views quoted the statement of former Representative Harness in which he said the object of the rider was to remove from office two officials, Commissioner Michael Straus and Regional Director Boke. The minority views did not prevail. The bill passed with this rider, except that instead of becoming effective immediately upon the enactment of the appropriation bill, as provided in the measure when it came from the House, the rider as finally adopted did not become effective until January 31, 1949.

Mr. President, when the President of the United States this year submitted his recommendation for the next fiscal year, he sent to the Congress a specific recommendation that the rider be repealed. The President, on January 6, 1949, addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in which he urged the repeal of this restrictive provision. I ask that the full text of the letter, with the accompanying enclosure, be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 6, 1949.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a repeal of a proviso contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1949 which is referred to in the attached letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

I have previously indicated my opposition to this proviso which has the effect of legislating out of office the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and one of his principal assistants. This arbitrary action is diametrically opposed to the principles on which this Government is founded. Furthermore, these positions are primarily administrative in character and do not necessarily require a professional engineering background.

I strongly urge the repeal of this restrictive provision.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

[Estimate No. 3, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1949.
The President,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit for your consideration a provision of language repealing a proviso in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1949 which would legislate out of office the Commissioner of Reclamation and one of the regional directors, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
General offices

Salaries and expenses (other than project offices)

The proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads: "Provided further, That after January 31, 1949, no part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be used for the salaries and expenses of a person in any of the following positions in the Bureau of Reclamation, or of any person who performs the duties of any such position, who is not a qualified engineer with at least 5 years' engineering and administrative experience: (1) Commissioner of Reclamation; (2) Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; and (3) Regional Director of Reclamation"—is hereby repealed.

I recommend the transmission of this proposed provision to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,

Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I placed the letter in the RECORD to make it clear that the President of the United States has asked for the repeal of this rider. The subcommittee on the deficiency bill held extensive hearings, went into the matter at great length, and reported to the full committee language striking out the repealer. Then, when that came for discussion before the full committee, I think several days at one time or another were devoted in part to the discussion. Finally, after much delay, members of the committee, feeling the necessity of having the bill acted upon on the floor, when one of the members of the committee raised an issue with respect to the loyalty investigation of these individuals under the Loyalty Act a subcommittee was appointed, and it was agreed that the matter should be postponed for decision. One member of the committee suggested that the second deficiency bill would be coming from the House presently, and that the matter could be decided at that time. So in order to save the time of the committee and of the Senate, because a subcommittee had been selected to confer with the Attorney General with respect to the loyalty investigations of the FBI, the bill was reported, but no action was taken upon the issue as an issue. The controversy was postponed.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the status of Commissioner Straus at the present moment, relative to his service as Commissioner, and also with respect to the payment of his salary?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As the situation exists now, he is not receiving a salary.

Mr. WHERRY. Is he still serving as Commissioner of Reclamation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He is still there, so far as I know. I have not asked.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wondered, because I was very instrumental in helping to get the legislation passed last year, postponing the effective date to January 31.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Nebraska was very instrumental in so doing.

Mr. WHERRY. I wondered what the status was at the present time, and during the interval when apparently the issue has not been decided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Obviously no money is being used from the Interior Department appropriation bill to pay the salary of any person mentioned in the rider, and I am sure no money is being used from any other source for that purpose. My only purpose in rising, Mr. President, is to say that this is a very unusual situation. Because there were other bills coming over from the House and because of the desire of Members of the Senate to have the appropriation bill taken up, the controversy was, as I say, postponed. It is my own conviction that if we had had the time, the subcommittee's amendment would have been rejected by the full committee. Of course I have no way of proving that. That was my own judgment as to the way the votes stood in the committee. But I certainly want the RECORD to make it clear with respect to those of us who believe that this was an improper legislative rider upon an appropriation bill and that it should be repealed because it invades the executive functions of the President of the United States by seeking to remove individuals from office. From our point of view the issue is not yet settled.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to hear the Senator say the issue is not settled. What I say has nothing to do with personalities, but it does have something to do with the principle laid down by the President in his letter. It seems to me that if the Appropriations Committee assumes authority to do what it has done in this case, with respect to the qualifications of a man in an executive department, then they are certainly usurping the power that rightfully belongs to the executive department. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming will agree with me about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say that of course the Congress does have the right at any time to change the qualifications for any position in the executive department, the qualifications of which are not fixed by the Constitution. If they are fixed by statute, they can be changed, and, of course, they can be changed by a rider to an appropriation bill, when the rider is properly adopted. But in this case I point out that this is a perfectly

futile attempt to change the qualifications, because it has no effect except between the period from January 31, 1949, to June 30, 1949.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator will agree with me that the Congress has power to prescribe any qualifications, other than those prescribed by the Constitution, they desire for a person who is serving in the executive branch of the Government. But what the Senator from Illinois is objecting to is the Appropriations Committee using a rider of this kind to disqualify an individual without some committee of the Senate, other than the Appropriations Committee, peculiarly fitted or qualified to investigate and consider the question being permitted an opportunity to do so. That is the point I am making now, and I think what the President said in his message to the Congress is fundamental. I think the Congress itself ought to be jealous of the different prerogatives we have, and attempt the best we can to restrain the Appropriations Committee from doing what has been in this bill, or from doing again what they did last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In response to the Senator, I think it is appropriate for me to read a paragraph from the statement which was issued by former Representative Forest A. Harness, immediately before the Interior Department bill was handled in the House a year ago. In the statement he said:

Legislation which would have the effect of removing Reclamation Commissioner Michael Strauss and Richard Boke, director of the Bureau's region 2, California, from their present positions, was recommended today by Chairman Forest A. Harness (Republican, Indiana), of the House subcommittee on publicity and propaganda.

He then sets forth this amendment or rider, which was designed to remove, as he said, certain officials. This is what prompted the President, no doubt, in signing the appropriation bill last year, to issue this statement:

Yesterday—

Said the President—

I signed the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1949. I did so only because I had no choice. Since the bill came to me after the Congress had adjourned, a veto would close down the operations of the Department of the Interior on July 1.

If it had been possible to veto this bill without bringing the vital work of the Department to a standstill, I would have done so because of a rider in the bill establishing arbitrary qualifications for the Commissioner, the assistant commissioners, and the regional directors of the Bureau of Reclamation. This rider is designed to effect the removal of two men now holding such positions who have supported the public-power policy of the Government and the 160-acre law which assures that western lands reclaimed at public expense shall be used for the development of family-sized farms. No matter what may be the asserted reasons for wanting to remove these men from office, the result would be to serve the purposes of special interests desirous of monopolizing the rich farm lands of the West and intent upon stopping the construction of transmission lines for the delivery of power from

Federal dams. These same interests tried first to get the law changed, but failed, and having failed, then sought to get the management changed.

So, Mr. President, the President made clear when he signed the bill last year and when he sent his message to the Speaker of the House, that the record of this legislation is an invasion of the Executive power of removal.

Let me add one word more. I appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and recited to that committee that, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I stood ready at all times to go into the matter of qualifications thoroughly and completely. Since that time my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. Downey] has submitted a resolution calling for an investigation of the Bureau of Reclamation. I have said to the Senator from California, privately, and I now say to him publicly, that it will be the purpose of the chairman of the committee to conduct that investigation. The committee has not only the power, but I think it has the duty to do so. I make this statement, Mr. President, only in order that it may be clear that because I did not ask for a vote on the question, I am not indicating that, in my opinion or in the opinion of many Members of the Appropriations Committee, the issue is settled.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, is the Senator willing to announce publicly in the Senate that the investigation which I have demanded of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be commenced within a period of 30 days, and thereafter vigorously prosecuted by his committee until its completion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my best answer to the Senator from California is this: There are before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs two matters of the utmost importance in which the people of California and the Senators from that State are deeply interested. One is the controversy over the waters of the Colorado River; the other is the legislation with respect to tidelands.

I shall not undertake at this time, and on the floor, to give a categorical reply with reference to a time within which this matter will be taken up, but I assure the Senator from California that if I can ever get my head above the waters of the Colorado River without having it submerged in the tidelands, we shall go ahead with the investigation.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say that whenever any committee, including that of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, is willing to listen to undeniable testimony supported conclusively by documentary proof, I am prepared to show that every day the inefficiency and dishonesty of the Bureau of Reclamation is continued in the West, tens of thousands of dollars are being lost. I am prepared to show by undeniable proof, on my word as a Senator, that there exists now a conspiracy in the

Bureau of Reclamation to promote unneeded and extravagant projects, and that if they are successful—and they may be successful within the next 60 days—the Federal Government, the farmers of California, and others will pay an unnecessary bill of at least \$100,000,000.

So, Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that his happy statement to me that whenever he can get free of the waters of the Colorado River and of the tidelands, he will undertake to consider this question, does not satisfy me. I have already presented to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee conclusive proof of the waste and maladministration under these nonengineering employees of the Government. I am prepared, whenever any committee is prepared to listen, to present an abundance of testimony of that kind—testimony so shocking and so incredible that it should result in the removal of these guilty men overnight.

Mr. President, the condition is so serious that it cannot be exaggerated. The loss runs into such huge sums that I say any appropriations committee charged with the duty of safeguarding the funds of the taxpayers, seeing maladministration by men lacking all essential qualifications of engineers, which did not say, "To the best of our power, we will prevent the waste of funds of the Government by changing this maladministration to one of high engineering ethics," would be derelict in its duty.

Certainly, Mr. President, the primary duty to appoint or to supersede these men rests with the Executive. But the primary duty of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and of the members of that committee, is to safeguard the funds of the public; and whenever convincing and conclusive evidence is presented to them of a wild and incredible mismanagement and waste, then I say, contrary to what the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has said, the members of that committee would be derelict if they had not done what they have done here, namely, to delete the House provision.

The distinguished Senator says this controversy has not been settled, but is merely postponed. Let me say to him that it has been postponed in a way that is entirely satisfactory to me, and whenever it is desired by any Senator to renew the controversy, we shall be present with an abundance of evidence to corroborate our position.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate long on this point, and I had not intended to speak today, and would not do so except for the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'Mahoney]. However, I do not believe that the RECORD should be allowed to stand as it is without having some clarification. I have the highest regard and respect for the Senator from Wyoming.

I had the privilege of serving during the Eightieth Congress as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that the issue now being discussed

has nothing whatever to do with the question of the transmission of power. Both my colleagues, the senior Senator from California, who sits on the other side of the aisle, and the junior Senator from California, are in favor of and have been consistently in favor of the building of transmission lines from Shasta Dam to the load centers, which have been a part of the Central Valley project from its inception. So the question of the transmission of power has nothing at all to do with the issue under consideration.

I wish to say that one of the fundamental responsibilities of a Senate committee or a House committee, and particularly of the Appropriations Committee of this body is to get information from the executive branch of the Government so that it can properly study appropriation bills, and can report to the Members of the Senate what the facts happen to be. Unless the Committee on Appropriations is able to get such information, the members cannot discharge their responsibility to themselves or to the Senate.

It so happened that I was serving as acting chairman of the subcommittee at the time Mr. Straus testified 2 years ago, and I asked him some questions when the committee had under discussion the Central Valley project. In answer to an inquiry which I propounded, the Commissioner of Reclamation stated that the carry-over funds in the Central Valley project would amount to \$10,000,000. I pressed him considerably on that point, because there was some doubt in the minds of the committee as to just what the carry-over fund would be. Time and time again Mr. Straus testified that the amount of the carry-over would be \$10,000,000.

Mr. President, that session of the Congress went by. The Congress made appropriations based on the information it had before it. A year later we discovered that a month before the Commissioner of Reclamation had testified before our committee that the carry-over fund would amount to \$10,000,000, he had received by teletype from his agents in the field in the State of California information that in fact the carry-over was some \$25,000,000, or more than double the amount he had stated.

Mr. President, this is a very serious matter. It has nothing whatever to do with partisanship. It has nothing whatever to do with transmission lines.

The able Senator from Illinois has stated that there was a matter of principle involved. The matter of principle that is involved is whether or not representatives of the executive branch of the Government of the United States are to come before a Senate committee, the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of this body, and give testimony before the committee that is willfully and deliberately false. If the Senate or the Congress tolerates in one iota representatives of the executive branch coming before a committee and giving willfully false and untrue testimony, no matter what party is in control of the executive branch of the Government, no matter what party is in control of the Congress, I say that it tends to

undermine the legislative processes of the Government, and makes it completely impossible for the Congress to discharge its obligation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact, however, that so far as concerns the issue the Senator from California is discussing, and the issue the Senator from Wyoming and the senior Senator from California have discussed, that issue is not involved in the pending matter? Is it not a fact that the Committee on Appropriations left the matter in the same situation in which the Eightieth Congress left it a year ago?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct, but as I pointed out at the beginning of my remarks, which are now almost concluded, I had not intended to speak on this subject, and would not have done so save for the fact that the Senator from Wyoming made a statement which I did not think completely covered the reasons which required the Congress in the last session to make the change, and I felt that the RECORD should be corrected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Undoubtedly the Senator is making a record, but the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, in order to save this body at this time going over the details it went over for 3 or 4 weeks, and in order to pass a deficiency bill which is absolutely necessary, avoided the controversy which the three Senators have been discussing. So why can we not pass the deficiency appropriation bill, and discuss at some other time the issue whether Boke and Straus should continue to serve the Government?

Mr. KNOWLAND. With all due respect for the Senator from New Mexico, for whom I have the highest regard, I have not taken more than 5 minutes of the time of the Senate, which I have used in order to make clear what I think needs to be clarified to the Senate. A number of letters have been written to various Members of the Senate. For the information of those who have not sat through the Appropriations Committee hearings, those who did not realize that here was involved an issue in which the very ability of a committee of the Congress properly to function was involved, I felt that it was worth a few minutes of the time of the Senate to clear the matter up.

I merely wish to say, in conclusion, Mr. President, that I am pleased that the Committee on Appropriations has taken the stand it has assumed. If and when the issues shall come before the Senate, I expect to have something further to say on the matter, and to cite the page, the verse, and the book to show that there was a deliberate and willful attempt to deprive a committee of the Senate of information to which it was lawfully and properly entitled.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked the distinguished Senator from Wyoming as to what the status of Commissioner Straus was at this time, in view of the amendment that became effective on January 31, 1949, and which is now

in effect, and the answer was, of course, that the Commissioner was not drawing any salary.

I should like to ask a further question, if I may, and I ask it because I have been asked the question myself. Does the senior Senator from Wyoming feel that the Commissioner should remain in full charge, and perform the functions of the office of Commissioner, even though he has not been paid?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my opinion upon that matter is of no effect at all.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the Senator's opinion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not looked into the law. I have been given to understand that the Solicitor for the Department of the Interior takes the position that the provision which cuts off the salary of the Commissioner does not cut off his duties. That probably would have to be decided by higher authority than the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his observation. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate today, but I am in a state of total confusion as to what the result is to be on this amendment. I wish to state, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that when I joined in reaching what I thought at the time was a solution of the difficulty, and helped adopt the provision in the Eightieth Congress, I thought that by January 31, 1949, the issue would be determined. But the controversy has continued, and here is an official who is not drawing any salary, but apparently is assuming the full responsibility and authority of the office.

It seems to me the issue will not be settled if the provision contained in the pending bill is repealed. In order to accomplish the objective which some Senators apparently thought was accomplished, that is, to provide by law that only a qualified engineer shall occupy the place in question, there ought to be some limit to the time the Commissioner who is not qualified under the language of the rider placed on the appropriation bill could serve.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there are a few committee amendments which have not been acted upon. I ask the Senate to act on them at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Rivers and harbors—Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works", on page 28, line 5, after the word "works", to strike out "\$10,500,000" and insert "\$10,509,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control—Flood control, general (emergency fund)", on page 28, before the words "to remain" to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$20,000,000", and in line 16, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be made available under the provisions of and for the purposes enumerated in section 205 of the above act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 11, to insert:

TITLE II—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document Nos. 15 and 24, Eighty-first Congress, \$22,700,571.07, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 8, to insert a new heading, as follows: "Title III—General provisions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 10, to change the section number from "2" to "301."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 3. The provision in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which places a limit on the price which may be paid for such typewriters as may be purchased under the act shall not apply to the purchase of office type machines which are designed and constructed primarily to compose and print master copies for quantity reproduction by another process.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 1, to change the section number from "4" to "302."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 302. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations in this act in whole or in part for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available from and including March 1, 1949, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between March 1, 1949, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain data giving justification for the amendment, and I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the data referred to will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1949.
(Memorandum for Mr. Everard H. Smith,
Senate Committee on Appropriations)

We have reviewed the items in the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1949, with regard to those appropriations which are out of funds or will be out by April 15, 1949, for obligation purposes. As some of these appropriations were exhausted as far back as March 1, 1949, it is felt desirable to redraft your proposed section 3 to cover this by using March 1 instead of April 1.

Attached is the suggested redraft of section 3 and a list of the appropriations which will be out of funds by April 15, 1949.

F. J. LAWTON,
Assistant Director.

SEC. 302. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations in this act in whole or in part for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available from and including March 1, 1949, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between March 1, 1949, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

APPROPRIATIONS HAVING SUPPLEMENTAL
AMOUNTS IN PENDING FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL
WHICH WILL BE OUT OF FUNDS FOR OBLIGATION
PURPOSES BEFORE APRIL 15, 1949

The Judiciary: Fees of jurors: April 14.
Office for Emergency Management: Office of Defense Transportation: Salaries and expenses: March 1.
Federal Security Agency:
Employees' compensation fund: April 1.
Grants to States for public assistance: April 1.
Housing Expediter: Salaries and expenses: March 15.
United States Maritime Commission: Vessel operating functions: March 1.
Veterans' Administration:
National service life insurance: January 1.
Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief: January 1.
Veterans' miscellaneous benefits: March 10.
War Assets Administration: Salaries and expenses: April.
Department of Agriculture: Commodity Credit Corporation: Administrative expenses: April 4.
Department of Commerce: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: Export control: April 1.
Department of the Interior:
Bureau of Indian Affairs: Welfare of Indians: February 24.
Bureau of Reclamation: General fund, construction: Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada: March 1.
Post Office Department:
Railroad transportation and mail messenger service: March 15.
Railway mail service, travel allowance: March 8.
Foreign air-mail service: February 28.
Vehicle service: March 19.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1949.

(Memorandum for Mr. Everard Smith, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate)

Supplementing my memorandum of April 1 concerning the dates on which certain agencies in the first deficiency bill would run out of funds for obligating purposes, I would like to call your attention to the following cases in which the agencies will run out of cash to make payments:

Veterans' Administration—Veterans' miscellaneous benefits: Out of cash at the present time.

Judiciary—Fees of jurors: Will be out of cash April 14.

Housing Expediter—Salaries and expenses: Will meet April 13 pay roll by deferring payments of all other bills and will be out of cash thereafter. Next pay roll date April 27.

War Assets Administration—Salaries and expenses: Will meet April 13 pay roll by deferring payment of all other bills and will be out of cash thereafter. Next pay roll date April 27.

Federal Housing Administrator—Administrative expenses: Will meet April 13 pay roll by deferring payments of all other bills and will be out of cash thereafter. Next pay roll date April 27.

Commerce—Export control: Can meet April 18 pay roll by deferring payment of all other bills but will have no cash thereafter. Next pay roll date May 2.

Interior—Welfare of Indians: Out of cash now.

General Fund Construction—Davis Dam: Out of cash now.

I mention these because of the fact that the proposed recess of the House might prevent completion of consideration of this bill until after April 25. Several of the agencies are worried as to whether they should continue to obligate against the amounts in the bill by keeping people on the pay roll when they will have no cash to meet these pay rolls until the bill is passed.

F. J. LAWTON,
Assistant Director.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 33, line 1, to strike out the numeral "4" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "302" be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment to the committee amendment in line 1 on page 33, to strike out "302" and insert in lieu thereof "303."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerks will be authorized to make such corrections of section numbers throughout the bill as may be necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropria-

tions I offer another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

The basic salary of the research assistant to the minority leader authorized by Senate Resolution No. 158, agreed to December 9, 1941, hereby is increased from \$6,000 to \$7,320 per annum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, after line 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

CONSTRUCTION, ETC., BUILDINGS AND
UTILITIES

For an additional amount under this heading for the conversion of the Bushnell Army Hospital, Brigham City, Utah, for school purposes, \$3,750,000, and the limitation, under "Construction, etc., buildings and utilities" in the Department of Interior Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount which may be used for surveys and plans and administrative expenses, etc., is increased from \$190,000 to \$227,500.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the committee has not passed on the amendment, but so far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, it seems to me the amendment might well be adopted in the interest of the Indians. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I appreciate the very fine statement made by the chairman, but for the purpose of the record I should like to make a brief explanation of why the amendment is offered, particularly at this time.

As many Senators know, and many probably do not know, some 61,000 Navajo Indians are living on the Navajo Reservation in New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah. We made a treaty with these Indians about 80 years ago in which we agreed to provide educational facilities for them. As I remember the words of the treaty we were to provide one school room and a teacher for each 30 pupils. There are now on that reservation some 16,000 children of school age who are not in school. Such a situation has existed for years, because the United States has not provided the facilities for these Indians.

They are quite a problem now in the matter of welfare. Many of them are not in condition to work at white occupations. We find, as a matter of fact, that the reservation resources will not sustain more than 30,000 of these Indians, although there are now about 61,000 Indians on the reservation. It is going to be necessary, and it is now gen-

erally recognized as being necessary, to move from thirty to thirty-one thousand of these Indians elsewhere in the United States so they can make a living and become self-sustaining citizens of the United States.

We are under the obligation of educating these Indians. Sixteen thousand of them, as I have just pointed out, are not in school. We had a program submitted to us by the Department of the Interior and by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, calling for educational facilities and for a welfare program for these Indians, amounting to \$90,000,000. Personally I look with much favor upon that program. Certainly in order to keep our pledged word, if not for the sake of humanity, we should do something for the relief of these Indians.

In Utah the United States constructed during the war the Bushnell Military Hospital. It is of permanent construction, brick, steel, and concrete. It cost more than \$10,000,000. The hospital buildings are readily convertible into dormitories for Indians. We have found that at least 80 percent of the Indians do not understand English, do not speak it, and for that reason cannot take occupations and work in white communities. There are in the Bushnell Military Hospital some 80 buildings of brick, steel, and concrete. It is almost a complete city in itself. It has been abandoned for several years by the Army and turned over to the War Assets Administration. The War Assets Administration has tried, without success, to sell the plant. It has not received any offers at all except from one man who is willing to take the plant, pay a dollar for it, and operate it as a private school for underprivileged children. He was going to have a military school there. His situation was investigated and it was found he did not have sufficient resources to carry on. Had his offer been accepted we would not only have been required to give him the buildings and the plant, and some 800 acres of very fine ground, but we would have been required also to equip the plant for him, and then it is doubtful if he could have succeeded. He was the only one who came forward with any kind of offer to use these buildings. It costs us \$30,000 a year to maintain the buildings with guards and fire protection.

The War Assets Administrator, Colonel Larson, came before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and testified that the proposal to turn the Bushnell Military Hospital over to the Department of the Interior for the use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in educating these children in a boarding school was a very fine proposal and he favored it. The Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Zimmerman, and Dr. Beatty, Director of the Division of Education of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, also testified that this plant could be converted so that 2,000 Indian youngsters could be housed there in a boarding school where they could be trained in vocational education and in English so they could work among white people and maintain themselves.

It is only about a day's trip by bus from the Indian reservation to Brigham City, which is in the heart of industrial and agricultural Utah. There will be ample opportunities for these Indians to work when they are once trained, when they are once taught the English language. We have the need. The buildings are ready to be used. By the way, Public Law 20 was passed by the present Congress authorizing the transfer from the War Assets Administration to the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior of these buildings, to take effect upon the appropriation being made, so the Bureau of Indian Affairs could go to work.

The Indian Bureau now plans to make full use of this plant. Two thousand Indians not in school can be taken there—probably those 12 years of age and older, those who are old enough to learn vocations and trades—just as soon as the plant is ready.

The reason why this program could not be fully considered by the committee either in the House or the Senate was that the law was not passed in sufficient time to get the information before the necessary committees. I have discussed the subject with the Bureau of the Budget and with the Indian Bureau, and they are in hearty accord with what I am now doing, that is, bringing the question to the attention of the Senate and having the project included in the pending bill as an amendment, so that beginning next fall this plant can be placed in operation, probably on a limited scale, for the education of Indian children. Probably by January 1, if we start immediately with the construction of the necessary classrooms to go along with the dormitories, the full 2,000 Indian students can be housed there and go to work. Delay until July 1 would probably bring construction into the winter. I think Members of the Senate know that in that climate construction is almost impossible in the winter. In any event, it would be very costly. So we shall save the \$38,000 a year which we are spending for guards, and put Indian children in school where they belong, and where we have agreed to put them. The country will be better served by having this done now.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How many Indians will be taken care of at this particular place?

Mr. WATKINS. Two thousand from the Navajo Reservation, and some from other reservations can come in as the need develops.

Mr. LANGER. What is being done about the remainder of the Indians who are not going to school?

Mr. WATKINS. Fourteen thousand Navajo children not now in school, and whom we are obligated to place in school, will have to be provided for by some other means. I shall come back here and, in company with other Members of this body, present measures and ask for appropriations to carry out our pledge to those Navajo Indian children. After this project is taken care of, the remainder

of the 16,000 children will be placed in school.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that now is as good a time as any to take care of the remainder of those children? Why wait until we come back again?

Mr. WATKINS. I think it would be impossible in a deficiency appropriation, and in cooperation with the Indian Bureau, to get the necessary plans ready so that the appropriation could be placed in this bill.

The principal reason for placing this particular amendment in the bill is to save a year in the lives of these students and put them in school now, rather than come along with an appropriation in July and have the construction drag through the winter. The President has approved the plan. The Indian Bureau recommended it, and the Budget Bureau cleared it. We intend to follow through with this plan, and now is the time to do it. If this bill is passed tonight and becomes a law within a few days, money will immediately become available.

Furthermore, it is necessary to get equipment for the school. The Indian Bureau has been notified that at Hanford, Wash., there are available many articles which will be needed in the Indian school, such as cooking utensils, stoves, bedding and beds, and other types of equipment now on sale at the atomic energy plant there. Some money is needed immediately in order to enable the Indian Bureau to buy these articles. Under the law, they must have cash. That is why the latter part of the amendment authorizes an increase in administration expenses at this time.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Just when does the Senator intend to offer an amendment or introduce a bill to take care of the remainder of the Indian children who should be in school?

Mr. WATKINS. I intend to work with the Indian Bureau and the Department of the Interior. As the Senator knows, I was chairman of the Indian subcommittee for the past 2 years. We have been trying to devise a program to take care of the needs. I hope the department will have its plans ready. If we proceed as we intend to proceed, I think there will be a measure before the Congress in the near future to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest to the Senator that the second deficiency appropriation bill will be before us in 2 weeks. Does not the Senator believe that he could have an amendment ready by that time to take care of the remainder of those children who long ago should have been in school? Thousands of them cannot even speak English.

Mr. WATKINS. I so understand.

I am especially concerned when I consider the ease with which we approved an authorization bill for \$16,000,000 for the Arabs over in Palestine, who are not particularly and directly our concern. That measure went through promptly.

I am sure that the Congress, realizing its responsibility, will take care of those Indians.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a report submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on Senate bill 170. It gives the details and the information which would have been given to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the report (No. 30) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, having considered the bill (S. 170) to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, report favorably thereon, with an amendment, and recommended that it do pass.

This legislation authorizes the Administrator of the War Assets Administration to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, for use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a vocational school for Indian children and a center for housing and training adult Indians for off-reservation employment and placement, the property known as the Bushnell General Hospital near Brigham City, Box Elder County, Utah, comprising 298.5 acres, more or less, together with roads, buildings, and other betterments thereon.

The Bushnell General Hospital was constructed by the Army in 1942 and 1943 as a 3,700-bed general and psychiatric hospital consisting of 183 permanent buildings, of which 108 were of wood-frame construction and 95 buildings of brick. The acquisition and improvement cost was \$9,822,915.99.

The hospital was declared surplus to the needs of the Army on August 21, 1946, after being rejected by the Veterans' Administration because of the lack of medical personnel in the immediate vicinity and the difficulty in staffing and maintaining the facility.

After advertising the property for sale or lease as a unit, during 1947, with no satisfactory bids, the War Assets Administration sold a total of 73 wood-frame buildings for off-site removal. On January 2, 1948, two areas were advertised for disposal as residential and farm land. Further advertisements of sale as separate units during 1948 resulted in the rejection of all bids.

The entire land area and the remaining 115 buildings were readvertised on November 15, 1948, with a fair valuation established at \$4,788,560. One offer on the property, for transfer on a public-benefit-allowance basis, was received but disposal was withheld at the request of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, pending enactment of necessary legislation to authorize its acquisition and operation as a school for Navajo Indians.

Under the treaty between the United States of America and the Navajo Tribe of Indians, proclaimed August 12, 1868, article VI provides in part as follows: "and the United States agrees that, for every 30 children between said ages who can be induced or compelled to attend school, a house shall be provided, and a teacher competent to teach the elementary branches of an English education shall be furnished who will reside among said Indians and faithfully discharge his or her duties as a teacher."

It is estimated that there are about 61,000 Navajo Indians now residing on the Navajo Indian Reservation in Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico, near the hospital site, with some 22,000 children of school age. The sponsors of this legislation maintain that the Government is still under obligation to educate these children, 16,000 of whom are at present not in school.

The hospital property involved in the proposed bill has no value to the Government in its present state, and its maintenance costs average approximately \$3,200 per month. It has been estimated that the construction of facilities of comparable size would cost \$14,000,000, whereas the present buildings can be converted to use as an Indian school at a cost of approximately \$2,000,000 to accommodate 1,400 children, and \$3,650,000 to its capacity of 2,000.

The transfer of this property to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for educational purposes and other utilization in behalf of the Indians would serve a useful and much-needed purpose. It would also remove the cost of maintenance and bring the property to an improved permanent status toward easy conversion as a Government hospital in any future emergency.

The Bureau of the Budget reported to the committee that there would be no objection to the passage of this bill. The following letters set forth the views of the Secretary of the Interior and the War Assets Administrator:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 25, 1949.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Reference is made to your request for a report on S. 170, a bill for the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

If amended as set out below, I recommend that S. 170 be enacted.

It is estimated that there are approximately 23,000 Navajo children of school age. At the present time there are educational facilities on the reservation, public, mission, and Federal schools for about 5,500. Provisions have been made during the last 2 years to transfer another 1,800 to off-reservation Federal schools. There remain, therefore, 15,700 Navajo children between the ages of 6 and 18 years for whom no school facilities are available.

Bushnell General Hospital, Brigham City, Box Elder County, Utah, was originally built by the Army as a 3,700-bed general and neuropsychiatric hospital. The plant consists of 108 permanent buildings on a site of about 298 acres, immediately at the edge of the city. The original installation is reported to have cost \$10,393,000. The buildings are in good condition, although all of the movable equipment has been removed.

The plant has been examined with a view to its conversion to an Indian vocational school. While not ideal, from school standards, it was found that a majority of the buildings may be converted to profitable use. Two great lacks will be classroom facilities and quarters for resident employees. It will also be necessary to reequip the plant completely.

In the proposed use of the plant two goals are possible. First, a school of about 1,400 pupils, which can be achieved with a minimum of additional construction. Second, a school of 2,000, which can be achieved by the construction of additional classroom facilities and employees' quarters. In either event the per-pupil cost will be well below that necessary to provide new facilities for an equal number of children.

After mature consideration it is my recommendation that plans be made for a school of 2,000 Navajo children at the Bushnell hospital plant, for this will provide for the education of the greatest number of Indians not now in any school for the least expenditure of funds. The necessary remodeling to provide dormitory facilities for 2,000 children is very slight. However, it will be necessary to provide by remodeling or by new construction quarters for approximately 100 married couples as well as more desirable quarters

for approximately 90 single employees. It is assumed that about 25 will be housed off campus. The only employees housed on the Bushnell grounds were single nurses and WAC officers who were given one small room each, which is less than is being supplied to Indian Service employees anywhere in the United States. Officers were required to live off campus; many of the maintenance employees were employed from among the local residents who already had homes in Brigham City; and relatively few of the employed personnel were married. For an Indian Service boarding school, it will be necessary for the majority of teachers, dormitory workers, and supervisory personnel to be housed on the campus. It will be possible to make an arrangement very similar to that of the hospital in seeking maintenance employees from among the residents of the community who will have their own homes. Only 2 of the major buildings on the campus are suitable for remodeling into classroom structures and these will provide only 35 classrooms. It will, therefore, be necessary to build 3 additional structures of about 14 classrooms each to provide the necessary adequate space (total, 42 additional rooms). Scattered around the grounds are other structures which will lend themselves to use as home economics rooms and shops. The hospital had a gymnasium and a swimming pool but no large auditorium. With 2,000 students it will be necessary to have an additional gymnasium and an auditorium of between 800 and 1,200 seating capacity. It is estimated that:

The cost of repairs and alterations will amount to approximately.....	\$950,000
The cost of new construction will amount to approximately.....	1,867,000
Of new equipment to replace that which has been removed.....	700,000
Supervision and contingencies.....	128,000
Subtotal.....	3,645,000

It is proposed, also, to use the Bushnell grounds and some of the structures as a center for adult Navajos and other Indians for whom off-reservation employment and permanent relocation is being sought. These families will be allowed to live at the site between periods of seasonal employment, and during their residence a program of training in off-reservation manners and customs and in the use of English will be undertaken. The necessary alterations and equipment to provide 36 apartments for this purpose will be..... 133,000

Total..... 3,778,000

A careful study shows that the cost of operating the public utilities (heat, light, sewage, etc.) will amount to \$280,200 annually for 2,000 children. If the total amount for repairs, alterations, and new construction is provided during the spring of the year and new construction begins as promptly as possible, it should prove possible to enroll an average of 1,200 children at Bushnell during the fiscal year 1950. It is estimated that the cost of operating plant and utilities for this limited number of children will be \$252,000 for the full 12 months. At the present time, WAA is maintaining a stand-by staff, the cost of which will have to be assumed by the Indian Service from the time of transfer until children begin to occupy the school, at an approximate monthly cost of \$2,750; and the cost of the teaching staff, materials of instruction, food, etc., will amount to \$460,000 covering an average of 1,200 children for 7 months. It is believed that when the full enrollment of 2,000 pupils is achieved the operating cost will run around \$751 per capita, or

\$58 more than the average nonreservation school, due to the greater cost of operating within this Army structure and because about half the children will attend for 12 months.

Practically all of the youngsters who will be placed in this school will be from the Navajo Reservation—a majority will be non-English-speaking when they are received. Many will be more than 12 years old and entering school for the first time. For these older pupils, an intensive shorter educational period must be planned. As a result, the total operating cost will be somewhat greater than for the average boarding school which is not faced with these problems.

In spite of these greater costs, the operation of Bushnell for this purpose will represent a savings to the Government, for it will begin to receive some continuing benefit on the original investment for property which now stands idle.

To clarify the apparent intent of S. 170, which is to transfer this property between agencies of the Federal Government without reimbursement or transfer of funds, it is recommended that the bill be amended by inserting after the word "Interior" in line 5, the phrase "without reimbursement or transfer of funds."

Congressional time schedules will not permit ascertaining in advance the relationship of this proposed legislation to the program of the President. This report, therefore, does not constitute a commitment respecting the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1949.
HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures
in the Executive Departments,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Reference is made to your letter of January 18, 1949, requesting the views of this Administration with respect to S. 170, a bill to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation would authorize and direct the War Assets Administrator to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, for use as a vocational school for Indian children and a center for housing and training adult Indians, the Bushnell General Hospital, near Brigham City, Utah. The hospital covers an area of 298.5 acres, upon which are located 115 buildings, utility lines, and fire-fighting equipment. No personal property is located at the hospital at this time. The total acquisition cost of the property was \$9,822,915.99.

The hospital was declared surplus by the War Department on August 21, 1946, after a determination by the Veterans' Administration that it had no interest in the property. Advertising of the property over a 2½-year period has resulted in the sale of some 70 buildings for use off site. No acceptable bids have been received for the remainder of the property.

It is the belief of this Administration that the question of enactment of legislation of this type is one for the determination of the Congress and, accordingly, it has no objection to the enactment of the bill.

Owing to the urgency of your request, this report has not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

Cordially yours,

JESS LARSON, Administrator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, this is the first appropriation bill to come before this session of the Senate. It is my personal opinion that the total revenues

of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, will be much less than we anticipate at the moment. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, it is anticipated that there will be a deficit of between \$600,000,000 and \$800,000,000. After we appropriate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, possibly we shall have a deficit, the way business looks at the moment, of anywhere from \$5,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000.

I urge that we reduce our expenditures. I again recommend that we arrive at what seems to be a fair estimate of the amount we shall collect in revenues for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and that we appropriate not a single penny above that amount. I can think of no greater catastrophe to the Nation than to continue to operate with a deficit during peacetime. That is particularly true when we face the fact that, during a period when the Nation has enjoyed its greatest prosperity, when the greatest number of people have been employed at the highest wages, when the farmers have enjoyed their greatest income, and business its greatest income, the Government has been unable to balance its budget.

Mr. President, I believe that the responsibility for balancing the budget belongs to the Congress. I do not believe that we are justified in appropriating more money than we can reasonably anticipate in revenues. I know that Senators are saying to themselves, "Where are you going to cut? Why do you not recommend some specific place to cut the budget?" I should be perfectly willing—and I think it would be the wisest course the Congress could pursue—to cut the budget not less than \$8,000,000,000. We made an effort to cut the ECA authorization. I recommended a cut of \$2,500,000,000. But the Senate in its wisdom has seen fit to pass the ECA bill authorizing a total of \$5,580,000,000.

So, Mr. President, we must face this issue sooner or later. I am not advocating that we cut out any of these projects; I am not advocating that we refuse to take on some additional projects which are in the best interest of the Nation. I am simply advocating that we cut all appropriations, that we reduce our expenditures in line with the anticipated revenues. Again I ask this question: If we cannot balance the budget under the conditions which have existed during the past 2 years, how are we going to be able to do so when business, industry, farm incomes, and all other incomes level off? Is it not better to appropriate a lesser amount of money for each project, and still maintain all the projects we would like to maintain, rather than to appropriate such great sums of money, exceeding the revenues by substantial amounts, and thus run so far into the red and bring about such a great deficit that the Nation will get into a financial condition which none of us wish to see develop?

So I strongly urge—and I shall continue to do so during the entire session of the Eighty-first Congress—that all appropriations be reduced. I believe

that as time goes on we shall find that Government revenues will drop. Let me suggest to the Members of the Senate that they go out into the country and talk to the people there and find out what is going on in the Nation at the moment, ascertain how business is dropping and how unemployment is increasing, how pay rolls are decreasing, and how the pay check of the worker is decreasing in size.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator realize that under the Reorganization Act we were to do the very thing he is advocating this evening; and that was to be done for the benefit of the Senate, by the 15th day of February. But by a vote of the Senate a few days before the 15th of February, the time for making the economic report was extended to the 1st day of May. Does the Senator further realize that, so far as the Senator from Michigan, a member of the Appropriations Committee, is aware, no steps seem to have been taken to comply with that requirement even as of the 1st day of May? Does the Senator from Indiana appreciate that?

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate it, and I know what the able Senator from Michigan has stated to be a fact. I appreciate his calling it to my attention, as well as to the attention of the Senate generally.

So, Mr. President, again I urge that we give thought to balancing the budget, to reducing expenditures, and not lose sight of the fact that revenues simply will be less, because prices are falling—they were too high, and now they are falling—and as prices fall, fewer dollars will be handled in America; and as that happens, there will be less revenue for the Federal Government. However, while revenues are decreasing, if we appropriate more money this year—as we are doing—we shall run up a deficit that much greater.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The parliamentary situation is that all committee amendments have been disposed of, and the bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. I have offered my amendment, but I do not believe action has been taken on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; it has been agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. Very well; I wish the RECORD to show that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,950,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$450,000."

In line 13, it is proposed to strike out "\$24,639,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$22,139,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me ask the distinguished senior Senator from

Illinois, the majority leader, and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], whether it is proposed to have the Senate finish action on the bill tonight, or whether it is desired to have a recess taken at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me inquire how long my friend the Senator from New Hampshire intends to speak.

Mr. BRIDGES. If we are to begin to consider the item for the New Johnsonville steam plant, I think we should finish it; does not the Senator from Illinois think so?

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire. I assume it will take some time to finish that item; I doubt whether we could do so in less than 2 or 3 hours. So perhaps we should take a recess at this time until tomorrow.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Can the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, in cooperation with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], give us any idea how long it will take to dispose of this item?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the issues involved in connection with the item for the steam plant are fairly well known. I intend to present a brief statement, and perhaps other Senators will participate in the discussion. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] may present a statement on another phase of the steam plant item, but I should not think it would take very long for him to do so. I hope we can expedite action on this matter, because I think the issues are fairly well known, and certainly there is no sense in prolonging the discussion.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will yield further, Mr. President, let me say that, as he has stated, we had prolonged debate over this matter at the last session; in fact we had two votes on it, as I recall. Therefore, it has been fairly well discussed and debated.

I do not know how long the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire may desire to discuss this matter now.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not desire to talk for more than a few moments; but undoubtedly other Senators will wish to discuss this question, and perhaps the whole issue will take several hours' consideration.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have advised some Senators that probably the Senate would take a recess at about 6 o'clock today, and no doubt some of them have already gone to their offices or to their homes.

So, in view of that understanding, I shall move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Before doing so, I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader about the item on the Executive Calendar. The only item on the Executive Calendar is the nomination of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Am I correct in my understanding that there is some objection to the nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will yield to me, let me say that twice I have asked to have that nomination passed over, and on both occasions the acting majority leader consented. I made that request in behalf of a Senator who wished to look into the credentials of the nominee. That Senator is not on the floor of the Senate at this time.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I may state that if the Senator from Illinois will permit the nomination to go over once more, then so far as I am concerned I shall not ask, by request, to have it go over again.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is the only nomination on the Executive Calendar, so I shall not move to have the Senate proceed to consider executive business, in view of the explanation which has just been made by the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, April 12, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11, 1949:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph Earl Cooper, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 3, district of Alaska, vice Raymond E. Plummer, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Vernon P. Burns, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama, vice Roulhac Gewin, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades indicated with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army under the provisions of title I, section 107 (b), Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress:

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Charles E. Dunham, O1c801.
Michael S. Grenata, O9304.
Franklin L. Litchenfels, O16355.
Alden H. Seabury, O7431.
James C. White, O11666.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Harry Mazur, O26137.

(NOTE.—Lieutenant Colonel Seabury was given recess appointment on November 24, 1948, and First Lieutenant Mazur was given recess appointment on December 7, 1948.)

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

TO BE COLONELS

Earl William Aldrup, O15972.
Miles Jason Baze, O41378.
Conrad Lewis Boyle, O15951.
William Joseph Bradley, O15967.
Harold Francis Chrisman, O15961.
Philip Feinberg, O38591.
Emroy Elmer Feind, O28787.
Conrad Gordon Follansbee, O15973.
Wayne Bailey Gardner, O41366.
Alexander Grendon, O39506.
Valerius Hakanson, O41371.
George Laurence Holsinger, O15980.
Carroll Delmar Hudson, O28785.

George Edward Isaacs, O15959.
John Gardner Ladd, O39509.
Frank Riley Loyd, O16004.
Harold Mills Manderbach, O15984.
Robert Reinhold Martin, O15953.
Murray Eberhart McGowan, O15943.
Edward Charles Miller, Jr., O38590.
Harry William Miller, O16005.
William Merritt Preston Northcross, O28793.
Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952.
Harry Edward Owens, O28786.
Raymond Dishman Palmer, O15942.
Lewis Ebenezer Perry, O28781.
George Cooper Reinhardt, O15963.
Coileman Romain, O28783.
Abraham Julius Rosenblum, O28788.
John Douglas Salmon, O15937.
John Henry Sampson, Jr., O15974.
August Edward Schanze, O15976.
William Frederick Schweikert, O28778.
Charles Stowe Stodter, O16013.
Esthel Oliver Stroube, O41368.
William Carl Thompson, O41374.
John Vogler Tower, O15956.
Herbert Ryan Tumin, O41367.
Harold Witte Uhrbrock, O15990.
Curtis Leigh Varner, O28779.
Thomas Claggett Wood, Jr., O15946.
Clyde George Young, O28790.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou conquering Galilean, as we walk with Thee through these days of Thy passion, unveil to us Thy redeeming grace, making it everlastingly new, yet as old as the heart of God. As we wait at Thy altar, we pray for the quiet balm of Thy holy presence. We invoke Thy guidance in all our labors, that we may give courageous thought to the decisions of this day. As sons of freedom, ever impress us with the urgency of our mission, to deal justly, to conquer wrong, and to guard our national honor.

How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of Him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 9, 1949, was read and approved.

EXEMPTING ARTIFICIAL LIMBS, FROM DUTY

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3932) to exempt artificial limbs from duty if imported for personal use and not for sale.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Tariff Act of 1930 (relating to the free list) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"PAR. 1816. Artificial limbs and limb braces, if imported for personal use and not for sale."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out lines 6 and 7 and insert the following:

"PAR. 1816. Artificial limbs and braces imported solely for the personal use of a specified person and not for sale otherwise than for the use of such person."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3932 provides for the free entry under the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, of artificial limbs and braces imported solely for personal use of a specified person. It will alleviate a most unfortunate situation in regard to amputee patients living in isolated communities along the Canadian border.

Prosthetic appliances, now composed chiefly of metal, are dutiable at 22½ percent ad valorem.

It is important that many of these patients be fitted in Canada because they are unable to travel 300 miles in order to be fitted in other localities.

For bilateral amputees a trip of 300 miles to be fitted to prosthetic appliances is impossible, but a trip to Montreal, Canada, by automobile in one afternoon is feasible.

The Tariff Commission approves the bill, and the Treasury Department has suggested the amendment which has been made.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the kindness of my friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and all the members of the Ways and Means Committee for unanimously reporting this bill out and bringing it up so quickly on the floor. The bill was introduced at the request of Dr. Marshall M. Kissane, of Malone, N. Y. Dr. Kissane was one of the top doctors of the Army in amputation cases and he found that along the Canadian border, where we live, it was difficult for disabled veterans and others to make the frequent long trips to New York and other big centers to buy artificial limbs and braces and the necessary subsequent fittings. This bill allows them to make the short trip in a car to Montreal and to frequently go back to have adjustments made. I appreciate the action of the Speaker and the House in allowing this bill to pass by unanimous consent.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. POULSON, and Mr. RODINO asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD, each to include an editorial.

Mr. JAMES and Mr. BREEN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

DREW PEARSON'S VICIOUS ATTACK ON SECRETARY FORRESTAL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Forrestal needs no defense at my hands. He is one of our greatest living Americans. We all regret to learn of his illness, and pray for his early recovery.

Practically every Member of the House I have talked to this morning, as well as employees of the House, including the page boys, have expressed their indignation at the vicious attack made upon him by Drew Pearson last night.

I wonder how much longer that loathsome slime monger of the air will be permitted to carry on his filthy diatribes against decent individuals who are unable to defend themselves.

As I said, Secretary Forrestal is a very sick man, and probably delirious at times, as a result of the agony through which he is now passing; but for this smear monger to go on the air and broadcast his outrageous attack on him to all the American people is enough to arouse the resentment of every decent human being throughout the entire country.

I am calling for a copy of this vicious speech; and I am going to call upon the Federal Communications Commission to take steps to prevent such inhuman abuses as this being broadcast over the radio.

It is about time the Government stepped in and put a stop to such ghoulish practices.

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

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to rise at this time to tell the House of the death of a former Member of this body, Hon. James M. Fitzpatrick.

His was the life of a typical American. He was born in Massachusetts; worked as a young boy there in the iron mines; came on to New York City, at an early age; continued to work in what some people would call menial capacities; worked his way through school; then entered politics in the city of New York, where he served in various capacities in the city government; then was elected to this honorable body from the old Twenty-fourth District in the Bronx. He served here with distinction for nine terms. He retired in 1944. It is with

extreme regret that we learn of his passing. We extend to his widow and the members of his family surviving him our heartfelt condolences and sympathy.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Jim Fitzpatrick is indeed a sad occasion for his many friends and a terrible blow to his loved ones. Those of us who served with Jim Fitzpatrick can well remember his fine disposition and smiling face as well as his sincerity and devotion to duty. I can see him now walking onto the floor of the House in that pleasant way that he always had, always smiling, always optimistic, always a gentleman, and radiating his spirit and personality among his colleagues, even in moments of great strain and stress upon the Members in connection with world matters, or in moments of stress and strain as to a personal matter of an individual Member.

There was no Member who more tirelessly devoted himself to his duties than Jim Fitzpatrick. He was a man of deep faith. I like to see people with deep faith, no matter what their religious convictions.

To me, it is a beautiful thing to see people whether they are Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, possessed of deep faith and willing to publicly profess their faith at the appropriate time—in fact, to profess their faith on all occasions, but particularly on appropriate occasions. Our late beloved friend was a man of deep faith. He was a fine husband and a fine father. He leaves behind him Mrs. Fitzpatrick and three sons and one daughter. One of his sons is an ambassador of God on earth, a Catholic priest, rendering service to God and country as a member of the Dominican Order of the Catholic Church, known as the Order of the Preachers, a great missionary and educational order. As a member of this order, his son is an outstanding citizen and servant of God. I can well remember the many times that Jim Fitzpatrick spoke to me about his son when he was a seminarian, and later after he was ordained. He spoke of his pride in his son and the joy that it brought to him and Mrs. Fitzpatrick in the knowledge that their son had received the call for service and to know that he had responded and that his whole life would be devoted to the service of God and his country.

James Fitzpatrick was a man of deep faith, a man who exemplified it with such sincerity and simplicity as to influence others to the maximum degree.

To his widow, to his sons, and to his daughter, I extend the deepest sympathy of Mrs. McCormack and myself. I know that I also extend the sympathy of all those who served with him, present and past, the sympathy of every one of them, to Mrs. Fitzpatrick and her children in their great bereavement.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, there are two philosophies of death—one that it is a black, terrifying, and awesome experience; the other is that while death itself is sad for those who are left, it is

the opening of a new vista, an eternal one, for the one who receives the beckoning call.

And so this morning, those of us who have learned of the passing of a former Member, the Honorable James M. Fitzpatrick, are saddened and we do experience a comingling of feeling, one of regret, but we are heartened at the recognition of the fact that he will now start his eternal life.

Over 80 years ago in the coal mines of Massachusetts a young boy earned his livelihood and as he worked underground, he saw that man's destiny was higher. He recognized his duty to do a day's work but he recognized still further the duty, the obligation of his employers to pay a living wage and to protect their men. Now possessed of this experience and this firm determination to better his fellow men, he came to the city of New York where, with its usual warmth, they welcomed him. He worked for the transit companies, first as a conductor and then in the claims department, and as he slowly but steadily climbed the ladder, his determination became greater and greater for public service. That public service was recognized when the people of his district elected him to the old board of aldermen. In those days the alderman was the connecting link between the people, the common people, and their government. They found his home always open, they found his ear ever attentive, they realized his heart, as well as his mind, understood their problems, and, again the party of his choice, the people whom he had served, gave to him one of the highest honors that can be afforded to any man in public life; they elected him to this, the Congress of the United States.

Without fanfare, without great, huge press releases, he continued as that connecting link and served the people now in a bigger area and in a bigger way. Never did he lose contact, never did he say "Yes" when by saying "Yes" he would compromise with principle or conscience and gain votes. James M. Fitzpatrick was a man of principle in not talk alone but in action. He served in this body for 18 years and was a member of the Appropriations Committee as well as many other committees during the tenure of his office.

Today, the House is saddened by the news of his death and it pauses during its busy day to pay tribute to one who served in this body and served so well. May the late Congressman enjoy now the fruits of his years of labor in the house of his Lord.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the death of Hon. James Fitzpatrick, a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives. We were close friends. We were neighbors, living in the same hotel. Our lives were thrown together not only in social life but in official labors. I found Hon. James Fitzpatrick an able legislator both in committee and on the floor of the House. When serving as a member of the Committee on Education of which I was chairman, I found him to be a broad-minded man of

vision, always fighting for the social and spiritual strength of his country and the welfare of his fellow men. In the field of rehabilitation of the crippled his enthusiasm knew no bounds, and his contribution to this worthy cause was, indeed, noteworthy. My friend, James, radiated good nature, affection and optimism. I know how devoted he was to his beautiful and accomplished wife, and also his pride in and love for his children. My sympathy and that of Mrs. Reed is extended to Mrs. Fitzpatrick and to her family in their great bereavement.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the death of former Representative James M. Fitzpatrick, of the Bronx, we have suffered the loss of an outstanding citizen and friend.

His record speaks for his keen interest in his community and Nation. In 1919 he was elected to the board of aldermen, on which he served for three terms, resigning from the board after his election to Congress in 1926. He was elected to Congress for nine successive terms, and retired at the time of the congressional redistricting in New York. He served on the important Appropriations Committee of the House, where his astuteness, good judgment, and business ability were important contributions to the work of that committee.

As a boy, he worked in the iron mines near his home town in Massachusetts. He came to New York in 1891 where he worked for the Metropolitan Street Railway Co., later becoming a claim adjuster. Because of his early experiences, he became a champion of labor—and remained faithful to the cause of labor throughout his legislative career. He fought for the laboring man at every opportunity, and voted accordingly.

From humble beginnings, he gained a high position of honor and respect, but he never lost touch with the "common man" and was in complete sympathy with his problems, aims, and efforts. He was friend and counselor to all who came to him for help, and gave generously of his time and efforts in their behalf.

We, in the Bronx, will greatly miss him, and his widow and children have our heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of the late James M. Fitzpatrick.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the metropolitan area of New York City cannot and does not claim credit for all the great reform movements of this wonderful country of ours; that would be a historical untruth.

We can, however, claim that liberal and progressive Senators, Representatives, and even Presidents have come from the State of New York, and in particular, from the metropolitan area of

New York City, with greater consistency than from any other section of the country.

To that noble tradition belonged the late great James M. Fitzpatrick, who brought to his official duties as a United States Representative from the Bronx not only a conviction of dedication to the welfare of the people but also a personal faith illumined with the light of truth and brotherhood. His was a full and wonderful life, which exemplified the American dream of material and spiritual success to the most humble if they but trod the good way of life.

It was my privilege to have served with Jim Fitzpatrick in this House; his name has been familiar to me from my earliest boyhood, and I hope that it can be said sometime that I served my people as he served his.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there were interred in the consecrated ground of St. Raymond's Cemetery, Bronx, New York City, the mortal remains of our former colleague, Hon. James M. Fitzpatrick. For 18 continuous years he represented the old Twenty-fourth New York Congressional District which roughly comprised the northeast section of Bronx County and the southern part of Westchester County, including the city of Yonkers. He did not seek reelection after he completed his term in the Seventy-eighth Congress. He served for years as a valued member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Born in West Stockbridge, Mass., almost 80 years ago, he worked as a boy in the iron mines near his home. In 1891 he came to New York and for many years was employed by the old Metropolitan Street Railway, and later the Interborough Rapid Transit Co. Always active in the politics of Bronx County his first venture into public life was as Commissioner of Street Openings. He was subsequently elected to the board of aldermen in the city of New York where he served for three terms until his election to the Seventieth Congress.

Jim Fitzpatrick was my friend. I shall never forget his thoughtfulness and kindness to me. He presented me to this House and stood with me when I first took my oath of office in the Seventy-sixth Congress. His clear political perception, his sound judgment and unflinching courtesy made him the ideal Representative.

In his death the country lost a distinguished citizen who gave many fruitful years of his life to public service.

I extend to his wife and children my deepest sympathy.

THE LATE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it will be 4 years tomorrow that America and the world lost one of the greatest American

citizens, a man recognized the world over as an outstanding humanitarian, one who had the interests of the masses in his heart and in his mind. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that he gave up his life for the cause of humanity. I know that when history is written, he will, even as he is today, be recognized as a distinguished American, and it will be recorded that he rendered to our country and to the world prodigious services. He will go down in history with Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Wilson, as the greatest interpreter of the cause of the common man, for he actually gave up his life for the cause of the people, for his country, and for the peace and democracy of the world. His indefatigable and successful efforts on behalf of the plain homespun American and the underprivileged, and for the preservation of our democracy, and the democracies of the world, shall endear him to all mankind. Beyond doubt he was the most beloved and most mourned man not only in our country but the world over. Here, indeed, is the man of the ages.

CIVILIAN ADMINISTRATION OF OCCUPIED GERMANY

Mr. JAVITS. 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. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the whole democratic world will approve the announcement made on Friday on the part of the United States and France and Great Britain that there should be civilian administration in western Germany. I wish to emphasize that those of us who have been deeply concerned about the manifestations of nazism in the western zones of Germany during the administration of the military governments there, want to be sure that there is not only a civilian government for western Germany which this announcement contemplates, but that there is also a civilian administration which will utilize to the full and cooperate with democratic and anti-Nazi elements in those zones on the part of the occupying powers. In the matter of the nomination of trustees for the Ruhr iron and steel industries; in the matter of the comings and goings and of striking out the names of those suspected of having Nazi affiliations who sought to participate in the German industrial fair in New York City; in remarks attributed to officials of military government like those attributed to the director of the administration of whole province of Wurtemberg Baden showing a lack of concern for the recurrence of Nazi influence in German public affairs (New York Herald Tribune, February 26, 1949); we have deep concern that our people who are handling the situation in Germany are too prone to themselves forget that the Germans have on three occasions been the greatest aggressive force the world has ever known, too prone to let circumstances develop under which they could start their aggressive

belligerency and their outrages against human rights again.

It will be recalled the names of 12 Germans were recently submitted by the Bi-Zonal Economic Administration—which is an indigenous German agency—to the Western Allied Military Governors as managerial trustees of the Ruhr iron and steel works. The report of the New York Times, February 26, 1949 states the following with respect to this list:

Most notable among German selections were Heinrich Dinkelbach, former financial director of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke and sponsor and financial contributor to the Nazi SS, and Herman J. Ahs, former Deutsch Bank director who was denounced in a special military government report a year ago as a participant in the exploitation of Nazi-occupied countries.

It will be recalled also that the democratic world was shocked recently by evidences of the revival of the Nazi spirit shown in such movements as the League for German Revival of which it is stated that leading former Nazi leaders are the guiding spirits.

We welcome this change just announced by the three occupying powers and have a right to expect that by this change the civilian administrations on both sides both for the occupying powers and for the Germans of the western zones, will at long last deal only with the democratic elements who are there, and who have been shamefully neglected, and not the Nazi elements and Nazi affiliates in western Germany.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole today on the ECA bill I may include certain extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "The Skipper of Guadalcanal."

UNITY IS NOT JUST A WORD

Mr. JACKSON of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a great tragedy has just been enacted in my home State of California. After many hours of heroic toil, workers yesterday reached the lifeless body of a little girl, 3-year-old Kathy Fiscus, of

San Marino, who had climbed or fallen into an old and disused well pipe, and had slipped down the pipe for nearly 100 feet.

The tremendous effort to free the child was fruitless, and the youngster was yesterday found dead. The heartbreak of the parents of the youngster is shared by millions of Americans.

However, the tragedy proved that in an hour of human trouble we, Americans become one, and that the great heart of America holds no place for hatred and rancor at such a time. We hear much of the "heartless corporation" which seeks only to grind labor beneath its heel, yet it was the expensive equipment of American industry that was rushed to the scene of the disaster in total disregard of the fact that the parents could never pay the \$500 per hour or more required for the operation of the giant rigs.

We hear that free American labor seeks only to sweat industry and business for every possible dollar it can, yet it is well to remember that honest and fearless American workmen were the men who worked until complete exhaustion overcame them in what proved to be a futile race with death. In an hour of darkness, the tools and the hands of America met for a moment in common cause over ground of common tragedy. In those short few hours there was proof on both sides that, given cause for cooperation, it is forthcoming.

How tragic it is that only in common sorrow and common need we have been able to break down the barriers that hamper our economic, spiritual, and moral growth!

"A little child shall lead them."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. WELCH of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he will make today excerpts from the United States News and other publications.

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

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 73]		
Allen, La.	Fellows	Morton
Barrett, Pa.	Fernandez	Murphy
Beall	Gamble	Nixon
Buckley, N. Y.	Gilmer	Norton
Bulwinkle	Granahan	Passman
Carlyle	Hall	Powell
Carroll	Leonard W.	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Hart	Regan
Chudoff	Hope	St. George
Corbett	Jennings	Smith, Ohio
Cox	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Davenport	Lane	Walsh
Dingell	Lodge	Whitaker
Dollinger	Lyle	White, Idaho
Douglas	Lynch	Withrow
Eberharter	Miller, Md.	Woodcott
Elston	Morrison	Wood

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3748) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3748, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, general debate on this bill is nearing the end. Generally speaking, Members on both sides of the aisle are to be congratulated on the nonpartisan spirit shown here. That is as it should be, for the ranks against communism in this country are not made up of Democrats and Republicans, as such; we are all just simply Americans who want to remain free.

It is eloquent tribute to the merits of the bill and augurs well for its overwhelming passage that even the minority party in the presentation of the minority report or minority views claims authorship of the European recovery plan.

The minority report of six pages carries six times, once for each page, the words, "We Republicans." In the committee report of 59 pages "We Democrats" cannot be found.

There should not be pride of authorship in a thing of this kind, but the record should be kept straight if the issue is raised.

The minority views, signed by all Members of the minority party except the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVRS], and which throughout its pages shows the artistic hand of

the very able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] says:

This vast and far-reaching effort initiated in the Eightieth Congress.

As a matter of fact, this effort was initiated by a great American, General Marshall, Secretary of State in a Democratic administration. It was then recommended and proposed to the Eightieth Congress by President Truman, and be it said to the everlasting credit of that Republican Congress that it fell in line under the matchless leadership of two great Americans, Senator VANDENBERG and our own beloved and admired former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, and enacted the proposal into law by a majority vote of both sides of the aisle.

If credit there be for ECA, there is credit enough for all. If the plan fails, we must all equally share the blame.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], in his speech and in the minority views, lamented the fact that this is not a package bill to carry all forms of foreign assistance as was the case last year.

The bill last year carried four titles in a package—European recovery, International Children's Fund, Greek-Turkish assistance, and aid to China. This was done mainly on the insistence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. It was a mistake and has been proven to be a mistake. This year in consideration of the European recovery plan we are sticking to our knitting. The other proposals must be considered separately on individual study and merit. The European recovery plan is unique in that it deals with, in the words of the gentleman from Ohio himself, those who have banded together "to help themselves, each other, and us."

Now, I must get along. I want to speak to the Members who, in good conscience and with the national interest uppermost in their minds, voted against the European recovery program when it came before the House a year ago.

I have no criticism of their motives. I believe that the opponents of this experiment were just as patriotic as those who defended this bill. At the same time, I believe that the things they feared then have failed to materialize.

The motives of the critics were sound. Their fears were baseless. If, with the same motives, they will reexamine their fears of a year ago, we can get an almost unanimous vote on this measure to extend the European recovery program. What possible action could better strengthen the position of this country and more profoundly hearten our friends and collaborators among the nations than a unanimous vote here in support of the extension of the recovery program.

The issue is different now from what it was in 1948. We debated then whether this Nation should launch this great experiment in international cooperation for economic recovery. Now the sole question is whether this Nation shall finish what it starts or shall be fickle in its undertakings. I believe no Member here

wants us to appear in the latter guise. One proposition upon which we can all agree is that our country, once it has put its hand to the plow, should cut a straight furrow to the end.

Let us recall specifically the fears which dominated the thinking of many of the Members of this body a year ago, and let us see what has happened in the actual course of events.

First, there was the fear that this would be just another relief measure. "Operation rat hole" was the phrase we heard over and over again on this floor to describe this program. Lend-lease, UNRRA, residual aid, and interim aid were all reviewed. The assertion was that each of these measures had been sold to this House as a cure for the economic ailments of Europe, and that each had had a sequel in the form of a demand for more aid. The same was predicted for the Marshall plan.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield just for a question.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has made reference to the minority views. I wonder if the gentleman objects to these words on page 2:

We deeply appreciate the fine spirit that prevailed in our committee throughout our hearings.

Does the gentleman agree to that part of our report?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not object to those words at all. They are kind words, but they are only salve-for the statement in the first paragraph. Those words are an anticlimax. I am talking about the words "we Republicans" when it should have been "we Americans."

I have no apology to make for the predecessors of the Marshall program. We can never know their real value because we cannot know what would have happened to the world if those measures had not been passed. They did not bear out all our hopes, but they were not a total loss to us and to the world. They might have been better conceived and better carried out. But they helped to keep all of Europe from going irrevocably over the brink into another dark age. We do not have to be ashamed of all that we did in the period of 1945 to 1948 in helping other nations, even if we might have done them better.

The point I want to make here is that the European recovery program, launched as the Marshall plan and legislated into our laws by the Economic Cooperation Act, is a different sort of program from the ones that preceded it.

The Economic Cooperation Act was enacted in a Republican Congress, under the matchless leadership of two great Americans, Senator VANDENBERG, and our own beloved and admired former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, and is today going to be continued under the leadership of another great American, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE], the present chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The European recovery program is based on the idea that the recovery of Europe is a job for the European nations themselves. It recognizes that they will not be able to do that job unless they get together candidly and work together energetically in a unified program to balance their resources and their requirements. It recognizes also that for a short period the European cooperators by supplying things needed from the dollar area which are beyond the participants' capacity to pay in dollars. We will finance these things as gifts if necessary; we will lend them the money if their credit position justifies the loans.

All of that is spelled out in the act. The recovery effort is a European effort. Our aid is only subsidiary to that effort. Our aid is given on the understanding that the Europeans must justify it by their record of what they are doing for themselves, and so the program is subject to annual review.

That is the way the program is turning out. It is not another rat-hole operation—not just a relief effort for a bunch of mendicant nations. It is a recovery plan based on self-help supported with temporary American assistance to close the gap between the needs and the capabilities of the participants—and with that assistance gaged and calculated to stimulate the other nations on their upward climb along the slope of recovery.

Our participants have not let us down. The hearings tell the whole story. The report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on this bill summarizes it. Let me quote just a few lines from that report:

After mature study, the committee is confident that the facts support the conclusions that production is rising significantly; that the participating nations have progressed substantially toward stabilization and have laid the groundwork for still further accomplishments in this regard during the coming year; and that the participants have made a start toward developing mutual trade as a principal avenue to the solution of their common economic problems.

What are the particulars? I quote again:

The total output of factories and mines in the participating countries during the calendar year 1948 was 14 percent above that of 1947, and about equal to prewar. Excluding western Germany, steel output is currently at a rate exceeding the prewar high of 1937 and 25 percent above that of 1947. The coal shortage has eased; although tonnage in the bizon and the United Kingdom remained below that of prewar, production in all other important fields in western Europe increased almost to prewar levels.

And here is another quotation:

The investment record justifies the conclusion that economic improvement in Europe is not transitory but permanent, the record demonstrates also that American assistance has renewed the confidence of western Europe in its own future. Gross investment in all countries for which estimates are available is expected to total roughly the equivalent of \$30,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1948-49—six to seven times the dollars provided by the Economic Cooperation Act. This means that gross investment would approximate 20 percent of the gross national product. This is about equivalent in proportion to the investment rate in the United States

in the four highest years in the period from 1921 to 1939—namely, 1923, 1925, 1926, and 1929. It is approximately three times the rate of investment of 1932 in the United States, the lowest year of the period referred to.

That means that the European participants are forging ahead—and doing it not simply on the basis of the wealth they are getting from us but from the wealth they are reinvesting because of their own renewed confidence in themselves.

What of stabilization? Let us look at some of the highspots:

Great Britain's achievements are notable in checking inflationary pressures and providing a budgetary surplus—the keystone to recovery in that kingdom. France has made an encouraging start toward combating inflation, which has plagued the country's efforts toward recovery since the close of World War II. There was a serious set-back due to the Communist-inspired coal strike of last fall. The present Government has dealt courageously and effectively with this problem, however, in 1948 France levied the highest taxes in its history, and tax rates will be higher in 1949. The French Government has successfully floated an internal loan of 100,000,000,000 francs—roughly \$310,000,000—the first loan, not a forced loan, successfully floated in France since 1944. Italy has had notable success during 1948 in maintaining the stability of its economy, first achieved in the fall of 1947, after a long inflationary trend, through the courageous adoption of a rigorous deflationary program by the Italian Government.

And so the record goes. The stabilization record is good, but it is not perfect. The nations of Europe know that they have to do even better, and I cite to you this quotation from their own study of the matter.

Throughout this report, the need to bring under control the inflation existing in many of the participating countries has been stressed. It threatens the production and investment program; it generates a demand for imports that wastes resources, including American aid; it hampers the export drive; it makes impossible that reasonable equilibrium in western Europe which must precede greater liberalization of inter-European trade and payments. The things that have to be done during the next 3½ years need time. Yet many can hardly be begun at all until inflationary pressures are under control.

And now, what of the development of trade among the Europeans?

As a result of increasing output and stronger fiscal and trade policies, the volume of exports from the participating countries rose and their ability to pay for essential imports improved considerably during 1948. Over-all exports for the countries taken as a group, excluding western Germany, were up 20 percent above the 1947 level. For the United Kingdom exports in 1948 were one-quarter again higher than in 1947. In Italy exports in 1948 were up almost 50 percent from 1947 levels; in the Benelux countries about 30 percent. In this current fiscal year the earnings of the ERP countries on exports and "invisibles such as income from the tourist trade" will

probably pay for a little more than half of the imports they need from the outside world. In the calendar year 1947 these earnings paid for only 40 percent of imports from the outside.

As European production and exports have gone up the trade deficit of the participating countries with the United States had narrowed. During the first 11 months of 1948 imports from the United States declined by \$1,000,000,000, as compared with 1947, while exports to the United States increased by \$223,000,000.

Enough of the proof that this program is not just another relief project. It is a recovery program, and it is working.

In arriving at that I think I have disposed of another charge that we heard a year ago—the charge that the European nations would take our substance and then lay down on the job. They have set themselves in the direction we wanted them to take, and they have made progress. All the dissension and sabotage that the forces of Moscow have been able to produce have not diverted them from that course.

That leads to another fear that needs a new airing. We were told a year ago that this program would only serve to get these nations into shape to be picked off by the Communists. The fact that, even while we were considering the bill a year ago, the Czech democracy succumbed to the onslaught of communism may have had something to do with that fear.

Now look at the facts. Communism has lost ground in Italy and France. It has failed to gain elsewhere in Europe. Communism's best efforts to sabotage this program by traitorous strikes and other such interference has not halted progress. Freemen are breathing more confidently in western Europe today than at any time in a decade. We have not prepared Europe for the kill in the way you fatten a turkey for Thanksgiving. Not Communist conquest but the North Atlantic Pact is a sequel to the launching of the European recovery program. Our critics told us a year ago that bolshevism would take over. Instead we have a firm undertaking among free nations to stand together and remain free.

The development of the North Atlantic Pact leads to another recollection of the fears of a year ago—the fear that our policy would result only in hatred for us, and would lead to war. I shall admit that this program has not assuaged hatred for us among our implacable foes. But who can contend today that hatred for us has increased in Europe? That fearful prediction of a year ago has a hollow sound when repeated now in the same week that the foreign ministers of the majority of the same countries as participate in this recovery program have gathered in this Capital to join their governments with Canada and the United States in a covenant of mutual defense.

Rather than go over the whole list of dire predictions, let me take up just one other. A year ago we heard again and again that this program would bankrupt

us—that it would put such a stress upon our economy and create such a problem of shortages that the American people would find the situation intolerable and would demand the cessation of this effort. This time we heard quite a different story in the committee hearings. The worries arise now from those producers who are experiencing the problems of surpluses and want the recovery program for Europe converted into a vehicle for bearing away the surplus commodities being produced in the United States. If Congress were to grant all of the requests that have been put before it in behalf of people who are worrying about surpluses, “the annual cost of the ECA program would be increased by some hundreds of millions of dollars per year. More importantly, European self-sufficiency by midyear of 1952 will become an unrealized goal.”

European recovery by midyear of 1952 is a feasible proposition and a sound prospect. It is a probable outcome of what we are attempting—and it will be realized if we and our friends in Europe just keep our minds on the goal and on our potential for reaching it.

I want to be just as realistic now as my committee was a year ago when it assured this House that all the fears expressed on this floor were fancies that would not come to pass.

In the first place, let us be realistic about the claims we make for the success of this program or the allegations of its failure. Both the critics and the friends of the program should approach cautiously the task of measuring results in the European recovery program. It is well to keep in mind that the data in hand show the performance only over a period of less than a year in a program envisaged to last 4 years. A lag between effort and result is inevitable. The processes of the program call for planning, authorization, procurement, and the introduction of the goods procured into the economy of Europe. In some instances it must be many months before the effect of money spent can be measured in terms of upswing in European production and productivity. Likewise, the effects of economic cooperation among the nations of Europe are matters to be evaluated properly only in a perspective of years. Friends of the program should keep in mind that some of the results achieved during the first year are actually residual effects of earlier aid programs or of earlier efforts by the Europeans themselves. They should remember that some of the most hopeful developments—for instance, the turning toward customs unions as exemplified in the Benelux arrangement—actually antedate the launching of this program. They should keep in mind, too, that nature itself has contributed a measure to European recovery in the past year; the bad weather of 1947 was succeeded by good weather in 1948.

Let us be realistic and conservative in estimating the needs and the degree of recovery achieved.

Defending the European recovery program requires a nice balance between

pessimism and optimism, between warnings and encouragement. Many of the voices that a year ago were urging that we reject this program because it had no chance of success are now crying out that we should abandon the program because the measure of its success is already so great. These voices like to cite a speech made about 6 weeks ago by Mr. Christopher Mayhew, Parliamentary Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs for the United Kingdom. Let us take a moment to see what Mr. Mayhew actually meant when he said that “Britain has now virtually completed its economic recovery.”

A careful reading of his speech in the light of the circumstances shows that Mr. Mayhew meant that during the last half of last year the United Kingdom's exports almost equaled its imports and that its foreign trade was in a sense balanced. Now, the plain fact of the matter is that Britain is exporting to the nondollar area about £300,000,000 worth of goods and services above what Britain imports from the nondollar area. If this surplus could be converted into dollars, Britain would actually be in a balanced trade position. The rub is that Britain cannot convert this surplus into dollars, and it is dollars, and dollars alone, that can be used to pay for the things that Britain must have in order to make the grade of recovery as conceived in the Marshall plan. Britain needs and gets from the dollar area more than it can pay for in dollars. At the same time, the nondollar area is getting more from Britain than it can pay for in sterling. A large part of the aid we are sending to Britain is actually being passed on by Britain to other countries that are fighting their way up the slope of recovery. Through the operation of the intra-European payments plan, the other participants in this program get \$480,000,000 worth of what Britain passes along. In other words, Britain operates a little Marshall plan of her own and is doing a large share of the work not only for her own recovery but also for the recovery of her neighbors.

Britain has recovered moral independence. But Britain has not recovered its independence of the dollar. The need for extraordinary assistance granted by this Government goes on and will probably go on, but in diminishing volume, for the duration of this program.

Finally, let me bring out one more point on which there must be realism both among the critics and among the champions of this program. Too much should not be claimed for it; too much should not be expected of it. The European recovery program does not have the answer for every economic problem besetting Europe. There will be plenty of opportunity for statesmanship, hard thinking, and courageous effort after this program has expired.

Anyone who believes the European recovery program is supposed to have all the answers should read the interim report of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. It is a completely honest document. It never attempts to delude us or the participating nations

with beguiling prospects that are not supported by facts. It tells in full detail the economic straits of the Marshall-plan countries. It makes no attempt to soften the contours of the road ahead. No one's false optimism will survive a careful reading of this document. It leads to one conclusion: The road to recovery is hard and may take longer than the most hopeful prophets pretend it will take. It leaves no support for the assumption that Europe's plight is a short-term circumstance traceable only to World War II. It recognizes that this plight is the result of a deep-seated malady traceable to a long-term change in the world's trade pattern.

The report dispels the happy belief that Europe's problems can be solved in terms of production alone, for Europe's production will be contingent upon the supply of raw materials, and that in turn involves the larger and much more complex problem of the world's trade pattern.

Finally, the report leaves one without the hopeful illusion that Europe, some time in mid-1952, will pass in a moment from the status of a patient to the state of complete health. A long and difficult convalescence will still lie ahead.

Let us not fool ourselves about that. Rather, let us look at this word “recovery” in all its meanings and see just what one applies to this program.

First, there is recovery in the simple sense of restoring production capabilities depleted by war. Europe is already achieving success in that phase—and more success lies ahead in the development of this program.

Next, there is recovery in the sense of getting free from the requirement of extraordinary outside aid. That means the effort to close the dollar gap. It is achieved by austerity in the domestic economies, exploitation of every opportunity to develop trade outside the dollar area, and the most careful channeling of dollar expenditures.

Then, after the dollar gap is closed—in this program we hope that will be in mid-1952—there is recovery in the sense of having reattained a self-sustaining basis. Then the nations participating in this effort can turn to careful use of their credit abroad, and to development primarily through attracting private enterprise from abroad to participate in their economies on a wider scale.

Finally, if all goes well, will come the more abundant day when they can achieve recovery in the sense of a renewed abundance—the day when austerity will be behind them and the opportunity for enriched living will again be open to all who want to put out the effort to achieve it.

I recite all that simply to make it plain that the Marshall plan envisages recovery only in the narrow sense of enabling the nations participating and this Nation also to be free of the great problem of the dollar gap between their resources and their needs.

The European recovery program is one step in a long road. It is the approach to convalescence. It is not a formula for fully restored health.

It does not solve the problems. It transforms them into a manageable posture. But grave decisions and hard work lie even beyond mid-1952.

I do not want to oversell this program to you. I want to be perfectly honest about stating what it does not do.

But let me tell you one thing it will do. It will insure that the basic, hard decisions that lie ahead will be made in this Capital and in the capitals of our friends. They will not be made in Moscow, or Warsaw, Bucharest, Prague, and the like.

The European recovery program will leave the free nations of western Europe and of this continent masters of their own fate, capable of managing their own problems. As a formula for freedom it is worth going through with a hundred times over.

In closing may I add this word of warning. There are other programs for foreign assistance still to come before this Congress. Each should be weighed on its merits carefully and exhaustively as has been done in this one. American dollars simply cannot go around the world. The supply is not inexhaustible. A halt must be called sometime, somewhere. Sympathy and charity are laudable traits, for which the American people are renowned. But we cannot further strain the economy of the United States by granting dollars to any nation in this world unless that nation shows an effort to help itself, help other nations, cooperate with us, and, last but not least, the will to resist the encroachment of communism.

The call for American dollars comes from around the entire globe, but if we scatter what resources we have everywhere we may be successful nowhere. That is a maxim of war, whether hot or cold.

Mr. Churchill said that he did not become the King's Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. I am sure you will agree, gentlemen, that we did not come to Congress to preside over the bankruptcy of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the enactment of the legislation now before us. During the Eightieth Congress I made my position clear on the European recovery program, and it has in no way changed. I believe that from the over-all standpoint the program has been eminently successful in working toward our ultimate goal. The economic recovery of Europe is necessary if we are to get our friends across the sea on their own feet and off the back of the American taxpayer. I further believe that during its first year the program has gone a long way

toward containing communism and discouraging aggression on the part of the 13 men who now dictate the policies of all the millions behind the iron curtain.

I know that efforts will be made to reduce the authorization contained in this legislation. Further efforts will be made to protect certain special interests in our own country. I feel that the authorization requested by the administration should be granted. If any cuts are to be made, let them be made by the Appropriations Committee. This great committee is eminently qualified to effect any economies that might be justified and practical.

I further believe that we should proceed with great care in any attempt to favor a domestic group or industry in connection with the ECA program. This is not a program to directly aid American industry, commerce, or agriculture. It is a program to aid them all indirectly in building prosperity throughout the world, in resisting communistic advances, and in achieving the security of world peace.

Let us deal with this legislation in a clear and convincing manner so that there can be no doubt in anyone's mind across the seas as to the intent of the American Congress and the American people. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation will be adopted promptly and decisively.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

MY COUNTRY'S FUTURE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us providing funds for the 15 months' continuation of the Marshall plan calls for an appropriation of \$5,550,000,000.

The signing of the Atlantic Pact and its approval by the United States Senate will bring another bill calling for an appropriation of approximately \$2,000,000,000.

Undoubtedly, the two measures are sponsored in the main by individuals who are of the opinion that the two measures, properly financed, tend toward the preservation of peace.

My vote will be cast against both appropriations because it is my sincere conviction that the Marshall plan has put us into a position which renders our involvement in war more probable.

The Atlantic Pact will almost certainly involve us in war. Not only are we to arm western Europe, but, even before the pact is approved by the Senate, we are being asked to send armed forces.

Shortly, there will come before the Congress from the armed services a request for an appropriation of \$15,908,166,800. I do not know—and I doubt if any Member of Congress or, for that matter, anyone in the administration, in the armed services, actually knows—the amount of money which is needful to

adequately prepare us for national defense or—if that be the alternative—for an aggressive war.

Believing that our national policy means war in the not-too-distant future, my vote shall be cast in support of every request made by the armed services. With the future national security of my country at stake, there is no alternative.

When the establishment of the United Nations was before the Congress, we were told by world-renowned statesmen that it was "a great adventure"; that it was a move looking toward the preservation of the peace of the world.

When lend-lease was before the Congress, the same statesmen advised us that it was "a great speculation"; that, by means of it and the expenditure of sums appropriated to make it effective, war-torn countries would be rehabilitated, a barrier against communism erected.

The Marshall plan, we were advised by international statesmen who assumed to have knowledge of international affairs, would enable Britain and western Europe to "contain" communism within the borders of Russia and its satellite countries.

None of these measures nor our contribution of more than \$23,783,000,000 has stopped either Stalin or communism. The internationalists' answer to that fact is: "Who knows what would have happened, how much worse the situation would have been had we not made the effort, given away the money?" My reply is: "Yes, who knows?" Certainly not those who conceived and put into operation the various plans, for their predictions remain unfulfilled and there are no facts upon which they can base the conclusion that but for their efforts the situation would have been worse.

Since 1914, this Nation has disregarded Washington's advice to avoid entanglements with foreign nations, repudiated the policy of isolationism which it followed prior to that time.

And what has been the result of our policy of meddling in the affairs of other nations, of attempting to tell the people of other lands under what form of government they shall live?

The First World War was fought to end war. That purpose it did not accomplish.

The Second World War was fought not only to end war but to carry the four freedoms throughout the world.

Shortly after we, our allies, and our enemies ceased fighting, there were four active wars in progress.

Today, world war III is in the making.

Today we are told that Russia and her satellite nations contemplate the domination of the world, the destruction of our form of government—that the security of our Nation is in danger.

While World War I and World War II were in the making and while they were being fought, many were frightened into the belief that, unless we participated in both of those wars and they were won, we would be overcome; the slaves, in the first instance, of the Kaiser, in the second, of a Hitler.

Hence, our men and our resources were the deciding factors in both wars.

In the last war we created the situation which, while destroying Hitler and nazism, made Stalin and communism a world power.

The same old fear which drove us into two world wars, neither of which gave us anything, is now being used to ready us for a war with a nation and a philosophy, Russia and communism, which have attained their present position of power because, and only because, of the aid we gave.

We saved Stalin and Russia from Hitler and nazism.

TODAY STALIN AND COMMUNISM THREATEN US

The argument now is that, Russia and communism having overrun eastern Europe and the greater part of China, having agents in South America and in this country, we, if we are to continue as a nation, must form a partnership, a coalition, with all those nations outside the sphere of Red influence, and pledge our resources and the lives of our fighting men and women in any war in which any of those nations may become involved.

To put it briefly and bluntly, the argument is that, inasmuch as Russia and her satellites are apparently united under one governmental head, the rest of the world, if it would avoid being conquered, must join together in opposition to the Russian alliance.

We are going back, as it were, to the age-old balance-of-power arrangement, the theory being that if the world powers be somewhat nearly equally balanced, neither group will chance an aggressive war.

That theory is as old as history and never has it prevented war over an extended period of time.

There are at least two reasons which to me indicate that the Atlantic Pact is inadvisable; that it is more likely to encourage rather than discourage war; make war, rather than peace, probable.

History tells us that the man who lets ambition rule him; that the nation which seeks domination over the rest of the world, is sure to fail and, in the end, meet disaster.

No one has yet conquered the world. No nation has yet ruled the world. There is no reason to believe that the causes which brought about the disintegration of the empires of old seeking domination of the world no longer operate.

The history of Europe indicates that, if Stalin controlled Europe from the East to the sea on the West, ultimately the diverse nature of the people, their conflicting views and ways of life, would result in a disintegration of his empire or federation—whichever you prefer to call it—and that ultimately, whatever form of government he might temporarily throw together would disintegrate.

Just a few days ago, from the well of the House a statement was made, referring to these United States of America as an empire. When once we seek to dominate the world, we become an aggressor—a position we profess to abhor, and experience justifies the prediction that we will fail.

Empires come and empires go. The most recent example being the British Empire, the nucleus of which exists only

because the fighting men and the resources of a Republic (not a democracy) have enabled it to live.

Churchill, the "Prince of Beggars," by his persuasiveness, eloquence, and because of our stupidity and generosity, caused us twice to save his England from destruction.

Will we permit her in this, the third world war, to drag us down with her?

Churchill's last visit was undoubtedly for the purpose of lending support to the proposed Atlantic Pact, under which we form a partnership with 11 or more nations, all of which are bankrupt, none of which is disposed to making a worthwhile effort to fight Stalin and communism—a partnership which, if we enter and do as we will be asked to do, will destroy our prosperity and freedom.

No man in his senses would join in a partnership or organization, agreeing to fight the battles of each and every member of that organization, when none of them nor all of them together could make a worthwhile contribution toward the joint enterprise.

Most people recognize the basic fact that the strongest possible barrier which could be erected against Russia and communism would be a rehabilitated, organized, industrious Germany. Yet the two nations most directly concerned—England and France—ever since the fighting ended, because of their jealousy and their greed, have blocked every effort we have made to recreate a nation of German people. Only within the last few weeks have they even conceded that they will discontinue some of their destructive efforts to build up their own industries, permit Germany to take measures necessary to become self-sustaining.

We are now being told, first, that we must rearm western Europe under the Atlantic Pact, then shortly will come the demand that our men and our munitions of war must establish a battle line in eastern Europe.

Few have forgotten that it was Churchill who told us, "Give us the tools and we will do the job." Then we were called to send a million men overseas.

The same old promise is here again. But mark this prediction—under the Atlantic Pact, wherever go our dollars or our arms, there will follow our men, and women, because they, too, have been inducted into the armed services.

By the Atlantic Pact, not only are we agreeing to enter a third world war, but, through it, the United Nations, and the Marshall plan, we are stripping ourselves of the resources which are necessary if we are to successfully defend ourselves, preserve ourselves a Nation.

Even some of the most outspoken and extreme internationalists have at times admitted that there was somewhere a limit to our ability to give aid, though always they have failed to define that limit or to act as though it existed.

What, then, is the answer to the world situation?

The answer is that, inasmuch as Churchill—and he should know—when the fighting was over, proclaimed this the strongest, the most powerful Nation in all the world, we should conserve our resources; then, to the utmost of our

ability, increase our capacity to produce; to go forward on every scientific front, looking toward the improvement of our fighting equipment; build here a Nation so strong, so powerful, that Stalin with all his allies would not dare to make an aggressive move against us because he would be forced to realize that such an effort could only end in failure.

Let us get away from the thought, ever that of the ambitious man, of an Alexander—a Napoleon—a Hitler, or a Stalin—that we are called to care for and determine the thought of the whole world—an impossible task, one sure to fail.

Any other course, the course now contemplated, the policy which we have been following, means, in my humble opinion, not peace for us or for our Nation in the future, but a world empire, first and for a time perhaps successfully extending itself throughout the world, but ultimately, because of that very expansion and the refusal of the peoples of the world to live under any one government, falling apart, disintegrating.

On every occasion my vote will be cast for national defense, for the strengthening of our country, for the arming of our Nation, even though it means an additional tax burden, even though it means a certain greater degree of domination by the Armed Services, because the opposite policy means not only all that, but, ultimately, destruction.

The policy we are following imposes upon the taxpayer a most grievous burden; condemns the future youth of our country to serve and fight on foreign soil, though our welfare is not at stake.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I wish to pay my compliments to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE. The courtesy, fairness, and consideration he has given to the minority I am sure is greatly appreciated by all those on our side.

In passing, I cannot refrain from saying the same fine spirit has prevailed in our committee toward the minority by all the majority members; and it is remarkable how the seven new members on the Democratic side have familiarized themselves with the complexities of this bill when they did not have the benefit of personal attendance at the extensive hearings held last year.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not it was a wise policy for our Government to engage in a \$17,000,000,000 program to rehabilitate western Europe and stop communism is now a moot question. Our policy is established to carry on this program until 1952. The fact is we are morally bound to carry it out, of course, with the right of review periodically by the Congress. We cannot stop in the middle of a fight.

From the evidence produced before our committee I believe the program has a good chance of working economically. I am not nearly so sure it will work politically. And there is always present the great risk that all our efforts will

be lost if Russia decides to go to war. But it seems to me this is a calculated risk we must take. If we were to stop this aid now, we might well lose all we have put into the program without attaining our original objectives.

I disagree with several provisions of this measure. I strongly believe the amount authorized should be greatly reduced. For example, as a result of the recent international wheat agreement, in all probability the cost of wheat will be from \$82,000,000 to \$124,000,000 less than estimated by ECA. Why should we authorize more than is required for this item?

Contained in the total amount authorized by this bill there is an item of \$169,000,000 for tobacco. When we at home are making great sacrifices to carry on this program, why is it necessary to spend such a huge sum for this purpose?

Also there should be a considerable saving on other commodities because of the deflationary price trend.

We have tried with indifferent success to determine just how much in commodities has actually been shipped under last year's program. As near as we could determine the figure is \$3,800,000,000 up to April 1, 1949. This leaves a balance available from last year's appropriation of \$1,100,000,000, sufficient to fill the pipe line for 2½ to 3 months. This would carry on the program without interruption until July 1. It therefore seems to me it is not necessary to authorize the full amount of \$1,150,000,000 requested as interim aid for that period. We should strive in every possible way to cut this program wherever it is justified and as soon as possible remove this terrific burden from the backs of our taxpayers.

In the minority views accompanying this bill we stated:

A careful and detailed review of the amount needed, in the light of conditions then existing, must be made by the Appropriations Committee.

I have no doubt the Appropriations Committee will screen the amounts requested very carefully. But I have not forgotten the hue and cry that went up when the Appropriations Committee last year brought in a bill containing deductions of the amount previously authorized. We were told we had made at least a moral commitment of the full amount previously authorized and could not properly make a reduction in the appropriation. Now is the time to make a reduction in the authorization bill and not wait until the appropriation bill is brought before us.

At the very time we are giving this aid we must remember there are in existence a large number of trade agreements between the recipient countries and Russia and her satellites. These are undoubtedly directly and indirectly building up the war potential of Russia and her satellites, just as are the huge reparations from Germany and other payments from Italy.

During the coming year it is my sincere hope all these matters will be given the most careful scrutiny and investigation. If it is determined these trade

agreements and other policies are not to the best interest of the signers of the Atlantic Pact and for our own security, then they should be discontinued or revised so as to prevent practices which will be damaging to our mutual security.

In committee I offered an amendment requiring a certain percentage of our corn shipments under this program to be in the form of corn products. I supported a similar amendment that a certain percentage of our wheat shipments should be in the form of flour. The evidence before our committee disclosed this could be done without any increase in cost to the ECA and with possible savings in shipping and manpower. It certainly would have been a great help to the farmers of this country when we take into consideration the break in farm prices due, at least in part, to our large surpluses. But, nevertheless, the committee refused to adopt these amendments, although it is my understanding they were placed in the Senate bill. I hope this House will include them, as was done last year.

As I indicated the other day when the China-aid bill was on the floor, I stated I did not believe it was a wise policy to bring in piecemeal fashion bills affecting our foreign policy. On the contrary, we should have a global approach as far as possible and consider all related measures at the same time. We should not be asked to consider the ECA program without taking into consideration what is necessary to be done in other areas of the world, such as China. We ought to have an over-all picture before us of the total cost of our entire foreign-aid program.

There are few, if any, on the floor of this House who could even estimate the cost of the rearmament program to the western powers who signed the Atlantic Pact, to say nothing of the cost to maintain such military defenses over a period of 20 years, as agreed to in the pact. Unless we have such an over-all picture, we have no way of determining whether these programs will undermine and weaken our economy at home.

In spite of the lack of coordination of our foreign programs, and in spite of the lack of knowledge as to how they will affect us here at home, I believe it is the fervent hope of us all that our foreign policy will stop Stalin by peaceful means and not bring on the very attack it is designed to prevent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the closing paragraph in our minority views says:

For politics to end at the water's edge, there must be a bipartisan participation in the formulation of policies, bipartisan agreement in the measures adopted, and bipartisan sharing of credit for the success of such policies.

I note that my good friend from South Carolina shows a grudging willingness to share with us Republicans a little of the credit for the forward march of this great program. I also note that, in addition to bipartisan support, we have tripartisan support for this program, from Republicans, Democrats, and Dixiecrats, and

that only one party represented in this Congress is opposed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What party is it that is against this legislation?

Mr. VORYS. The American Labor Party is officially against it, and the other parties are in support of the general principles through the expressions of their national conventions. Of course, individual Members of all parties have the right and the duty to express their views and convictions by their voice and vote.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield the balance of the time remaining on this side to one of the great elder statesmen of this age, a man of broad vision, deep spiritual insight, salty common sense and good humor, our beloved ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I take this position today with a sense of grave responsibility, and I want to say to the Members of this House that probably in the history of this great body there never has devolved upon its membership a graver responsibility, nor have its Members of all parties been clothed with such dignity as at this present moment.

I congratulate you young Members. You stand with foot uplifted at the threshold of your life; you are entering upon probably the most trying yet the most marvelous period of human history, and I pray God that every one of you and the people whom you represent may have the astuteness of mental vision, and the moral greatness to face the world that now challenges our resources of mind and character and our economies to the utmost.

This legislation now before the House, in my judgment, is probably as important and far-reaching as any that Congress has ever passed on. I want to say that in my own personal judgment the ECA has been a most remarkable success under the extraordinary leadership of Mr. Hoffman. It has kindled new hope in the hearts of the European peoples who are our ancestors; it has stirred to new life their economies; production has increased; the standard of living has risen, and they have rebuilt in some considerable portions, their shattered economy and their shattered ideas and ideals.

And now I want, if I may, to use my time in unfolding before you as I see it the real situation that confronts us here today. We will have amendments and we ought to have them. You and I here are charged with the responsibility of protecting our own national economy and seeing to it that this legislation is handled in a wise, a discreet, and a successful way. But after we have introduced all our amendments from the economic point of view, unless we know what we are doing and why we are doing it, at this moment we are very feeble indeed in our position.

Mr. Chairman, way back in prehistoric times, when I was young, I made the acquaintance of the greatest leader the world has ever known or ever will know,

the Man of Nazareth. I found that He had based His life and His service to mankind upon a strange and new philosophy, a universal philosophy. It was prophesied in the ancient Scriptures of the Jews that He would not fail nor be discouraged until He had set justice in the earth; and when He sent His disciples out carrying His message He told them to go into all the world and preach that Gospel to every creature. So, in Jesus of Nazareth I found my first teacher and my first leader to lay the foundations in my own mind and heart of a universal philosophy of human experience and human progress. I feel more profoundly today the truth of that great philosophy than I ever did in the days of my youth.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that we have viewed the background, I want to unfold in a few words what I see at this moment as the real task that we are undertaking to meet in this legislation.

I am interested, of course, in all the little tweedledees and tweedledums, about Republicans and Democrats, and what not—which do not amount to anything. But, at a moment like this, when I hear folks in and out of Congress discussing from that limited point of view these great issues, I am reminded of the old friend down on the banks of the Bay of Fundy, where we have terrible fogs. He was shingling in the fog one day, and he shingled right out in the fog for half a day and never knew the difference until he fell down and broke his neck.

Mr. Chairman, in the long journey of man from the jungle to this age of cathedrals, homes, schools, congresses, freedoms, and struggles for freedom, he has created and destroyed a number of civilizations. Today we stand face to face with the birth of the greatest civilization the world has ever known. This is that "one divine, far-off event" toward which the whole creation has been moving. For the first time in human history we are to have a civilization that is universal, that is clothed with the dignity of the individual—black, white, or gray, whatever he may be—that is clothed with the destiny not of one nation or of one continent but of all nations and of all continents.

I want to call your attention to the greatness of this moment in your history and in mine. What is going on that you are taking a part in? First of all, this economic problem that we have undertaken to solve in Europe has created a new unity among the European peoples. It has developed the notion of federation and cooperation among them that hitherto they have not known. It has brought those nations across the sea to our shores and brought us with them into a new unity and a new understanding.

I said before our committee one day, when we were talking to our dear friend, Sol Bloom, that the world is convulsed today by three great revolutions going on at the same time. The first is the desperate conflict between communism and Christianity, between slavery and freedom, that is in every land and must be solved sooner or later by the triumph of one or the other. Another revolution is the new awakening of self-respect and passion for freedom among the nations of the world that hitherto have been under

colonial control by western powers. And the third is the universal determination on the part of the masses of men in every country to better their economic condition, which so far has been responsible very largely for the glacial advance of the socialistic idea and ideals in all countries.

This is a time of tremendous confusion and tremendous difficulty, but, Mr. Chairman, the facts stand out so plainly that he who runs may read. We are at the threshold of a new world civilization, which by our ECA legislation and by our thought of world service and world leadership we have initiated. We are the leaders. We must accept that responsibility whether we will or not, and we will have to pay the price of that acceptance.

Today Washington is the political capital of the world. Today the United States is the recognized leader of the men and women everywhere on earth who desire to be free and who recognize the greatness and dignity of the individual. Today mankind is on the march. Sooner or later, with the leadership of this great Nation and with your leadership here, giving to you men and women the great responsibility and dignity of legislating in their behalf, men are on the march to a new age; an age in which individuals and races will be in contact with each other all the time; in which nations will have to unite upon common human problems, working in a world for common results everywhere.

This is a supreme hour in human history; great in every respect in its outlook, in its universality, in its heights and depths, and I congratulate especially you young Members that you stand at the beginning of this great age and, before the snows of winter settle upon you, as they have upon me, that you will have served the world and served your Nation as no other generation and no other Congress has ever had the privilege of doing.

Now, I close as I began, with one testimony. I believe the greatest event in our human history was the life of Jesus of Nazareth. I believe that there is no hope for mankind to solve its new worldwide problems, of life and death, unless we have a new spiritual awakening among all men; unless there is a new vision of the one God of all men, the Father of us all; unless there is a new sense of moral obligation that rests upon moral standards and can be accepted by all men. I say, even if this were the last word I ever spoke in this House, that the hope of the world today, as it was 2,000 years ago, centers about the Man who hung upon the Cross and rose from the grave triumphant. I beseech you men and women as you approach these great problems to approach them from the point of view of economic wisdom and judgment as you will; approach them from the standpoint of political statesmanship as you will; but remember this, a man is his soul and nothing else is the man; a race is its soul and nothing else; and in the future as in the past these great issues will be determined by the spiritual, the moral, and intellectual resources of men working together for a common world purpose, in a common world unity, and under the inspiration

of a common thought that all men are brothers and that their destiny is one.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that our American shipping is entitled to at least 50 percent, or perhaps more, of all goods shipped under the Marshall plan or any other foreign-aid plan made available under programs financed by our Government. We should enact legislation now that clearly states that a minimum of 50 percent of all goods shipped be shipped in American vessels at market rates for American vessels, with no exceptions unless the Maritime Commission certifies absolutely that American ships were not available at American rates.

It has been brought to my attention that only 23 percent of ECA petroleum cargoes has been carried by United States flag tankers and that a great portion of the total tanker cargoes has been transported by foreign tankers. I protest very strongly against such discriminatory treatment of the United States ships. To me there is no logic for this manifest unfairness. It is inconceivable that our American companies, transporting our commerce, should be displaced in favor of the merchant marine of foreign nations, some of which are not even recipients of our foreign economic-recovery program and which have grown to major size because of their lax laws and below-standard requirements. This, indeed, affects the security and economy of our Nation. The cutting of rates by foreign ships can be accomplished due to the lower standard of living of the workers of foreign countries as compared to the higher standard of living in our country. We should take immediate steps to increase the number of United States flag tankers which are so necessary for our national defense on the high seas.

Another important matter to be considered, and I quote from the report of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

It appears that American-owned marine insurance companies are being deprived of a large amount of insurance business, which but for the policy of the Economic Cooperation Administration would be available for the strengthening of this very important element of the American merchant marine. The Congress has several times in the past forcefully stated its position with regard to fostering the growth of the American marine insurance market. It is the consensus of your committee that the Economic Cooperation Administration and all other administrative agencies of the Government should keep cognizant of the policy heretofore expressed by Congress on this subject.

Several weeks ago, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, pointed out the inconsistency of spending billions of dollars annually for national defense while at the same time, because

of an opinion from the General Counsel of the ECA, we are opposing and weakening one of the important elements of national defense, the American merchant marine.

The American merchant marine approaches a most critical period. At present there is a serious unemployment situation and unless we pass this amendment today, clarifying and strengthening the intent of Congress, as expressed in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, this downward trend will continue as a result of the progressive restoration and expansion of foreign merchant fleets—at the expense of our people—and there will be further untold hardships among workers in the maritime industry, as well as a loss of jobs of more than 10,000 skilled American seamen.

No thoughtful person can be blind to the gravities of the international situation today. This is not the time to gamble with the future or take any chances of crippling our merchant fleet. It is ever necessary to have this fleet quickly available—the importance of which has been sharply demonstrated in two world wars. World War II caught us with a woeful lack of ships and if we persist in giving our business to foreign companies, our own shipping must subsequently suffer. To continue this policy is not in the interest of the United States, nor of our shipping industry, nor of the thousands of seamen and workers who are engaged in the maritime industry.

Gentlemen, the strengthening and preservation of our merchant marine is of the utmost importance if the American people would continue to live and direct the peace of the world, as we are presently doing through the Marshall plan.

Our American merchant marine serves a twofold purpose; in peace, for shipping—in war, for fighting, if we must.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, with the passage of the Foreign Assistance Act in April 1948, the United States embarked on a joint enterprise for the economic recovery of Europe. This was highly essential to stop the rapid spread of communism in western Europe and bring new hope to over 270,000,000 people. The condition was made, however, that the 19 European countries participating in the program should work together to bring western Europe into economic balance by 1952. Whether this will come about, only time can tell; but now that the program is over 1 year old, we have definite assurances that the free nations of Europe are on the way to partial recovery.

The ink was barely dry on the European Recovery Act, as passed by this Congress in 1948, when there were some immediate results. The Communists lost the elections in Italy, and now 1 year later it is an established fact that the

Communists have lost ground in every European nation where there is a free vote.

In the recent elections in France and Italy, the greatest Communist strongholds in western Europe, the Reds have just taken a terrific defeat at the polls. This is the direct result of the ECA program, and the improvement is to such an extent that Communist capture of power by ballot is practically impossible.

Despite these great gains, the European recovery job has just begun. This, Mr. Chairman, is the reason we are here today asking for the passage of H. R. 3748, which is a bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, to extend the European recovery program for an additional 15 months. This bill authorized an appropriation of \$1,100,000,000 for the period from April 3 to June 30, 1949, and \$4,280,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950. The committee held extensive hearings and heard many witnesses, both for and against this measure. But after 26 days the bill was reported from the committee by a unanimous vote. H. R. 3748 was amended in several places on the recommendations of members of the committee, the Administrator of ECA, and the State Department. The outstanding changes recommended were the language to encourage the unification and federation of Europe, the rewriting of the guaranty provision, the small-business amendment, Italian emigrant amendment, and modifying the wording defining the transportation costs. These additions should alleviate some of the difficulties previously encountered in the administration of this program, and they have all been discussed in detail by previous speakers.

I think the bill should pass this Congress for the full amount. The European recovery job has paid handsome dividends so far. We must hold the gains already made. Europe is moving ahead. It is our duty to help them. We are striving for peace, and those who are now seeking to reduce the Marshall-plan funds should reread the hearings, reports, and debates of last year's ECA program and then compare them with the progress made to date, and it would convince anybody that we made a good, sound investment. Communist conspiracy has been aimed at the world. We have been successful in turning the tide. The effort is great and we must not slacken in this great task.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING].

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, it puts a new Member in a rather peculiar position to follow such a powerful speaker as the one who just left the well of the House. It was a very fine speech. I had what I considered to be a fine prepared statement for presentation Saturday and expected to be called, but after listening to the very forceful arguments expressed here Saturday I was just a bit happy that I was not called. My statement lacked the fire of the very splendid speeches that were delivered here then, so I forsook the pleasure of talking to you at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the importance of this measure, and I also believe it would be to our national interest to support an amendment which I will offer to this bill. I want to say that I am heartily in favor of the great program that we are debating today, and I concur heartily, in the main, with all of the speeches that have been delivered here in support of the general program. I did not appreciate one speech which was made in opposition to this bill. It is my purpose here to call your attention to an amendment which I propose to submit later. If you will refer to the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A2148 and A2152, you will find a statement that I had prepared in connection with this important matter. Elsewhere in the Appendix there appeared some other material in support of my position. I know that this amendment which I am going to offer, which reinstates the 25 percent milling program or feature of the original act will have a tremendous impact upon the economy of our own country. I am sure that I will receive the support from many agricultural and farming communities, and from many other communities where the milling of wheat and the manufacture of flour are done. I know that we have had some speeches in reference to this matter in the past. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] mentioned the fact that we have a great deal of unity here, and I noticed that fact myself Saturday. It was like eating ice cream after eating sour pickles for 3 months. We were very harmonious here Saturday, and we are starting out that way today. It is a relief to a new Member who is not used to the gaff, let me say, to use that slang expression.

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

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

Mr. GORSKI of New York. May I add my sentiments to those expressed by the gentleman from Missouri. Coming from a district which is composed largely of a milling industry, Buffalo, N. Y., I have a large number of letters from management as well as labor in support of the amendment that will be introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING]. I want to say here that we in the city of Buffalo feel that if the bill is passed as it is drafted at the present time, it will eliminate jobs and put probably several thousand people out of employment. For that reason I want to state here that I am in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. IRVING. I fully appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I am quite certain I shall have support for the amendment from Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, and many of the other States that are interested in the manufacture of flour.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, when we enacted the Economic Cooperation Act a year ago many of us were interested particularly in the informational aspects of our assistance to Europe. America

was willing to help Europe. But it wished also that that help be recognized and acknowledged.

We wrote no special requirements into the act. One does not make acknowledgement and thanks a precondition for giving assistance to a friend. We trusted human nature in Europe to respond to the great effort which the United States was going to make in behalf of freedom and humanity. We rested on the assurance that if we ourselves made the information available in Europe, Europe would need no special obligation to get the word spread about that the United States was once again coming to the side of its sister nations across the Atlantic.

In the 3 weeks of hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we gave a good deal of attention to the results achieved along this line. All that we heard was encouraging.

We found that ECA has followed the practice of requiring the labeling with the ECA emblem of all goods and containers of goods procured with ECA funds—subject to exceptions, of course, for types of bulk commodities for which such a requirement is impractical.

We found that the office of the ECA Special Representative in Europe has established an alert, vigorous information program. This leads out to all the missions of the ECA participating countries—except for the minor countries or those participants receiving no direct aid. Each has an active, competent information staff which works closely with the information establishment of our embassy.

News about the Marshall plan is still the principal item on each day's presentation over our information network in Europe. It is still big news in the press of Europe. In the democratic press it is news—and in the Communist press as well. I suppose we should be just as glad for the denunciations of Marshall-plan aid in the Communist papers as we are for praise of Marshall-plan aid in the democratic press of Europe.

In summary, we can be sure that Europe is being adequately informed of Marshall-plan assistance.

What I want to ask is this question: Do we in America know well enough and appreciate fully what Europe is doing under the Marshall plan? There is a public relations duty for us as well as for the recipients of our assistance.

The most wonderful thing about the program to me is not simply that we have staked a few billion dollars on the production potential of Europe—and that our confidence has been justified. It is not the measurable, concrete story that is told in the indexes of the output of Europe's factories and mines, or the rate of investment, or the volume of traffic.

What impresses me most is that when we started this program we made a bet on human nature, and we are winning on that bet. Let us forget the notion that the Marshall plan is an undertaking in charity.

Its major premise is the self-respect of Europe. We are told that a continent, like a human being, can keep its self-respect only when it is living from the

product of its own labor. Secretary of State Marshall realized that when he first proposed this magnificent plan in his speech at Harvard, now almost 2 years ago.

The Marshall concept was that Europe, if given a chance to develop its way back to a self-sustaining basis, would respond. He believed in that hope strongly enough—and we believed in it strongly enough—to pledge ourselves to underwrite the deficit for the time being if the Europeans would make the attempt.

Let us keep constantly in mind that this is a recovery program. It is a program to help Europe recover a self-sustaining basis through the recovery of production, the enlargement of its trade, and the stabilization of its economy. It is a program also to permit Europe to recover its sense of the tradition of freedom, to help Europe regain its moral independence. Let us remember, in the consideration of the bill and of the appropriations to follow, that the great value of this program is that it provides enough to give Europe more than relief. It gives Europe a margin for recovery. It is this element in the program that has brought a response in spirit and a diligence in effort among the Europeans far beyond the measure of any of the preceding programs to assist the war-depleted countries.

Wherever men were free in Europe, they responded to the Marshall proposal. Wherever their governments have passed under the cloud of dictatorship, they have stayed away in envious aloofness.

The free men of Europe went to work. The flow of assistance in the Marshall plan gave an extra stimulus—but it has by no means been the sole source of energy and substance in the rehabilitation of Europe. The main source has been the men and women of Europe, responding to a new hope, meeting the challenge of an opportunity for a renewed self-respect.

We should honor them for it. We should congratulate ourselves, not for our charity, but rather for our insight in seeing that, despite the terrible ordeal of war and despair, the human values were left in Europe as a foundation on which to build.

Let us say a word of praise now for the British, who have so nobly sacrificed in their austerity plan to restore a self-sustaining basis in their economy.

Let us say a word of praise also for the French, who appear so surely to be finding the upward way after the years of dismay, defeat, occupation—and then the ordeal of battle in the liberation.

Let us say a word of praise for the Italians, who did not lose the instinct of freedom even in two decades of dictatorship, and who now again are walking in the complete friendly fellowship of the Atlantic world.

We might go on like this, naming each of the peoples with whom we are honored to be associated in this great experiment in hope and freedom.

Let us remember that the revival of trade between east and west Europe is a fundamental concept in the success of the Marshall plan. Europe's best hope is in the restoration of her unity—and

that restoration will come to pass when the grip of dictatorship over the eastern countries finally ceases.

In the Marshall plan we have made recovery and the revitalizing of democracy a factor of hope, not alone for western Europe but for eastern Europe as well. These peoples of eastern Europe, many of whom in the last 10 years have fought with such heroism for freedom and self-respect, have not forgotten all that they fought for then.

Let me quote a few words from British Foreign Secretary Bevin in his interview at the National Press Club here a week ago:

Do please remember that there are millions of people * * * in all countries who are only looking for the day when the curtain will be rent and the light can go through again.

The Marshall plan gives hope to them as well as to the peoples of western Europe.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, today the Committee on Foreign Affairs presents to the House H. R. 3748. This bill amends and extends title I of Public Law 473, Eightieth Congress. After weeks of extensive study and careful work on this bill, it has been unanimously reported out of the committee.

I am sure that most of you will agree with me that a problem of such magnitude as European recovery cannot be translated into a law that will entirely satisfy any Member of the House. We rightfully approach this problem as we approach any problem, from 435 individual viewpoints, none of which are exactly alike. I sincerely hope that action on this very vital and dynamic issue will be approached with open minds, seasoned with cool and deliberate judgment, adjusted with fairness, and resolved with wisdom.

NEED FOR DEBATE

I am sure none of us want to deny or restrict fair and honest debate for, after all, public discussion is one of the major foundation stones of democracy. Our discussion here today should and will help in making the best possible decision. Congressional action is and should be merely an official expression of public desire. Congressional action is an expression of the recognized needs of our time. In our deliberation here today let us keep in mind that it is much better to debate an issue without settling it than it is to settle an issue without debating it. I would have no part in unduly restricting debate and constructive criticism. Yet I hope that opposition to our nonpartisan foreign policy will not sink to the levels of thoughtless sniping. There will be the argument that we just cannot afford to spend so much money. The answer to this argument is that we cannot afford the consequences of not spending it. There will be the argument that the plan would not work. The answer to this is that the plan is working. There will be the argument that we are rebuilding our competitors for world business. The answer is that we are rebuilding our customers for an expanded world trade.

There are those who will say that we are merely pouring American dollars down European rat holes. The answer to that argument is that you cannot pour American dollars down any kind of a hole in any foreign country and make them stay there. American dollars or American dollar credit must come home or they lose their value. American dollars represent American goods and American services. American dollars must ultimately be spent in America for either American goods or American services. Every dollar going to any foreign country, either through loans or grants, or any other method, remains a dollar and will eventually buy only American goods or American services.

GENUINE WORLD CONCERN

There is today a greater and more widespread genuine interest in our foreign policy than ever before in the history of the Nation. Many reasons for this interest are quite obvious:

First. Two world wars in one generation.

Second. National spending for national defense.

Third. The cost of repairing the destruction of war.

Fourth. The impossibility of isolation from world-wide movements.

Fifth. The sobering responsibility that democratic world leadership is ours.

These reasons could be extended by any of you to great lengths.

DEMOCRACY IS IN DANGER

We would be fools indeed if we overlooked the basic fact that democracy and all it means to the free peoples of the world is very definitely challenged today. There are those who believe and are determined that democracy with its doctrine of individual dignity and freedom must be banished from the earth. The plain facts of life are obvious. The world is divided into conflicting camps. We find ourselves engaged in an old technique with a new name—"a cold war." Neither the struggle nor the issues over which we divide are new. The conflict is world-wide. Two world wars were merely two rounds in the bout. The conflict is between two opposite concepts of government. A compromise just is not in the cards. In my humble opinion, the conflict is a mortal struggle. The final outcome awaits a knock-out blow.

NATIONAL DEFENSE ESSENTIAL

The world situation today demands adequate national defense. Congress has and will continue to recognize and meet this need. We must continue to consolidate and expand the military strength necessary to protect and preserve our pattern of life. We accept as inevitable enormous expenditures to remain free. While I am not at all critical of our essential national-defense program, I must point out that national defense from the military point of view alone is a negative approach to security. In our attempt to survive we cannot and should not continue to depend entirely upon military strength to crush those who would destroy us. Such a course will eventually exhaust our strength at the expense of enduring security. What I am trying to

say is this: "Would it not be wise, while remaining strong, to share our pattern of abundance and devotion to freedom with all who will accept it?" It is my contention that it is cheaper, more pleasant and safer to make friends than to defeat enemies.

ECA IS THE FRIENDSHIP ROUTE TO STRENGTH

The European recovery program is just what its title suggests—a European recovery program. We should judge it and support it as a European recovery program. If we attempt to make ECA merely an American business venture or an outlet for surplus supplies, or a European relief program, we will most surely miss the bulls-eye. We must make ECA first, last, and in between, a recovery program. ECA must be made a recovery program dealing primarily with living, breathing, thinking, and appreciating average human beings. ECA is a recovery program designed to rebuild a war-wrecked economy. Out of the ruins a self-sustaining economy can be built—an economy in which the people may find some incentive to live. ECA, while insignificant in cost in comparison to the cost of war, may well mean the difference between the perpetuation or the end of democratic freedom. ECA is the friendly route to security and peace.

ECA, THE TECHNIQUE OF PEACE

Democracy and freedom must grow and expand by its efforts to maintain and promote peaceful relationships. War never solves any problem. By war, with its heavy toll, we force to submission those who would destroy us. It is marvelous how we will work with other nations to effectively prosecute the expensive, wasteful, and destructive tactics of war. We offer no objections to tangling alliances when an enemy is on our backs. Then we welcome and encourage the closest possible cooperation. We willingly submit, and rightfully so, to strenuous self-denial and exacting regulations to further a war effort. We gladly combine every possible interest and strain our economy almost to the breaking point to defeat an enemy on the field of battle. We and our democratic friends have thus won two world wars. We have learned the techniques of war. We win our shooting wars, but as yet, we have to master the techniques of peace. How long are we going to continue winning wars and throwing away peace? It is very disturbing that we bend every effort to defeat an enemy and refuse to give the necessary thought and attention to building the patterns of peace. Will we ever take the tumble that it would be much cheaper, far more pleasant, and certainly much safer to build for peace than to fight for existence through war. It should be a sobering thought that the entire expense of ECA, even if extended several years, might finance world war III for perhaps only a few hours. When are we going to realize the simple fact of life, that freedom cannot live on the battlefield? Freedom must live by practice of the techniques of peace. ECA is a major part of an inexpensive, happy, abundant, and powerful technique of peace.

ECA VERY TECHNICAL

A program so extensive and so dynamic as the European recovery program must necessarily be set up by legislation which is complex. It could not be written otherwise. It is a new technique in human relationships. The machinery to properly administer ECA is a worthy challenge. The thought, the concern, and the friendship written into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 is the marvel of a new age. The first year of its operation is an accomplishment of which we can be justly proud. This concerted effort to rebuild and expand confidence, hope, and friendship through operation peace has made a deep and permanent impression on a war-torn and weary world. Complicated though it is and although it would require hours, yes weeks, of study to really know the details, yet its results are quite obvious. Democratic nations are withstanding the onslaught of those determined on destruction, our own economy is reaching new heights, confidence and hope are again becoming realities in the hearts of men and Christian civilization is encouraged by the faint glow of a new dawn. Then let us not stumble or quarrel over the complexities of this new machine of friendship and peace; rather, let us marvel and rejoice at the smoothness, precision and sureness of its operation. We can very easily retard effective operation by unwarranted controversy. I sincerely hope that we will not obstruct the operation of this machine by magnifying unessential details. After all, it doesn't make too much difference whether the main wheel has 15 or 17 cogs so long as it turns in the direction of a free world.

OUR SOBERING OBLIGATION

Whether we like it or not, the obligation and responsibility of world leadership is ours. What we do, or perhaps what we fail to do, will tip the balance. The fact that we were the people who had the power, with the intelligence and will to use it, that won the last two wars is significant. We make no attempt and have no desire to scale down the contributions of our friends and allies to mutual victory. We know many of them suffered infinitely more than we did. Our irreparable loss of loved ones, together with the wrecked bodies of thousands of our veterans, is only a grim part of the widespread wreckage of civilization which only they who make up this hellish wreckage will ever know. As the leader in the shooting war we awake in victory to a greater leadership—not a leadership in destruction and hate, but a leadership in construction and love. We mastered the techniques of war and made the sacrifices and paid the bills necessary to implement those techniques. Shall we do less now? The task, the obligation, the challenge, is ours. The stakes are too high and the alternative is too grim to fall now. We have no choice but to master the techniques of peace and to make the sacrifices and to pay the bills necessary to implement those techniques. We, and our democratic allies, have won on the military battlefields of the world the privilege and opportunity of leading and directing

mankind in building a peaceful world based on friendship, abundance, and the dignity of a human being.

WE ARE THE ONLY HOPE

We are the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world today. Yes, we are the wealthiest and most powerful nation of all time. In sincere appreciation to Almighty God, we, in the depths of humility, should be the most friendly and most generous nation of all time. Surely the mind and will of divine providence is behind it all. Here we are on the winning side of the world's greatest tragedy with our Government intact, our country free from the physical wreckage of war, and our economy at an all-time high. We are the only nation that can befriend a wrecked humanity. We, as a nation, do have the bread of physical life to share. We, as a nation, have the means of production to share. We, as a nation, have wealth to share with those who need. We, as a nation, have the spirit of the Carpenter of Galilee to share with those who will accept it. Does this unique position carry no obligation? Have we no conscience? Yes, there is an obligation. Yes, we do have a conscience. Just about a year ago a grateful people, through action of their Congress in the enactment of a foreign-aid program, very quietly and without fanfare extended a hand of friendship to a starving world. By passage of this bill now before us we will further implement and further establish the role we are destined to play. Let us proclaim to the world in language that cannot be misunderstood our intention to extend the hand of friendship, encourage the arts of peace, and defend the concepts of freedom.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, (a) it is with a deep feeling of humility that I stand before you today to talk about one of the most important subjects of our time, the recovery program for Europe, which represents a positive, constructive part of our foreign policy and a heroic sacrifice on the part of the American people which has been an effective instrument in the interest of world peace.

(b) The older I get the more countries I see, and the more I learn the prouder I become of the fact that I am an American citizen. In these troubled times we have a great responsibility.

(c) I am proud to be a Member of the United States Congress, the greatest deliberative body in the world.

(d) It is an inspiration to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee, which has demonstrated a fine, wholesome, bipartisan spirit in fighting together for a friendly, fair, and firm approach to the peaceful solution of world economic and political problems.

(e) Our chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE, is truly one of God's noblemen, and the entire administrative and professional staff has given invaluable assistance in the preparation of this legislation.

II. WE MUST CONTINUOUSLY FIGHT FOR OUR FREEDOM

(a) Mr. Chairman, America has a great history, but since the beginning of the American Revolution, when we were first fighting to gain our freedom, we have always had to take calculated risks to protect it.

(b) In the American Revolution, George Washington took a calculated risk when he exposed Virginia to added dangers by moving her crack troops to defend other areas. Virginia needed those troops desperately, but George Washington was fighting for our entire country, and he won liberty for us all. It would have done no good for him to have saved Virginia and to have lost the country. Virginia could not have survived under such conditions.

(c) There is an obvious parallel today to the calculated risks taken by Washington, but on a much broader scale. In order to save American liberty again, it has become necessary to take the calculated risks of cracking our economy by helping the freedom-loving nations of Europe financially so they could become bulwarks of strength against dictatorship, atheism, and aggression.

(d) We could not stand by and see one country after another go the way of Czechoslovakia. Russia had already absorbed 15 sovereign nations.

(e) We could not take the even greater risk of waiting, because we could already see that the freedom-loving, God-fearing people of the world could easily become enslaved by the "dictated to" peoples of the world.

(f) To avoid this, then, the alternative to such a calculated economic risk was the great risk of a hot war and the sacrifice of American blood. By comparison, the cost of this program is small, indeed.

III. THE PROGRAM HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL

(a) We have been fortunate to have highly efficient and capable representatives serving us in the European recovery program. Mr. Paul Hoffman and all of his assistants are to be highly commended for the fine job they have done.

(b) We should continue this program because it is working. The great amount of political and economic unity in Europe at this time could not have been achieved if it had not been for our help and assistance. Europe's economy is more highly integrated today than it has ever been before. The political unity of countries which have never been together is on the verge of consummation.

(c) In the political field the two most important developments since the war have been the establishment of the Brussels treaty system or the western European union as it is sometimes called and the recently announced decision to establish a council of Europe.

(d) Last week we witnessed the signing of the Atlantic Pact. We have just recently read about the three powers agreement in Germany. Previous speakers have told you about the coordinated efforts to bring about reconstruction in Europe through the OEEC, the Benelux

Treaty, the Scandinavian trade agreements and the intra-European payment plans. Considering the historic independence and even antagonistic attitude of the nations involved, this unity is truly a remarkable testimony of the success of the program.

(e) The Marshall plan has given Europe life and hope. In this part of the world it has stopped Russia, a former ally that never quit preparing for war, never demobilized, and never matched our efforts for peace. To the contrary, she has broken over 50 agreements to date which threatens the security of the entire world.

IV. WE MUST CONTINUE THE ERP

(a) The most important thing for us to realize is the fact that there is no such thing as isolationism any more. This fall I took a trip to Europe and visited 11 countries and returned to the United States all within 4½ weeks. We just recently read about the Air Force plane, *Lucky Lady II*, circling the globe in 94 hours. We are living in each others' back yards today whether we like it or not and we are truly our brother's keeper.

(b) We simply cannot survive on a little green spot in this world today surrounded by a sea of misery, despair, corruption, hunger, and aggression. Under these conditions even if communism were not running wild, it would be some other ism and we would be in danger just the same.

(c) We must continue this program. It is the greatest effort that any nation in the world has ever made to help the suffering people of other nations and it is the most enlightened risk that America has ever taken to protect our freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth and fifth sentences of section 102 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 are hereby amended to read as follows: "Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to the countries of Europe, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through their joint organization to exert sustained common efforts to achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the unification and federation of Europe, and to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation: *Provided*, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: Page 2, line 3, before the word "unification", insert

the word "economic"; and in line 4, before the word "federation" insert the word "political."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may seem unnecessary. Some believe that the words of the bill as they were worked out in our committee already carry the same meaning that this amendment will give to them unmistakably; but I feel that further development of economic unification and political federation in Europe are so fundamental, such basic requirements for the success of this program that we are not being fair either with our own people and are being even less fair with the people in Europe whom we are trying to help to recovery unless we make perfectly clear what we believe the ultimate goal must be.

This program was started last year with the plain condition in the law that we would help only those countries that would cooperate economically with each other and with us. The bill last year stated this, and the language is strengthened in the present bill declaring that "it is the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through their joint organization to exert sustained common efforts to achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity." Thus we have already declared that we encourage them to achieve speedily that economic cooperation in Europe which we say flatly is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. Now, if it is proper for us to say that it is essential that there be economic cooperation in Europe, why should we not go ahead to say, if that is our view, that we want to encourage the economic unification and political federation of Europe.

Almost every witness before our committee, of whom we inquired about this matter, testified that Europe would not attain permanent recovery by 1952, so that these nations would be able to stand on their own feet unless they move rapidly in the direction of greater economic unification and political federation. Why do I thus separate the two? Because they are not the same. Look at our own country. In my State, Minnesota, we have great deposits of iron ore and one of the greatest sources of our State's wealth and high standard of living is our iron ore; but the iron ore would be of no benefit unless we were able to get it together with coking coal. Now, where is the kind of coal that is necessary to turn this ore into steel? It is in West Virginia, 1,000 miles away. Fortunately, under our system, the ore from Minnesota and coal from West Virginia can get together in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, and Gary without going through customs barriers, changes in currency, and without waste, delay, and confusion at each.

The main reason our country is in a position to help the nations and people of Europe is not because we are smarter than they are; we are not, we are of the same stock. It is not because we have greater resources under our control than they have; we do not. It is not primarily

because we have been spared the physical destruction of two great wars, although that is part of the picture. The main reason is because our forefathers developed a system whereby we have 48 federated political units and at the same time we are one unified economic unit. How many of the 48 States could be prosperous if they insisted on being completely separate economic units? Probably most could exist, but many could not be even self-sustaining, and none could be prosperous. The source of our great prosperity has been our success in welding the States into a single economic unit.

Likewise, in Europe, if those countries are to get on their feet and become self-sustaining and strong, they must move steadily in the direction of becoming an economic unit, that is, in the direction of breaking down trade barriers of all sorts. They have already made real progress, for example, the Benelux customs union, and probably still more important, the recent treaty between France and Italy, and also the case of the three Scandinavian countries.

No one expects either economic unification or political federation to be achieved overnight; we are perfectly aware of the problems involved and the difficulties. I do not suggest that we impose this as a condition but make it rather as a recommendation. We do not say, "You must do this or we will cut off our aid," for the far-seeing leaders of those countries have to work them out by degrees. But we can help those leaders, and we should, by expressing to them frankly our sincere conviction that they should work in this direction, and encourage them to move as rapidly as possible toward further economic unification and political federation. Some of the strongest and the ablest men in Europe have told us off the record that they would welcome this amendment because it would strengthen their hands when they go to their people or their domestic interests or to their Parliament and urge them to accept and work for closer association and integration with their neighbors. That is pretty hard for them to do because their political opponents promptly get up and charge, "You are more interested in other countries than you are in your own country." But if they can say that the people of the United States have declared it is their policy to encourage such economic unification and political federation, their hand is greatly strengthened. They need this official expression of the conviction of the American people that in order for this great mutually beneficial effort to succeed, they must move as rapidly as possible toward "the economic unification and the political federation of Europe," that language makes crystal clear what we think is necessary.

It is not imperialism, but kindness, when a doctor out of his experience tells his patient what he believes the patient must do in order to recover.

I hope this amendment will be accepted without serious opposition.

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] was offered in committee, and it was examined by the members of the committee from every angle. In order to understand the meaning of the amendment, in order to understand what it will do, not only to this program, but what it will do in respect to the policy enunciated by our country in the original act, it is necessary for us to explain the objectives of this bill, not the political objectives, for we have none. It is our policy to pledge to the participating nations that we have no desire whatever to enforce or to inflict our political advice or requirements upon European countries.

The people of the United States have no desire whatever, no wish or no intention to interfere with the politics or the political objectives of any of these European countries. In all of our legislation with respect to this matter we avoid the use of the term "political" because each one of the countries is a separate sovereign country and all of them are entitled to their sovereignty. We have no disposition by this act or by any other act upon the part of this country to interfere with that sovereignty or to disturb their political equilibrium.

What did we declare in the original act to be our policy? Let me read:

It is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries through a joint organization to exert sustained common efforts as set forth in the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation signed at Paris on September 22, 1947, which will speedily achieve that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. It is further declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence in Europe through assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation.

If that does not set forth in clear, explicit language a sufficient policy upon the part of this country, I do not see how the language could be made stronger. Yet, the gentleman wants to insert the words "political federation" and "economic unification." We have already declared we are in favor of federation and unification, but he wants to insert the word "political." I say we have no desire or no intention whatever of interfering with the politics of those countries or in anything political about their organization or their set-up.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I feel rather reluctant to take the floor today and say anything about this legislation after the statement was made by the minority subchairman of the committee that all Democrats are for the bill, all the Republicans are for the bill and all the Dixiecrats are for the bill, leaving the inference at least that

any one who opposes this bill in any way whatever would be ostracized from his political party. Or in fact he might be considered as not being a good American—even an outlaw. If that be so I accept the challenge and assume the responsibility, but I am against this legislation and I want everybody to know it. I am a Republican and I expect to be a Republican until they kick me out, because I believe in America and Americanism and I am an American individual. But, when I read the first paragraph of the legislation, after it makes a statement about what the legislation is going to do, I note this:

Provided, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

I say that this legislation does impair the economic stability of the United States. That is the reason I am against the bill, and I say it puts us in such a position that we, as a country, are going to fail, go into bankruptcy, if we keep on doing the things we are doing under legislation such as you are now bringing before the Congress.

What have we done toward aiding and assisting those foreign countries? Let us just review them a little bit. We have given over \$64,000,000,000 to these countries under lend-lease; what did we get for that—you gave \$24,000,000,000 to foreign countries after the war effort up until VJ-day and the advent of the Marshall plan; last year you gave them about \$7,000,000,000 under this plan with an obligation implied of ten billion more. Now in this bill you are asking for \$5,653,000,000. Well, let us just see how the economic stability of the United States is going to stand that. Here is the Treasury statement of April 4, and it shows that we are in the red \$251,553,000,000. You have gone in the red this year—and June 30th will soon be here—\$2,566,290,756.24. Too bad, then the President of the United States comes in here in January and he says he wants to do this: He wants bigger old-age pensions, more pay for the idle, higher minimum pay, to pay all medical bills of the people of this country, pay for the sick, new taxes, build homes at less than cost. Federal aid for schools, electric power at less than cost, lower rents for tenants, bigger Government aid in the West, bigger price supports for farmers, bigger Government subsidies, higher wages, lower prices, and what not.

Now if you are going to get all of that for the people of the United States and then assume the responsibility of all the people of all the nations of the world, God help America, because this Congress is only wrecking our American economy. This Congress is going to wreck America, and I just defy anybody to say that it is not, for in 5 years from now, if you keep on going the way you are, Joe Stalin will have easy pickings over here in America, because you will be wrecked and you will not even be able to take care of your own people. I stand here fighting the things that this committee is trying to do. I stand here fighting for America. I stand here fighting because I believe in Amer-

ica, but I know well and true enough that you cannot do what you gentlemen are trying to do. I think it is just simply outright silly, and that is my opinion of this legislation. You signed the Atlantic Pact last week. It will not be but a few weeks until this same committee will be in here and they will be wanting more than a billion dollars to arm all the countries that signed this pact, and you will be asked for a billion dollars for Greece and Turkey and all the other countries of the world to arm them. What are you doing? Destroying America?

The cold war now going on has cost us billions already, and for the following years the State Department wants for the cold war the following:

1948.....	\$4,498,000,000
1949.....	7,700,000,000
1950.....	11,601,000,000
Total.....	23,799,000,000

You talk peace and prepare for war. Not only do you spend annually over \$15,000,000,000 developing our own war machine, you build up a war machine in every country of Europe. Europe has had enough war, and they got us into two of them. This action will probably involve us in a third world war. It is terrible to contemplate. Talk peace, yet prepare for war—prepare all Europe for war. It will surely be a hot war when you get them all ready for war. It will cost us so much money that our taxpayers cannot stand the strain on our economy. To me this is just silly. Certainly it is not sound.

Every time you spend a billion dollars it costs every man, woman, and child in America \$7. Multiply that by 7, and this legislation costs each individual \$49 for this bill alone, or for a family of six almost \$300 each. How many families can stand it? Certainly none of them, if called upon to put up the money, would want to do it. This bill is unsound in principle. It might have the right motive—but people have a good motive—but the results will be most disastrous. That is my judgment of the legislation, and I am opposed to it.

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

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, in my humble judgment the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives is one of the finest bodies in our great House. I am reluctant to deviate from the great work which they have done in any respect. I consider myself one of the strongest supporters of the Marshall plan. I very deeply feel, however, the fundamental issue involved in this amendment.

Some of you will undoubtedly recall that I offered the same amendment about this same time last year. That amendment was debated here during the closing hours on the bill, and upon the basis of a very impassioned address made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] who at that time was in charge of the legislation on the floor, the amendment was defeated.

Some time ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] came to me—and I think I am at liberty to say this, because I read it in the New York Times—and told me that he had made a mistake in opposing the amendment which was offered at that time.

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

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I am a Methodist, and we of my faith believe in the mourners' bench. The gentleman attempted to put in the words "and unity" last year. I opposed him. I was wrong. In the committee I offered an amendment to put in the words "and unity," but the committee changed the words to "unification" and added the word "federation." I feel that I have shown my repentance in joining the gentleman in getting into the bill substantially the same words he offered last year. He was right.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate his statement.

I think the committee has done a very constructive thing in endorsing in principle in the preamble to this bill the fundamental concept of federation in Europe. I have followed this debate as carefully as I can. I believe practically all of us are convinced that unless we have peoples who are free and allies who are willing to stand by us in this terrific struggle which is now in effect throughout the world our own Nation can have no hope of survival. I think, too, that it can be said without too much fear of contradiction that the Marshall plan in essence contemplates the combined resources of a free Europe working together toward the defeat of Communist aggression.

The language the committee has now incorporated in the proposed legislation, in which the idea of federation and unification is endorsed, is important and vital language because, in my humble opinion, without unification, without federation in Europe, without the free nations' working together economically and politically, this program cannot succeed.

The distinguished chairman of this committee has made the point that by the insertion of the word "political" we may somehow or another give the impression throughout free Europe that we are interfering with the sovereignty and the basic rights of the peoples of the 16 participating nations of Europe.

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

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. Is not that exactly what the Communists are accusing us of doing in their fight against this program?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I am very glad the gentleman made that point because I intended to make the identical point. The Communists now all over Europe are saying that the Marshall plan is designed as a plan of American imperialism, whereby we will absorb the sovereignty of all those great independent nations of Europe.

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

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, all over Europe today the charge is being made by the Communists that the Marshall plan interferes with the sovereignty of the free nations of Europe, so that by the addition of the word "political" we add nothing new to the Soviet charge. The free people know that these charges are not true.

By inserting this language we do this—and in my judgment, it is vitally important—we give encouragement to those forces working in Europe now for unification and federation. Believe me, those forces are vital and important. You know what they have already done. They met last May at The Hague. They met again in September at Interlaken in Switzerland, and I had the privilege of attending that meeting. Again, at the Interparliamentary Union meeting in Rome last fall the first welcoming words by the Italian Foreign Minister were that Europe must unite or perish.

All the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota does is to say in the preamble that, as a matter of hope or as an expression of desire, without interfering with the workings locally of the governments of Europe, the United States of America hopes there can be economic and political cooperation throughout the 16 participating nations.

Certainly no Member of this body can deny that without political cooperation the Marshall plan cannot succeed. If the Marshall plan does not succeed, then we have wasted billions and billions of the American taxpayers' dollars, and we have run the risk of a third world war.

No matter that will come before this body could be of more importance. Without a federation in Europe, without that ancient dream of all political factions in Europe, which are devoted to free government, whether they be socialist or conservative, whether they be of the free left or free right, they have united on the fundamental concept that the combined economic resources of Europe must be worked out by political cooperation.

I understand this amendment simply puts the Congress on record as favoring, in principle, that vital concept. As a matter of fact, every important American leader, regardless of his political faith, and practically every segment of the American press, and all of our great organs of opinion, have endorsed this principle.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am in a peculiar position with reference to this amendment. I think the words "economic and political" are inherent in the words "unification and federation" that we have al-

ready put in the bill. I would be most disappointed if, by a vote against these words, the House would appear to go on record as being against such unification and federation. The meaning of those words, it seems to me, cannot be denied. If "unification and federation of Europe" does not mean "economic and political unification and federation," then what does it mean? The gentleman from Minnesota, it seems to me, has neglected that old "adage," "If at first you do succeed, do not try again."

The gentleman from Minnesota got in the word "federation" in committee. I helped him and the gentlewoman from California helped him, and altogether we got this language in, which is a great step forward. Last Saturday, when few of you were here, I said this:

As events unfold and develop, it is becoming increasingly clear that without increased unification in Europe, economically and politically, the Marshall plan is "operation rat hole."

Here is what Paul Hoffman said—and you will find it in the hearings, as well as on page 11 of our report:

The material well-being of the people of Europe cannot be obtained if each country tries to work out its own salvation along separate nationalistic lines.

Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree with the sentiments given here by the gentleman from Louisiana, and the gentleman from Minnesota. I am deeply concerned, however, that this attempt to gild the lily by adding words which imply that unification and federation mean something else from what we all think they mean, will be misconstrued.

If this amendment is voted down it will be construed to indicate an intention on the part of the House which I do not think the House wishes to express. I am, therefore, perfectly willing to support the amendment, but if it is voted down, it should be made clear that it is because that expression is already inherent in the bill and not because we are opposed to unification and federation of Europe.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Why does the gentleman think that it is against the will of the House and that it would not be an expression of our will?

Mr. VORYS. I am concerned that the words being offered here have the same meaning which is inherent and implicit in the words "unification and federation." If the amendment is voted down, it might be implied that the House does not mean what those words obviously mean.

Mr. GAVIN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] definitely expresses what he wants to bring about in effecting this economic cooperation and federation.

Mr. VORYS. That is right. My point is that whether this amendment is voted up or down, the meaning is implicit in the bill that we have reported from the committee. I do not know how I can make it any clearer.

Mr. BREHM. There is no harm in blessing the Ten Commandments, is there?

Mr. VORYS. I am perfectly willing to vote for the amendment, but my concern is, and I saying it for the record, and for the conference, that if the vote goes against it, the House action is not thereby interpreted as attempting to strike out the ordinary meaning of the words "unification and federation," which the gentleman from Minnesota has been so helpful in placing in this bill at this time.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring out an angle that perhaps has not been brought out in connection with this amendment. If the amendment means what I think it means, I think it is a rather dangerous thing to encourage economic unification of Europe if that economic unification is in opposition to the economic development of the United States. I represent that section in California in which most of the motion pictures of the world are produced. If there is one industry in the United States that has been seriously affected by the curtailment of production of pictures in Great Britain, or the denial of the showing of American films in Great Britain, it is Hollywood. The Hollywood unemployment situation is back to what it was in 1937. This is no small industry; it runs into millions of dollars.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Not at this point. Negotiations have been attempted to adjust the situation. Great Britain still maintains that she wants 45 percent of the showings of British pictures in Great Britain to the denial of American films. The American motion-picture industry cannot break even without 30 percent of the foreign market, and the market has been dried up to the point where unemployment in the motion-picture industry, as I said, is back to what it was in 1937. This is not a policy that is agreeable to the people of Great Britain; it is a policy that is even opposed in the House of Parliament. I have statements here that I will include in my remarks from various members of Parliament that show that this is a denial of the freedom of exchange of motion pictures that heretofore has existed between Great Britain and the United States, and is hurting the British film industry.

If we are going to say beyond what the bill already says by amending it to read "to encourage the economic unification of European countries," are we going to say that they should unite for the purpose of affecting our wool industry, our fishing industry? Both have already been seriously affected by the last appropriations that we made for ECA, and who knows what will be the next industry of the United States to be seriously affected?

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. Not at this time. I will yield later if I get some extra time.

The Motion Picture Producers Association at the present time is trying to negotiate with the State Department for the purpose of adjusting this difficulty in the showing of films in Great Britain. I voted against the British loan in spite of appeals on the part of many, many heads of the motion-picture firms. They told me that some \$87,000,000 was in the Bank of England that was due them and that loan would release the money. I told them at that time that the British loan would cost them more than \$87,000,000 in the long run.

It did not produce the money; as a matter of fact, there are millions of dollars now frozen in Great Britain, dollars that belong to the American motion-picture industry. It is being held in Great Britain.

I do not like this language, if it is going to mean that we are to encourage economic unification of Europe to the detriment of the economic development of the United States.

I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. How will the people of Europe, Great Britain, or any other country, be able to buy the products of the Hollywood motion-picture industry unless they have dollars with which to pay for them? And how can they get the dollars without the economic recovery which can come only through greater unification?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I do not yield further, Mr. Chairman. I have noted that when Great Britain establishes a policy of trade restrictions it is the signal for every other country in Europe to follow a like policy. When Great Britain establishes a policy, immediately all the countries in the sterling bloc take similar action.

Mr. JUDD. Is the gentleman willing to accept pounds sterling, or francs in payment for the products of the motion picture industry, or does he want to get dollars? And how without a coordinated development of their resources and an improvement of their economic situation are they going to be able to get the dollars the gentleman wants paid to his industries?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am greatly concerned lest the pound sterling supplant the American dollar as the standard of exchange and whether we are not some of these days going to be asking for pounds sterling instead of American dollars.

Mr. JUDD. May I remind the gentleman that one of the three purposes of the original act as passed last year was: (3) facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But not to the detriment of the economic development of the United States, and that is what is happening.

Mr. JUDD. This is precisely what is needed to help the economic development of the United States.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Is the gentleman making a speech against the bill or against the amendment?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Against the amendment if it encourages their development to the point that it is against the economic interests of the United States.

The United States has always been a completely free market for motion pictures, wherever made. There have been no limitations on imports and no restrictions on the exhibition of foreign films in this country.

As a medium of expression like the press, the radio, periodicals and books, the motion picture should have the widest opportunities for exchange among the peoples of the world.

An entirely contrary point of view prevails in many other areas of the world, notably in Great Britain, which has adopted various restrictive devices discriminating against American films.

This British policy has been stepped up constantly in intensity since the war.

In August 1947 the British Government imposed a 75-percent tax on the estimated earnings of foreign motion pictures. This was obviously aimed at American films which traditionally supplied about 80 percent of the British market. This confiscatory tax forced American motion picture companies to halt shipments of films to Britain because the tax meant they could do business in Great Britain only at a great loss.

The tax was a device imposed on top of a quota system whereby 20 percent of playing time in British theaters was reserved for British-made films. Even this 20-percent quota could not be fulfilled by the British film industry, because there were numerous defaults by British theaters.

The official reason advanced by the British for the 75-percent tax was the necessity to conserve its supply of dollars.

The American industry was, of course, aware of Britain's dollar problem. On many occasions, the American industry expressed its willingness publicly to work out with the British Government an arrangement which would accomplish two results:

First. To conserve dollars for Britain through a voluntary limitation of remittances by American companies.

Second. To assure Britain an adequate supply of films to keep its theaters open and operating in order to meet the entertainment needs of the British public.

With the 75-percent tax throwing the entire British motion-picture industry into an economic tailspin, the British Government invited representatives of the American industry to come to London in the winter of 1948 to discuss a film agreement to accomplish these two purposes.

Such an agreement was made in March of 1948. Under its terms, the 75-percent tax was abandoned, and the American industry agreed to limit its remittances from Great Britain to \$17,000,000 annually. This was a considerable sacrifice for the American industry, for it meant that approximately three-fourths of its earnings had to remain in Great Britain.

On both sides of the Atlantic the agreement was regarded as a mutually satisfactory accord.

Under its terms, the agreement was to become effective in June of 1948, and it was felt that a new era of mutual understanding and better relations was to begin.

This hope was short-lived. Hardly had the agreement gone into effect when the British Government adopted another drastic restriction on American films.

The 20-percent quota was raised to 45 percent. This was done at the insistence of British producers, even though they had not been able to meet a quota less than half that figure.

What was the effect? It undermined confidence in the whole British film industry, brought protests from the exhibitors who relied on American pictures for their theaters, caused studios to be shut down, and threw thousands of people out of work.

In spite of the chaos in the British industry resulting from the 45-percent quota, the British Government's answer is to propose now to reduce the quota by only 5 percent. This is obviously a meaningless gesture and removes neither the cause of the British industry's crisis nor the discrimination against American films.

Following are the views and opinions of several members of the British House of Commons who do not agree with the restrictive policy of the Attlee government against American-made motion pictures.

During debate in the House of Commons on March 30, Tom O'Brien, member for West Nottingham, spoke against the excessive quota out of his long and intimate knowledge of motion picture conditions as general secretary of the largest British film trade union—the National Association of Theatrical and Kine Employees. He said:

In the field of entertainment there is one thing that even our friends, the Russians, have failed to do. They have succeeded in everything else, but they have failed to make their own people, and the people in countries they control, see films they do not like, even at the point of a gun. We cannot make people see films they do not want to see—no quota, whether high or low, will succeed in doing that. If we wish to have a successful British film industry, and to maintain and expand it, we must do it on quality. Quality does not mean extravagance, waste, and unnecessary costs. We must not aim at an arithmetical quota merely to satisfy ourselves that we have a 40 to 45 percent quota of films—which people do not want to see. We must satisfy ourselves: first, that the quota can be met and that what is made is good; second, that the pictures will commend themselves by their own merit; third, that finance is available to stand up to the quota.

I am not convinced, and a considerable section of informed opinion in the industry and country is not convinced, having regard to what has happened during the past year, that finance is available, or will become available, to meet a 40 percent quota. * * *

It is my own view as well as that of other people that this 40 percent quota will create further unemployment. * * *

We cannot keep our cinemas open for many years to come with British films alone even if every studio in this country were fully occupied and were producing first-class films. This is an accepted fact which the board of

trade (government agency which recommended the quota) will not deny. Whether we like it or not, we have to have American films. * * * We should apply our minds, as a long-term solution, to making arrangements or to trying to re-open the matter in some way to avoid a quota.

Oliver Lyttelton, member for Aldershot, mentioned the feeling prevalent among British exhibitors that their interests had been neglected in respect to the quota, and spoke of their being "extremely perturbed about the quality of British films which are being produced under a quota which they think is unduly high." He said:

From what I gather myself about the industry, the effect of fixing the 45 percent quota has undoubtedly been to give some substance to the fears about the quality of British production which, I think, have been formed as a result of fixing too high a quota.

Mr. Lyttelton reviewed the agreement concluded in March 1948, between the American industry and the British Government by which the American industry voluntarily agreed for a temporary period, ending in June 1950, to limit drastically its dollar remittances as a means of assisting the British economy. He said:

A great mistake was made at that time, because immediately after the agreement had been concluded the quota was put at 45 percent without any previous consultation at all with the Americans. * * * Whether rightly or wrongly—that question really does not arise—it infuriated American opinion; they thought they had not been treated on the square. * * *

It is clear that the industry is in great jeopardy and the first step to take is to secure the cooperation of those (the Americans) who are as much hit as we are in trying to clear up the mess.

Sir Ian Fraser, member for Lonsdale, said:

Exhibitors in different parts of a considerable area of the northwest of England tell me they cannot fulfill a quota of 45 percent. They say they cannot fulfill a quota of 40 percent. Therefore, they visualize that they will have to commit, if not a felony, at any rate a misdemeanor or an offense, if the law says they are to do it. They tell me that they have tried to comply with the law. They have been willing to show good films, indifferent films, and bad films, and they have shown films over and over again, but they still cannot fulfill the law.

Neil Maclean, member for Govan Glasgow, said:

The particular quota which has been established and which now, according to the president of the board of trade, should be reduced in its percentage is, in my opinion, still too high.

As a matter of fact, the 40 percent which he is now suggesting is in defiance of the recommendations of the organization which he himself set up, the Cinematograph Films Council. That council recommended a 33½-percent quota. The president wishes to impose a 40-percent quota instead of the 45-percent quota that presently exists. In so doing, I consider that he is acting in defiance of the council that he set up and to which he looks for advice and guidance in what he is to do with regard to the cinema industry. They gave him advice which he now recognizes as partly correct by the reduction he is now proposing, but he will not go the full distance.

Edgar Granville, member for Eye, said:

I have said repeatedly when discussing this problem that any attempt to try and build up our film industry on parochial lines will fail, whether the quota be 40 percent or 45 percent. Films are international. I should have thought that the party opposite, with its international outlook on all matters of culture and recreation, would have been the first to admit that. At this late hour I appeal to the right honorable gentleman (president of board of trade) to get together with the United States and any other interests and let us have an international agreement which will give the production side of the industry in this country the first real opportunity it has had for 20 years.

William Shepherd, member for Bucklow, said:

We have to consider, in discussing this question of a 40-percent quota, whether it will make for a reconciliation between the American interests and the British interests, because that is paramount at the present time. If we pursue a course which is antagonistic to our American friends, the industry in this country will never really get on its feet.

I suggest that this quota, although it is reduced from 45 percent to 40 percent, is perhaps not best calculated to achieve that end. I hope that the president of the board of trade will do all that he can in the next 2 or 3 months to try to get some agreement with our American friends.

What is happening now is damaging to the interests of both the American and the British industries.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment if it means to encourage the economic development of Europe to the detriment of our own economic progress and prosperity, especially when they are using our American dollars to stop our own industry and increase our unemployment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, harmless as the amendment may sound, it has within it dangerous implications. It was presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and considered very carefully, and it was voted down by the considered judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House on a nonpartisan basis. After all, it should be kept in mind that this so-called Marshall plan is the cornerstone of American foreign policy. Because our money is being spent in Europe does not mean that the European nations themselves have no pride.

I should like to read for the committee the statement of Mr. Harriman when the same subject was raised while he was before the committee. Mr. Harriman said with regard to inserting conditions similar to the one in the amendment:

I think you are treading in a very dangerous field. These are mature and sovereign nations with widely different types of organization, economic organizations and systems. I do not believe we could accomplish what ought to be accomplished if conditions are laid down in this field. Suggestions, advice? Yes. Discussions and argument? Yes; but not conditions.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. That is not the amendment. This would not impose a condition. It is simply a suggestion or advice.

Mr. RIBICOFF. No; it is a type of advice where you seem to be telling Europe what to do. I may say to the gentleman from Louisiana that one of the main propaganda points that the Communists make against the Marshall plan is upon the theory that Uncle Sam with his dollars is trying to tell all of Europe and all of the world what to do. If we tell Europe when or how or why they should unite, we are treading on European sovereignty and playing right into the hands of the Communists. I want to point out to the gentleman that the European recovery plan itself is leading to the unification of Europe.

Let me point out also that we have Benelux, where Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg have already united. You have also seen formed recently a customs union between France and Italy. If there will be patience with the OEEC you will eventually accomplish what you desire in this direction. I think the Members of the House must realize that in a program like this we must be patient and not try to force upon the European nations our own conception of how they ought to govern themselves.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. May I ask the gentleman, does he agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorvys], that the words "unification" and "federation" imply political and economic?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes. I believe that is the ultimate object we are seeking.

Mr. SMATHERS. May I ask the further question then, what possible objection could the gentleman have to it?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Because by putting in "economic" and "political" we seem to be placing ourselves in the position of telling European nations what we expect them to do. May I say to the gentleman also that France, England and Belgium have as much pride in their nations as the gentleman from Florida and all of us in the United States have in our Nation. Unification, economic and political, will take time and should not be forced upon Europe because we of the United States are giving our dollars to help European recovery.

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. Unless we definitely specify certain conditions, how long does the gentleman think the economy of this country can stand the \$5,000,000,000 appropriation every year?

Mr. RIBICOFF. All I can say to the gentleman is that this is a keystone in our American foreign policy and if we do not spend this money for European recovery it will cost us many more dollars in the future to stop communism by ourselves. We are asking these countries for assistance too and I think it

should be kept in mind that we have a great fight going on between Russia and America. This fight is based upon the sinews of production. If Russia should be able to take over the European recovery so that all productive capacity of Europe is incorporated under the Russian system, it would be equivalent to the industrial economy of America. That is one of the basic reasons we are stopping the Russian march to take over western Europe.

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

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

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that we gave Russia \$11,000,000,000 not long ago in lend-lease with the idea of trying to help Russia? Now what are we trying to do? You will find out we are doing the very same thing here that we did to Russia a year ago.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In reply to the gentleman may I say that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER], handled that argument very well last Saturday when he said that if the \$11,000,000,000 were not given to Russia it would have meant the lives of many hundreds of thousands of additional American boys on the beachheads of Europe. I would suggest reading the Record of Saturday.

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I simply desire to call the attention of the Chairman to the fact I would like to be heard briefly on this matter.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to observe that the committee took all the time in general debate, and some of us would like at least 5 minutes to correct certain of the erroneous conclusions that were stated here on this floor.

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

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the sky is going to fall whether or not this amendment is adopted. As a matter of fact, the committee very carefully considered this amendment. Members from both sides of the aisle were in favor of the purpose of the amendment, but the great majority of the committee came to the conclusion that it was not a wise thing to do. I think it was Apostle Paul

who centuries ago said: "All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient." Now, of course, we agree that it would be both lawful and wise that Europe politically unify itself, but whether it would be expedient for the Congress of the United States to say that Europe must or should do this thing is a different matter. It was not a question of whether the committee was in favor or against the political unification of Europe. It was a question of whether or not we could better accomplish the purpose of political unification of Europe by leaving the word "political" in the bill, or taking it out.

We came to the conclusion that the best thing to do was to leave it out. As a matter of fact, Mr. Harriman warned us about it; Mr. Hoffman warned us about it. So far as I am concerned, I do not care what Russia thinks about what we write into this bill. The question that concerns me is whether we defeat our purpose by putting the words in there.

The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Louisiana have indicated that the amendment broadens the provisions of the bill as regards European unification. But as a matter of fact may I call to your attention that those words are not broadening. They may be construed as a limitation.

What does it say in the bill before us? "To encourage unification and federation of Europe." The amendment proposes to say not all kinds of unification; it just says economic unification, and when it comes to federation of Europe, everybody knows when we talk about federation we mean economic federation, political federation, and spiritual federation. But the amendment proposes only political federation. It not only is unwise from the standpoint of the declared purposes of this bill, but the committee overwhelmingly thought it would be unwise from the standpoint of the effect it would have upon Europe.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think the gentleman is making a very excellent statement. It is my understanding, however, that the legislation as presented to this body has the word "economic" in it, does it not?

Mr. RICHARDS. No; it does not.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Oh, yes.

Mr. RICHARDS. No; it does not.

Mr. VORYS. Not at this point.

Mr. RICHARDS. No; it does not.

Mr. JUDD. In line 1.

Mr. RICHARDS. Wait a minute. I am talking about the preamble of this bill. It says, "To encourage unification and federation of Europe." It does not say economic federation and it does not say political federation, but it means those things without saying them. The statement the gentleman is talking about, economic federation, is in another place in the bill.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. On page 2, at the top of the page, I read: "To achieve speedily that economic federation of Europe."

Mr. RICHARDS. Oh, that is correct. That is all through the bill, but I am talking about section 1 which the amendment seeks to modify.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I think the gentleman is making a very fine statement, and it was proposed last year that if we struck out the word "economic" it would not be necessary to insert the word "political," but it is my conviction that if you insert "economic" then you ought to insert "political."

Mr. RICHARDS. I just want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the words that the gentleman from Minnesota proposes to put in here will not accomplish the purpose he wants. He says that he wants to broaden and clarify the purposes of this act.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. That is correct.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am amazed at the debate here. It seems to me that the words "unification" and "federation" are the greater.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly the greater always includes the lesser, and putting the words "economic" and "political" in there are the lesser.

Mr. RICHARDS. Exactly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Furthermore, I am very fearful that the words "economic" and "political" are going to be words of limitation. There are many factors that will bring about unification and federation other than economic and political; many factors outside of that enter into it. It seems to me that the intent of the Congress and the intent of the committee is being limited by the use of these words, because it says "economic and political" and eliminates all other factors that are essential outside of economic and political. The state of mind and many things enter into bringing about unification and federation. It seems to me that these are words of limitation, and for that reason it would be unwise for the Committee to adopt the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. The majority leader is undoubtedly correct. They are words of limitation. I think it would be unwise to put them in here.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be voted down.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment. I wish someone would take some of my time, briefly, to tell me what can enter into these negotiations that is not either economic or political. I think the majority leader has referred to a state of mind that might exist. Show me a state of mind in Europe today that is not based on either economics or politics.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will yield if the gentleman wants to answer that question.

Mr. VORYS. I merely want the RECORD to show that no one attempted to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think there is any answer to the question except that these matters are all simply economic or political.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman recall that the only time Europe was ever united was under the church in the Middle Ages?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is correct. I do not know of any church that is not based on either economics or politics, along with the spiritual theories it advocates. If you know of any that is not based on that, tell me about it.

This proposition has been sold to the American people on the basis that the program would bring about the economic unification of Europe and straighten out some of the politics over there so that those governments could get along together.

I also think it is high time that those in charge of the policy of administering these appropriations should put some limitations on them. I have never been in favor of the burden being placed on our taxpayers and bond buyers. The bond buyers support the deficits and the taxpayers furnish the money to balance the budget.

I have never been in favor of those burdens being passed along to them because there has been such loose, extravagant use of the money and such unaccountability. I have never been satisfied with the results of the Marshall plan or the Truman Doctrine appropriations because I have never felt that the administration of those funds had very much respect for the burden imposed on the people who were paying the taxes and buying the bonds.

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

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

Mr. RICH. In the last sentence of the first paragraph it is stated that no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States. Does the gentleman believe this legislation in any way, with the other legislation that has been granted to help these countries, will impair the economic stability of the United States?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it has impaired the economic stability of the United States, but this yardstick comes up: Has it impaired it as much as it would if you did not have the plan? That is what we are up against and there is no satisfactory answer to that question. Suppose you do away with this plan, liquidate the Marshall plan, the Truman Doctrine, and all that goes with it, and kiss it good-bye and quit, what would be the economic consequences of such a program to the United States? Nobody can satisfactorily answer that. I know that just as well as you do. Here is a question where you take a chance.

You take a chance by going ahead with a program of this kind and let the consequences be what they may, and they may be very bad; or, you take the other road. I think the plans have impaired our economic stability, but the alternative might be worse. That is something you as a politician have to take a chance on, too, because if you vote against this the thing may catch up with you and the people may wash you out. I have had to take that chance. I have not supported it up to date. I am not saying yet what I will do with this bill. The chances are I shall vote against it, because I am not satisfied with the administration or with the results.

Mr. RICH. If we have a debt of \$252,000,000,000 and those countries all-told have a debt of less than \$150,000,000,000 are not they in just as good a position to help themselves as we are, financially, especially?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think they might help themselves a lot more if we would just step out of the picture, but we are not going to step out. This Congress is going to approve this bill, and no doubt many other proposals in the future.

It will approve future appropriations under this program. There is no doubt of that in my mind. I would like to make this bill as palatable to our people as possible. Therefore, I support this amendment.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. To come back to the amendment. In the beginning opponents said it should not be supported because to put in the word "political" would make it too broad, and now the majority leader objects to it because he says putting in the word limits the scope of the language. Why should we not say what we mean precisely?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Exactly. It is about time we say what we mean and back it up.

Mr. JUDD. We owe it to our own taxpayers, and we owe it to the people of Europe to say that it is the policy of the United States to encourage certain definite things, and thus avoid uncertainty resulting from vague and undefined words.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I believe in, and why I support the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, are we inviting disaster—committing national suicide? How long can we play Santa Claus to the rest of the world before depleting our natural resources? How long can we, with less than 6½ percent of the world's population, and less than 7 percent of the world's area, continue to operate an international WPA? We have already depleted our natural resources from 11½ to less than 8½ percent of the world's raw material.

Because of our high standard of living, we, 145,000,000 people, are consuming our 8½ percent of the world's natural resources, about as rapidly as the other

2,250,000,000 people are consuming the other 91½ percent. Yet the traitorous internationalists—the greedy one-worlders for a profit—continue to dish out to foreign, inefficient, and in many cases corrupt nations, the wealth that belongs to future generations.

There is very little high-grade iron ore left in Minnesota—very little high-grade manganese and chromium left in the Nation. We need manganese to make steel and chromium to make stainless steel. Without steel there can be no national defense. We are rapidly depleting our petroleum and many other products necessary for our welfare.

Under the Marshall plan, at the taxpayers' expense, we sent so much aluminum to Great Britain, that she returned some and sold it to us at black-market prices. The manufacturers did not draw on Great Britain for this aluminum, but upon her Marshall-plan credit in the United States Treasury—a credit that Britain has no more intention of paying than the \$34,000,000,000 she owed us after World War II that we canceled.

Under the Marshall plan the farmers were robbed of steel piping—well casing—for their homes and livestock. The veterans needed homes, and the builders were robbed of the piping needed to build such homes. Under this plan our manufacturers sold all available steel pipe to Holland and other foreign nations at \$110 a ton.

Again the manufacturers drew on Holland's and other nations' Marshall-plan credit in the United States Treasury—on our taxpayers' money. Not a penny of this credit will ever be paid back. Then about a year ago Holland had so much United States steel piping that she offered to sell to an American distributor all the piping he needed at \$290 a ton f. o. b. Holland. Thus the Marshall plan created an international black market with a vengeance.

Unless this international insanity of destroying ourselves is stopped, we will not long survive as a great Nation. What is true of manganese, chromium, and steel pipe is true of thousands of other needed articles—articles produced by Americans and ignorantly and lavishly given to foreign nations.

The Marshall plan has been handled inefficiently, wastefully, and in many spots corruptly. As a starter we appropriated \$15,000,000 for certain newspapers and periodicals for their help in putting over the Marshall plan on a supine Congress and a misled people. If that bribery is not a betrayal of our Nation, then I do not know what a betrayal is. I say without hesitation that the internationalists—the one-worlders for a profit—are more dangerous than the Communists.

Men always deceive themselves by abandoning experience to follow blind leaders—blind bellwethers. How long will we follow and permit the do-gooders on the packed Foreign Relations Committee, in their blindness and zeal, to destroy our Nation? I have the highest respect for the members on that committee, but they are lost in the dismal swamp. They do not know where they are going

or where they came from. If they ever hit it right, it will not be by the law of averages, but by the law of accident.

Six years ago that committee told us that unless we surrendered our domestic market, reciprocal trade agreements, there would be a world war III. Later we were told to avoid war and rearmament, we would have to lavish billions upon other nations—among them Russia and her satellites. The waste and corruption connected with UNRRA has not yet been fully written. Then came Dumbarton Oaks, and they told us we had to have an international bank which in the end will fleece the American taxpayers out of another possible \$16,000,000,000 or \$17,000,000,000.

Then the committee told us that in order to avoid world war III, we would have to loan Britain \$4,400,000,000 and cancel the \$34,000,000,000 she owed us. Next we were told that unless we gave \$350,000,000 to arm and feed the decayed Greek Government's Army, the Communists would get us. Later it was billions more for the Greeks and other inefficient, and in some cases, corrupt nations.

The some \$60,000,000,000 that we have mostly squandered on foreign nations since World War II, and the billions more we are asked for have not and will not, in the end, produce peace, but war.

Now again we are lavishly entertaining the representatives of foreign nations—some "has beeners" and some "never wasers." These foreign representatives all flocked to Washington to sign the North Atlantic Pact, and before the ink was dry, they demanded that Uncle Sam give them billions in addition to the Marshall plan for armament. Each representative had one hand out in front of him and the other behind his back hoping to get one hand full of American goods and the other full of the taxpayers' dollars.

The forerunner, as usual, was Winston Churchill. He was wine and dined at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. He made a speech to gullible Bostonians. He calls annually just about the time that Uncle Sam finishes collecting taxes. He believes that the early bird gets the worm—gets the cash. On arrival he had his picture taken on the boat. Then he was wine and dined by the intellectual Tories who like to bask in the British atmosphere.

I do not blame these foreign lobbyists. I do blame our Government and the Committee on Foreign Relations for being gullible enough to be taken in by that kind of flattery—gush. In spite of the fact that we are some \$260,000,000,000 in the red, and with future obligations owe \$663,000,000,000, we are asked to operate an international WPA. In fact we are bankrupt twice over. The Federal Government, with future commitments, owes twice as much as the normal value of all our property. We owe about four times as much as all the rest of the world taken together.

We are now asked for billions more to continue the Marshall plan and billions more to arm half of the world against the other half. We are asked to commit national suicide by giving away our natural resources and depleting our

Nation, and in the end when we are exhausted we may have world war III on our hands because of our stupidity.

The time has come for us to refuse to follow blind bellwethers. The time has come to put an end to the stupidity of the do-gooders both in and out of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Young].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I say that I am enthusiastically supporting this authorization. Regarding the pending amendment, reading this bill I note it refers to "sustained, common efforts to achieve economic cooperation, and to encourage the unification and federation of Europe," it appears to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is a meritorious one.

It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota should be adopted. I find myself in accord with the gentleman from Louisiana. This amendment, it seems to me, makes for clarification. The purpose of this entire measure is to preserve peace, and may I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my neighbor to the east, that I am here as a representative at large of all the people of the State of Ohio in this Congress, and that I speak with the voice of 7,000,000 of my constituents, Republicans and Democrats alike, who are for America foremost and first; and I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana that there should never be another world war. Two world wars—and it happened that I had the honor to serve in both of them—two world wars in which we were forced to participate were two world wars too many.

This amendment does not express any limitation, but rather is a broadening statement of the great humanitarian purposes of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, this authorization should be passed overwhelmingly. We intervene in Europe not for the purpose of domination but to prevent domination by the Soviet Union. We intervene, not to impose our system of government but to allow other peoples to choose their own system. We intervene to protect freedom. We intervene to achieve world peace. We intervene to protect the integrity of nations like Italy, Greece, and Turkey—to safeguard our own national security and with it the peace of the world.

It is of the utmost importance that we continue economic aid and an information program—that we confine and contain the Red threat of Communist aggression.

It is an unfortunate choice confronting our people. It means we must pull in our belts. It means we must spend a huge amount of our resources but if we count our pennies now we shall have to count our war dead later.

Dictatorship once again threatens us. The ECA program, or Marshall plan, has succeeded, to this good hour, in rolling back the tide of Red fascism or communism—it matters not by which name you term it—and were we to stop now, before the nations of western

Europe are able to proceed on their own, it is probable that the few remaining citadels of freedom in the Old World would be unable to prevent themselves from becoming black holes of oppression behind the Soviet's iron curtain.

World War II left us the most powerful nation on earth, politically and economically supreme. With that power goes a responsibility we must not ignore.

In Italy, to cite an example of which I have personal knowledge from 27 months' services overseas in the armed forces, the Axis armies in their retreat adopted a well-planned scheme of demolition, the like of which the world has never seen. As the Fifth Army went forward from Salerno to the Brenner Pass, the Germans and Fascists, in their retreat throughout the length and breadth of Italy, destroyed what the shells and the bombs of the armies did not demolish. Italy and other nations of western Europe were shattered and famine stricken. They would have been easy prey to communism, had it not been for the Marshall plan and the great and unselfish aid this Nation has given. As a result of the program, for which I today urge renewed support, Greece, Italy, and Turkey stand firm against Communist Russia. Who is there to say that any of these nations would have a government of their own choosing if we had not aided them 18 months or more ago?

Mr. Chairman, this program upon which we vote is a program for peace. We who support this will help write into history not of wars, but of peaceful people, their life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

Ours is the greatest and richest industrial nation on earth. We learned the hard way in bitterness and despair back in 1931 and 1932 that isolationism and depression go hand in hand—that building a wall around this Nation bankrupts agriculture and paralyzes transportation and trade. We have learned that international trade is not a one-way road.

By this great program we support today we voice again our realization that only a prosperous world can be a peaceful world and that by building up the industry and trade of foreign nations, we enlarge our own industry and trade.

The bipartisan foreign policy of the Truman administration has met with success even beyond our fondest hopes and dreams. It would be unthinkable that in this, the second year of the European recovery program, we should stop in our tracks or retreat. Our answer must be to vote up this authorization.

In Europe, through the application of the Truman Doctrine, or the Marshall plan, we have stopped the march of communism and we are seeking to bring permanent peace to a torn and war-weary world. Who is there who can say that but for our aid the Soviet Union would not have imposed an extension of the iron curtain across an area dominating a natural resource of tremendous importance in peace and in war—the Mediterranean Sea.

The American people may well have a feeling of confidence and satisfaction that they have, in Washington, a Presi-

dent and a Congress, preparedness-minded, courageous and firm in dealing with the Soviet Union.

The alliance of the free nations of Europe and this Nation, as is evidenced by the North Atlantic treaty and by the entire ECA program, attests that a strong unconquerable America is determined to achieve a just and lasting peace in a democratic world. If the Soviet Union should assault us this year or in the years to come as an aggressor nation in the Hitler pattern, an overwhelming force will be alert and prepared to hurl back the aggressor. We who support this authorization attest our belief that free peoples everywhere have a right to enjoy peace and security in a free world.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Judd) there were—ayes 72, noes 133.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 2, line 11, after the word "states" strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the following: "Provided further, That assistance under this title shall not be made available to any participating country which fails to comply with the decisions or accept the recommendations of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations on measures to maintain or restore international peace or security or to bring about compliance with the provisions of the Charter until such time as the President finds that such compliance or acceptance has been effected."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment as is by now well known is intended to deal with the problem of the failure of the Government of the Netherlands to comply with the United Nations Security Council's resolution of December 1948, respecting Indonesia, ordering a cease fire and the release of the high officials of the Indonesian Republican Government held as prisoners. The issues are grave and could well affect the views of millions of people of Asia and the East Indies with respect to the devotion of the United States to freedom and self-determination for them.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that any effort to discredit this amendment by an argument as to the character of the people in the Government of the Republic of Indonesia I think is fruitless, and on two grounds: First, we already have a complete record since December 1948, that both the President of the United States, and no greater authority exists in our Government on foreign affairs, and the Secretary of State of the United States have protested to the Dutch Government against these very activities with respect to their failure to comply with the resolution of the United Nations Security Council; and, second, we are not being asked to make an independent finding of fact in connection with the administration of this amendment. We are asked only to take

the solemn determination of the Security Council of the United Nations, of which the United States is a member, and in connection with which determination the United States has the absolute right to veto, so that if the United States does not agree with the resolution of the United Nations Security Council it could veto that resolution.

The argument will also be made with respect to this resolution that it is unnecessary because if the United Nations should impose sanctions, then the United States by virtue of its adherence to the United Nations Charter itself, must carry out those sanctions and no amendment to this law is necessary to bring that about. Certainly no amendment to this law is necessary to bring about the carrying out by the United States of sanctions imposed by the United Nations, but such sanctions cannot be imposed unless the Security Council votes, not a resolution like the one we are discussing here with respect to Indonesia, but specifically votes economic or other sanctions. Before it can vote those sanctions any great power, and that includes the Soviet Union, can veto, so that if the resolution for sanctions is vetoed in the United Nations Security Council there is nothing that the United States has to carry out under the terms of the Charter.

The Dutch, who are going to get under this particular legislation some \$355,000,000, are not obeying the United Nations Security Council and we are told that the United States has not the power to do anything about it under circumstances where it is proposed to actually deliver this vast sum of aid to the Netherlands Government.

It is a fact that the United States as a measure of protest has already cut off aid to the Netherlands East Indies. But what has that done? What has been done is to deprive the East Indians themselves of the benefit of some assistance under the European recovery program; in addition some two-thirds of our aid had already proceeded to Indonesia before it was actually cut off by order of the Administrator following the resolution of the United Nations Security Council.

There is also a possibility that this kind of amendment and this particular situation will not apply alone to the Netherlands, but may apply to other nations. There are other great colonial powers in the European recovery program: Belgium, Great Britain, and France, to be specific. All the peoples of Asia are thinking now in terms of their own freedom, and their own independence. The ERP is a great program for economic recovery—to do what? To promote freedom, and all I am asking in this amendment is that as a declaration of policy we will say that we intend to see that freedom is promoted now, not by following our own views or the views of somebody else, but by following the organized opinion of the world, the organized conscience of the world in the United Nations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other body has already considered this question and

came up with an amendment which was but a declaration of what is already an obligation of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. The other body has already passed an amendment to the European recovery program purporting to do something about the situation. What they have done is to say that where the United Nations Security Council has ordered sanctions to be imposed, the United States will withhold its aid unless the particular nation affected performs what the United Nations wants it to perform. Well, that is already a proper obligation of the United States under the United Nations Charter. We are creating no new obligation if we do nothing but pass the amendment of the other body.

In addition I would like to point out that I have not offered an amendment requiring that the Administrator or the President forthwith cease aid to the Netherlands if it continues its refusal to comply with the United Nations Security Council's resolution. On the contrary, I have written it into the statement of policy to give our top executive authority on foreign affairs—the President—with complete flexibility with respect to when and how that policy is to be carried out. But, I certainly think it is fundamental if the European recovery program is to succeed in this fight for freedom, that this provision be put in the law as part of the fundamental policy of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the continuation of ECA aid, for this investment in the rehabilitation and care of the people of war-torn countries is our most potent weapon in the present struggle between democracy and communism and in our efforts to preserve peace.

However, we know that the Congress, in voting for the Marshall plan, had no intention of allowing the funds granted or lent thereunder to be used in any program of aggression by any nation receiving such aid. In my opinion, the present Indonesian situation presents a flagrant defiance of the United Nations and its Security Council. Further, although there have been strong denunciations of the Dutch because of their offensive against the Indonesians—they continue in their aggression and their refusal to adhere to the order issued by the Security Council.

We must, therefore, protect ourselves against further misuse of grants under the Marshall plan. The people of the United States have indicated their willingness to make sacrifices for the nations which would benefit under the Marshall plan—but, primarily, those sacrifices are meant to preserve peace. We cannot afford to give aid to those who defy the orders and decisions of the United Nations or its Security Council, now or in the future. The prestige of these bodies must be maintained unless we are to have another futile and useless organization like the League of Nations.

Firmly convinced that we must take drastic action, I introduced H. R. 1643 on January 18, 1949, which provided:

That no money under this act shall be granted, lent, or used to or for any country which violates any provision of the Charter of the United Nations or directly or indirectly engages in acts of aggression, so long as such acts continue, as determined by proclamation of the President of the United States of America or by the United Nations.

This bill was introduced with the thought in mind of withholding aid from Great Britain and Holland, who were both aggressors at the time. Since then, Great Britain has been compelled to desist, but Holland persists in continuing with its program of aggression. In the light of these events, I am pleased to support this amendment which proposes to shut off American aid to any nation singled out for punishment by United Nations sanctions for violations of the UN Charter. This provision will protect us in the future, and will assure us that United States funds will not be used to further an aggressor's cause.

This country has no wish to assist any aggressor nation in a destructive undeclared war or any other activities which undermine the peace. It is only by signifying our firm intention in this regard now, and legislating accordingly, that we can hope to maintain the efficacy of the United Nations, upon which we must rely to keep order in our troubled world.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is evidently a great deal of misinformation on the Dutch-Indonesian troubles. I have studied this matter for some weeks, and I am convinced that it would be a mistake to enact an amendment to withdraw aid from the Netherlands because of the so-called police action of December 1948 and the continuing disorders in parts of Indonesia.

I have before me a report issued February 2, 1949, by Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, now president of Brooklyn College in New York. He is known as an expert on Netherlands affairs and says at the beginning of his report:

Our American policy—and I am talking about American policy toward Indonesia, and only insofar as it is relevant about the

policies of the Netherlands or other powers—is an incredible mixture of ignorance, of false starts, of noble intentions, and of ideological hypocrisy.

Dr. Gideonse then traces the Dutch colonial policy and concludes that these people of Holland have been easily the most progressive colonial power. It is well established, he says, that the Dutch have been progressive in the sense that the government of the dependent territory is conducted in a way to permit and promote a growing participation in that government by the folks who are themselves the natives of the dependent country. Unlike some other folks, he says, the Netherlands have not only preached this, they have practiced it. He cites the incident of the Rosenwald Foundation—that when the Rosenwald Foundation got interested in the problem of the educating of the American Negro of the United States, they chose to bring in as their leading expert a gentleman who had the standing of being the leading administrator of education in Dutch Indonesia. That choice was quite a compliment to the education achievement of the Dutch colonial administration.

Dr. Gideonse, in his report, states that the present Government of the Netherlands is a coalition between the large Catholic Party and the large Socialist Party. The more conservative groups are not represented on the right, and the Communists are not represented on the left. Policy in Indonesia at present is supported by Parliament and by the Dutch people. I have in my records here copies of correspondence between Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, and Mr. A. Vermuelan, secretary of the Netherlands Federation of Trade-Unions. Mr. Vermuelan writes Mr. Murray, under date of January 24, 1949, that the federation of trade-unions rejoiced when the Linggadjatti and Renville agreements were signed because they looked upon these agreements as a realization of the ideals expressed in the charter of their federation. He says it became more and more a matter of great concern to the federation when developments during 1948 showed that chances of achieving a definite agreement with the Republican Government of Indonesia decreased steadily. He states that there can be no difference of opinion as to whether the fact that the Republic did not carry out the agreements into which it had entered and that no further arrangements could be made, must be attributed to unwillingness or to impotence, or to both, on the part of the Government of Indonesia. Mr. Vermuelan states that it is an established fact that communistic influence within the Republic was growing and that this influence made it increasingly difficult to reach an agreement with the Netherlands, and, finally, to the inability of the Republican Government to control its armed forces in irregular formations. Mr. Vermuelan further states it is the considered opinion of the federation of trade-unions that the military action of the Netherlands Government should be justified by the measures which will be taken in the next few weeks

and that it is the intention of the Netherlands Government to direct its efforts toward a peaceable settlement, as evidenced by the speech of its representative in the Security Council.

Mr. Murray, in replying to Mr. Vermuelan under date of January 31, says the CIO accepts his assurances that the present action of the Government is motivated by the desire to maintain law and order in all Indonesia, and acknowledges that the Netherlands Government has never taken an exception to the final government arrangements of Indonesia in the United States compromise plan.

It is perfectly plain that Russia would like to draw Indonesia into her orbit, the sooner the better. The best method to effect this is to try to conquer Indonesia by her fifth columns. Should the U. S. S. R. succeed, they will then have deprived the Western democracies of one of the treasure houses of the world—a treasure house vital to us in peace or war. If Indonesia should be conquered by Communist fifth columns, the balance of power in the world-wide struggle might tip to the Russian side.

The Moscow Communists, under the leadership of Alimin, Musso, and Sjari-fudin, have been one element in the Government of the so-called Republic. The latter was appointed Minister of War by President Soekarno and he signed the Renville agreement. He later admitted that he had always been a Communist and was executed by another element in the Republic. Now here is the record of two of the other leaders, President Soekarno and Premier Hatta:

WASHINGTON PICKS SOME QUEER PROTÉGÉS TO FIGHT IMPERIALISM IN INDONESIA

For weeks on end, our UN delegates have tried to outbid and outorate Russia in proclaiming the State Department's affection for Indonesia's nationalists. Pressure groups from all over have issued impassioned resolutions hailing Indonesian leaders as democratic underdogs personified and symbols of the world-wide struggle against tyranny.

Nobody, of course, can be that pure, and the Indonesian nationalist leaders certainly aren't. Just who are they, this former President Achmed Soekarno and Premier Mohammed Hatta, and what is it that makes them the idols of weepy sentimentalists from Palembang to Union Square?

Both have played along with Communists, on and off, ever since they appeared on the political scene. That, we realize, is still considered a highly respectable practice by some people who call themselves progressives. But Soekarno and Hatta also weren't reluctant when it came to collaborating with the Japanese effort to take over Asia. Here, briefly, is the story:

When the Japanese arrived in the Netherlands East Indies, they quickly recognized Soekarno and Hatta as their friends and brought them to the main island, Java. Soekarno, in his enthusiasm over Tokyo's first big victories, bet on the Japs to win. He told his followers on March 1, 1943: "Ever since the Japanese Army constituted a government in these lands, we Indonesians have done everything in our power to work with them, and we have exerted ourselves to attain that great goal placed before us by Dai Nippon: The greater East Asia coprosperity sphere."

Hatta celebrated the Japanese Emperor's birthday a few weeks later with these words: "We are integrated in the prosecution of the war of greater East Asia, and it is in complete

accord and cooperation that we work within this community of destiny." Making sure of pleasing his Tokyo bosses, he added: "We are ready to participate fully in the fight for the destruction of the United States and of England, and for this reason we stand in complete confidence and with all our strength behind the army of Dai Nippon, so that it may achieve victory."

Both Soekarno and Hatta were leaders in a number of Japanese-sponsored organizations set up to recruit Indonesians into Nippon's Army and to spur war production. Among these groups were the Poetera organization, the Hookoo-Kal and the Java Central Advisory Council. Soekarno and Hatta traveled up and down the country, making speeches, writing appeals, and generally trying to get popular support for Tokyo's "co-prosperity" notions. In 1945 they organized, on their own initiative, a so-called New Life Movement, designed to rally the Indonesian people against the expected Allied invasion.

Just after the atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, Soekarno and Hatta were summoned by the Japanese to Saigon, Indochina. There they were told by the Japanese commander in chief for southeast Asia, Field Marshal Terauchi, that orders from Tokyo called for immediate proclamation of an Indonesian Republic. Soekarno was properly and extravagantly grateful. He acknowledged independence as "a favor of His Majesty, Tenno Heika, sprouting forth from his unlimited wisdom" and expressed his "eternal thanks." It should be noted, of course, that from the Indonesian point of view independence was welcome under any sponsorship, but that does not mean that we should regard former collaborators with Japan as models of political perfection.

The Indonesian Republic was born at the Batavia house of Rear Admiral Maeda, head of Japanese naval intelligence, on the morning of August 17, 1945. Soekarno signed the proclamation of independence that made him President and Hatta Vice President. Rear Admiral Maeda looked on; he had just planted a gigantic time bomb. Today Soekarno and Hatta are the subjects of Washington's concern. In its anxiety to get on the band wagon of "anti-imperialism," the State Department has taken on some curious protégés.

The American-sponsored resolution of the Security Council has demanded that the Netherlands Government set free the Republican leaders and negotiate with them. It might well be that the Dutch Government would be compelled to allow them to enter the Federal Government of the United States of Indonesia. These Communists, these Japanese quislings could then work legally toward the Soviet Government of Indonesia. Do you blame the Dutch for resisting them, for trying to clear them out of the so-called Republic? What would we do in similar circumstances? You know what we would do, I know what we would do—we would be harder than the Dutch have ever been.

Pressure groups from all over have hailed Indonesian leaders as democratic underdogs and symbols of republican principles. The leaders of the Republic that signed the Renville Agreement on January 17, 1948, were former Japanese collaborators and were among the people who hailed the Japanese as the founders of the great prosperity order of East Asia. The three main leaders who signed the Renville Agreement for the Republic, it is believed, have been executed during the last few months by more moderate elements of the Republic.

Returning to Dr. Gideonse's report, he states that before the Dutch military action of December 18 last, there were on average 50 Indonesian officials a week killed by guerrilla action. That was done deliberately to frighten the Indonesians from participating in the government administration of the Dutch area. The whole military action of the Dutch, Dr. Gideonse reports, the first one a year and a half ago, and this one now, has cost less than 100 casualties and this last one, counting the Indonesian casualties on both sides, less than 250. When you remember that the total population is 75,000,000 and that there were 50 killed a week among Indonesian officials up until the police action, these figures take on a new meaning.

The Marshall plan is not designed to help the Dutch alone. The Marshall plan is designed for the reconstruction and restoration of western Europe, and the Dutch have been in the forefront in cooperating with this plan. They suffered the loss of one-third of their national wealth through the occupation of the Germans; their living standards reached an unbelievably low point—at one time they were living on 400 calories a day, and when a communistic-inspired Japanese-quisling-trained group of people backed an uprising in Indonesia, it was immediately shouted that democratic principles are being violated. We do not always know what we are talking about. There is one last point. It is that if ECA aid is to be an instrument of political coercion, that would be against the basic concept of ECA. If this principle was established, the United States would be placed in the position of reviewing the activities of all the recipient nations with a view to determine whether such activities measured up to criteria satisfactory to United States foreign policy. Under this principle, the continuation of ECA aid to any nation could be construed as signifying endorsement by our Government of all the policies pursued by that nation and would place us in an impossible position.

I hope you will defeat the amendment. Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman agree that the President, the Secretary of State, and the United Nations Security Council, all three, have vigorously condemned the Dutch for their failure to comply with the resolution of the United Nations Security Council passed in December 1948?

Mr. CHATHAM. I believe that is generally known.

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

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact there are already in the law provisions which require the Administrator of the ECA to comport with the foreign policy as established by this Congress, by the Secretary of State, and by the President? In other words, does not the gentleman feel that the situation is already covered by existing law?

Mr. CHATHAM. The gentleman from Florida is exactly right. Section 118 of the act instructs the Administrator to terminate aid to a country whenever "because of changing conditions assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States."

THE CHICAGO COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
PRESENTS AMERICAN POLICY IN INDONESIA
(By Harry D. Gideonse)

Chairman CYRUS H. ADAMS III. Few people are better qualified to inform us than Dr. Harry D. Gideonse. To many in this room, he is well known from the years between 1930 and 1938 when he was in the Department of Economics at the University of Chicago and he has addressed this council on several occasions. To the radio audience, his voice will be remembered from his participation in the University of Chicago Round Table, the Invitation to Learning, and other similar programs.

Born in Rotterdam in the Netherlands, he came to this country at the age of 3. He received his bachelor and master degrees at Columbia. He has received other degrees from the University of Geneva in Switzerland, from Brooklyn Law School, St. Lawrence University, and Western Reserve University. He has had a distinguished teaching career at Barnard, Columbia, Rutgers, University of Chicago, and is now president of Brooklyn College in New York.

To list just a few of his activities, he is an author, an editor, a director of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, chairman of the board of Freedom House, and since 1946 has been a member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Primarily an educator in the field of economics, he has always been keenly interested in foreign affairs. Although he has lived in the United States since the age of 3, he has never lost interest in Netherland affairs and has continually kept in close touch with that country.

He will speak to us today on American Policy in Indonesia.

Dr. HARRY D. GIDEONSE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members of the council and old friends, it is fun to be back here, fun to see old friends and to speak from this familiar pulpit. It is not fun to talk on a subject that is as full of confusion, and I think misunderstanding in the United States, not to speak of a few other places, as Indonesia. But the Chicago Council has a rather peculiar record as far as its choice of topics for me is concerned. I recall one time when you invited me back in 1939, when we had just seen the beginning of the Second World War, and the Chicago Council put on a program to which you had invited a gentleman who had often been Senator Borah's brain truster, who was to argue that it was not our war and could not be by any stretch of the imagination be our war, and then his opponent was to argue that perhaps this was our war, and we should pay some attention to our interest in its outcome. That was my role, and it was not an easy one, although perhaps, as time went on, it became a somewhat understandable performance.

Then in 1943 you brought me on a comparable sort of an assignment. At that time, as some of you may still recall, American public opinion—and particularly the liberal and democratic wings—had become greatly concerned about the fact that Mr. Roosevelt was doing such strangely reactionary things when he wasn't giving full recognition to General De Gaulle. You may remember how all the liberals and all the democratic elements were critical of Mr. Roosevelt because he somehow could not see the four-freedoms light with regard to General De Gaulle. It was my function to come in and give you a speech in which, without any connection

at all with the State Department, I could speak somewhat more freely than the gentlemen in the Department who were under the sealed-lips tradition of responsibility. I explained how it could be argued that General De Gaulle was not so far away from Marshall Petain and Vichy in his attitudes on social, economic, and political questions, again a position which was then very difficult to take and for which perhaps some people have today a little more understanding.

Now, if you look at Indonesia, it is perhaps the toughest assignment of them all. I do not remember a question on which American public opinion has seemed, from the Chicago Tribune on the right straight through the fellow travelers on the left, as united in its determination to believe things that aren't so; and as united in its determination to refuse to listen to the other side, and I compliment the Chicago council for one of the rare opportunities to speak a piece in public on what are some of my reasons for making that very severe statement.

I am going to argue here, and I am putting you on warning, that our American policy—and I am talking about American policy toward Indonesia, and only insofar as it is relevant about the policy of the Netherlands or other powers—is an incredible mixture of ignorance, of false starts, of noble intentions, and of ideological hypocrisy. It is quite an order and now let's proceed.

To understand the position you must first of all remember that the Netherlands for now well on two generations have been regarded as, I think, easily the most progressive colonial power. They have quite a record that way. Any college library will show it. It is well established, I think, in the literature on colonial administration that the Dutch have been progressive, progressive in the sense that the government of the dependent territory is conducted in a way to permit and promote a growing participation in that government by the folks who are themselves the natives of the dependent country. Unlike some other folks, the Netherlands have not only preached this, they have practiced it. This is not recognized merely in the Netherlands. It is even recognized by groups like our own Chicago Rosenwald fund. I say that because I don't think that anyone would argue that the Rosenwald fund was a reactionary or an imperialistic group. When the Rosenwald Foundation got interested in the problems of the education of the American Negro in the United States, they chose to bring in as their leading expert a gentleman who had the standing of being the leading administrator of education in the Dutch East Indies. That choice was quite a compliment to the educational achievement of the Dutch in their colonial administration. The material written by the gentleman can be consulted in any American college library. And the choice was not made by anyone engaged in power politics at Lake Success or in the Netherlands. It was the choice of the Rosenwald fund, a free independent group of American citizens interested in the education of the American Negro. You couldn't have a more objective testimony to what that group thought of the educational policies practiced in the Netherlands East Indies.

Let us look at it historically, and let me cite a few facts. I do not wish to overburden you, but to remind you of some facts that show that education to native self-government was not some afterthought of the Dutch, not something that the Netherlands discovered during the Second World War when they temporarily lost control to the Japanese. The notion of participation of the natives in colonial government in the Dutch East Indies is very old. The notion of separating the budget of the Netherlands and the Netherlands East Indies is more than

70 years old. The notion of a colonial policy, the primary purpose of which would be the development within the Dutch East Indies of native Indonesian ability to share in and ultimately to take over the control themselves, goes back to the year 1901.

A Cabinet was put into office in the Dutch Parliament in 1901 to implement that policy. There is a very long record of policies designed to give the native civilization of the Dutch East Indies self-control culturally, something the West has not always understood, because it interfered with the imports into the Dutch East Indies of western culture, western religion and western technology. But the Dutch all along followed what you might call an anthropological policy in the Dutch East Indies. In other words, the great variety of racial, and religious groups in the islands were to be preserved in the integrity of their own culture. For example, they were legally to be judged in courts in which their own customary law was to be the standard—not Dutch law, not western law, but so-called Adat law. Adat is simply the word for native custom. We would say common law, and when the natives did not have the scholarly resources to codify such law properly, Leyden University devoted some of its most distinguished scholars to this task. Van Vollenhoven, who was one of the greatest experts in international law, was one of the great scholars in Adat law, codifying, in other words, the customary law of the natives, including among other things, the principle that no Dutchman, no westerner, was ever to be a judge in any of the Adat law courts. The Adat court law was always administered by natives who handed out native law. Land ownership was never to be vested in non-Indonesians, much to the displeasure of many foreign investors.

Of course, the implication was that you had other courts for other kinds of law, every group being judged on the basis of its traditional views. This is understandable if you recall that there are some 75,000,000 people in the Dutch East Indies; including some 15 to 20 clearly recognizable racial groups, and some 200 local dialects. They have no common language, although the Dutch have gradually put through the notion of Malay as the common language in recent times. It is now called the Indonesian language and is more or less a synthetic improvement of Malay above the bazaar Malay of the market. So Malay in that respect is a little like the Hebrew of modern Israel which has been given a contemporary vocabulary to describe recent economic, technical and scientific developments for which old Hebrew had no vocabulary. The Indonesian language of today, which you read about, is that standardized East Indies Malay, and its spread accompanied the accomplishment of over-all political unity by the Dutch. There was no such unity until it was accomplished in three centuries of Dutch administration.

Now, these 75,000,000 people living in an island empire that stretches over an area as large as the whole of the United States, have an enormous cultural and historical diversity. It is therefore natural that if you wanted self-government, you had to work with these groups in their own cultural tradition. If you tried to impose one standard on them all, you would be going flatly contrary to that object of self-government and self-participation, which we have always regarded as the yardstick of progressive colonial administration.

The developments toward self-government began to take a more concrete political form Indies—1916, mind you, when the Dutch established the so-called popular council (Volksraad) still by a slight majority Dutch; 1918 was another step; 1922 and 1928 were other steps in the expansion of its membership. By 1928 it had become in majority Indonesian and it was then an agency in

which the final budgetary control over the Dutch East Indies had been transferred from the Hague to Batavia. That, you see, is 20 years ago. There still existed at that time a veto on the part of the Dutch Parliament over the budget as a whole, but no longer an item veto; and the budget as a whole was never vetoed. In other words, you had there a continuous development of participation of sharing in the government of the Dutch East Indies on the basis of favoring the development of local native cultures.

Don't get the impression that this was all done unanimously by the Dutch. Of course not. The Dutch aren't angels, no more than the Americans. There were commercial and bureaucratic interests that they did not wish to relinquish, something from which they deprived profits of a commercial and financial sort. But you also had these other elements of which I have been speaking that dominated in the Netherlands Government policy, as I said, from 1901 on. There are such differences right now in the Netherlands where there are several rather important political groups, not however members of the present government of the Netherlands, who have all along felt that the policy of the Dutch Government has been altogether too idealistic and too unrealistic. These groups feel that power and force were not used early enough. These groups, many of them, are very close to big industry and financial investments in the islands. They have disapproved of this so-called ethical policy since 1901, and they are very vigorous in disapproval now. But they are not members of the present government of the Netherlands.

I think it is very important for you to keep in mind that the present government in the Netherlands is a government roughly comparable to a combination between the present government in England, a labor government, and the government in France. The two dominant parties in the government of the Netherlands today are groups that we could call Social Democrats and Christian (Catholic) Democrats. That is to say, the large Catholic and the large Socialist Party combined in one cabinet. The more conservative groups are not represented on the right, and the Communists are not represented on the left. Policy in Indonesia at present is supported by parliament as a whole, with the exception of eight Communists, and those of course you would not expect to be in support of any policy other than one that presented Communist infiltration in Indonesia.

If you look at the picture after 1945 you find, after the islands were liberated, a period of great confusion, because the Japanese, when they found they had to leave, left Japanese puppets in control. Soekarno, the president of the so-called Indonesia Republic, and Hatta, the vice president, were both men who during the Second World War were on the side of Japan. They were in Tokyo. They are both committed to extremely critical statements about American imperialism although they like to compare themselves today—even on postage stamps—to George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. The other day you saw in the papers pictures of Soekarno in Tokyo, which was one of the affiliations that were built up during the war and very genuine at that time.

When the Japs were forced to leave, they left Soekarno and Hatta in charge, and they left them armed with Japanese armament. The top leadership, in other words, of the so-called Indonesian Republic is definitely Japanese puppet leadership. It isn't as simple as that, however, for the Republic as a whole. There has always been a very large branch of so-called Republican leadership that is definitely Communist-infiltrated, if not Communist by identification, and the situation is further complicated by Nationalist and extreme Moslem elements. It is

not simply black and white. Some of these groups overlap. There are Communist affiliations that are built right into the Japanese Quisling groups. On the other hand, there are Communist groups that resent the Japanese element very much, because some of the Republican leaders during the period when they cooperated with Japan allowed tens of thousands of Java's best young men to be used by the Japanese to do construction jobs and build airfields, and so on, for Japan on the islands throughout the Pacific, and almost none of those boys came back. So that Java remembers that some of the Djogjakarta leaders did that Quisling job as far as Java's best young men are concerned. And, of course, the Communist element in this movement remembers that very much, and occasionally revives the memory of it.

Then you must keep in mind that in Java—and in Indonesia generally—the population is overwhelmingly Moslem. That is one of the big differences we must always keep in mind when we think of the Dutch East Indies and the Philippines. The Philippines were Christian, an inheritance from Spain. The Dutch East Indies are Moslem, overwhelmingly so, and there are socially conservative but religiously militant Moslem movements, and there is a good deal of that in Java, and in Sumatra. These Moslem militants are often extreme conservatives on the social question and therefore very much of an obstacle to the Communists who try to infiltrate the country. So you get, as you sometimes get with some of the Negro or Zionist groups in the United States, a very determined effort on the part of some of the Communist groups to confuse people's thinking about Negro or Jewish groups by trying to achieve some degree of infiltration in them, and thereby confuse the public as to the nature of those movements. You have that in Java where you can find certain groups of a militant Moslem character, that have practically no standing at all as far as the large majority of the Moslem elements are concerned, but these ideological motives confuse the observer—and sometimes the natives—with regard to where the real loyalties are.

One more word about the Republic. The Republic is called a "Republic," and I think that is one reason why American opinion is so much in its favor—anything described as a "republic" must be good. We think of it in terms of 1776—freedom, democracy, elections. Now, it is very important to keep in mind that there are elections in the Dutch East Indies, and there will be more, but the one part of Java where there never have been elections is the so-called Republican part. There never have been elections there. They have what they call a parliament, but it is entirely composed of people who have just been chosen by the leaders who were not elected either. There have been no elections in Republican Java. There have been many elections in several of the so-called federal states, the states that are favorable to the Dutch formula of Indonesian federation preserving local autonomy in the various areas. It varies from one part of the East Indies to another because of the cultural factors. In many regions there are age-old local governmental institutions of their own.

Some of the governments have been based on elections as far back as 30 years, so that when we talk about elections we should keep in mind that the only parts of Indonesia in which there have been elections are the Dutch or so-called federal parts. There have never been elections in the Republican part.

Another thing that one has to keep in mind is that the Republic is a very peculiar kind of republic. Djogjakarta and Soerakarta, which are the geographical centers of the Republic, have always been among the

most backward or feudal parts of Java, so much so that the Dutch always hesitated to exercise their western influence there. On the maps before World War II you will find Djogjakarta and Soerakarta described as the so-called Prince's countries. That was done because the Dutch had never really imposed their rule completely on the entrenched Tory Moslem character of the rule by the Sultan of Djogjakarta or the Prince (Susuhunan) of Soerakarta. The Republic works in some way with the Sultan of Djogjakarta, and it is very interesting to note that the military governor of Djogjakarta is the old Sultan of Djogjakarta, a very strange kind of a thing when you think of the propaganda about the republican character of the so-called Indonesian Republic. I am not suggesting that there is deliberate deception here. I put it forward simply—and because I have to be brief about it in view of the time that is available—as another warning as to the complexity of these things. Djogjakarta doesn't represent elements that are more progressive than the Dutch; it represents very definitely, historically and socially, a group that was very much less advanced than a very large part of the rest of Indonesia. As to the western ideologies, that was added by these Communist elements of which I spoke a moment ago. You have there a mixture of a variety of forces which are very difficult to understand unless you have lived with it for a long time, and unless you know something about the genius of the party-liners' work when they have their minds made up to create disturbing pictures of confusion that will serve interests allied with Soviet influence throughout the world.

It is interesting to note just in passing that when negotiations took place under the Good Offices Committee of the United Nations—in which the United States was represented by President Graham, of the University of North Carolina—which ended in the negotiation of the agreement that was called the Renville agreement, Mr. Graham was there as the American official choice for membership in the Good Offices Committee, and he witnessed most of the negotiations between the representative of the Dutch, a Javanese, and the representative of the Republic, Sjarifoeddin, who was then Prime Minister.

Now, President Graham is a very honorable gentleman, but as some of you may have gathered from newspaper reports in the last few weeks, his name was in controversy before our own Atomic Energy Commission in connection with his loyalty record, because he was not thought to be as discriminating as he might be about Communists and fellow travelers. I base that statement on the newspaper reports that we have seen with regard to that loyalty report to the United States Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission chose to disregard it. Personally I have no doubt as to President Graham's loyalty, and I would trust his discretion concerning atomic-energy information. Nevertheless, there was a question raised as to whether he had been as discriminating in his observation of Stalinist fellow travelers as one would want an American representative to be under these circumstances. He sat on deck with those gentlemen for months during the negotiations on the Renville, and he came back with the conviction that all these arguments about Communist infiltration amounts to nothing. Just the other day when President Graham received the Hillman prize offered by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, he used the word "totalitarian" to describe the Dutch, and he referred to the Republic as the forces of freedom.

Now, it is interesting to observe that Sjarifoeddin was the representative of the Republic on that occasion during this long period when President Graham could ob-

serve him there on the deck all the time, and today, by his own admission, not by the assertion of some suspicious conservative agency, not by the statement of the Dutch, but by Sjarifoeddin's own admission, he is a self-confessed Communist since 1935—since 1935. Certainly, it is legitimate to feel that during all the months of negotiations our observer was perhaps a little wanting in discrimination with regard to those things to which he should have developed a wee bit stronger form of ideological allergy. [Laughter.]

Now, let's go beyond that. Sjarifoeddin resigned his office immediately after he signed the Renville agreement. Now, what do you think the impact on the Dutch would be after negotiations in which a man, after painful months of argument, agrees to something and then immediately resigns so that his successor can say, "I am not bound by that because somebody else signed it." Later on Sjarifoeddin joined in a form of Communist rebellion against the regime. It was said immediately by friends of the Republic that this rebellion proved that there had been Communists, and that they had infiltrated the important positions, but that they had now left the regime. In a sense it perhaps proves that point, and Sjarifoeddin seems to have been killed in that venture—although no one seems to have very good information on that—but the important factor to remember is that when the rebellion took place within the Republican forces, the Republican government released from prison a gentleman by the name of Tan Malakka. Tan Malakka was another kind of Communist. Perhaps you can make the comparison as between Tito's communism and let's say Stalin's communism. They agree on a lot of things, particularly on what they would do to us, but they disagree among themselves, perhaps as to the extent to which you use nationalism as a clock, and so on. When Tan Malakka was released from prison his followers cleaned up this Sjarifoeddin element and then, of course, came to increasing power as an influence within the Republic because it was their force that did the job. Incidentally, Tan Malakka has had influence in the Philippines, in Canton and all sorts of places in the far East over 25 years. He has been one of the most dynamic Communists in that area. Tan Malakka is the man who kidnapped Sjarilir, the foreign minister of the so-called Indonesian Republic, after Sjarilir in negotiations with the Dutch, had agreed to a formula which he and the Dutch thought to be workable. That stopped that particular phase of the negotiations. Then later on Tan Malakka was captured by the Republican government and put in prison. Later on—as I have just said—the Republic released him to fight these other Communists.

Do you get a picture of a regime with which it is rather difficult to negotiate? A regime with which after 3 years of patience, of negotiation that never seemed to commit anyone, and increasing guerrilla warfare, it becomes a bit understandable that you should finally say that you will release your troops to march in and clear things up? Then we read in the American newspapers that after the troops have moved in, the guerrilla war started. That is another complete misconception. The guerrilla war has been going on since 1945 with the armaments left by the Japanese. The only reason we think it started after the Dutch police action or military action began, is that American newspapers and news services do not regularly keep reporters in Java. They send them in when big news breaks. If they had kept them there regularly they would have reported, as all Dutch news services reported, that guerrilla war continued straight through the period in which the republican

representatives were promising it would cease, and that the troops of the Republicans would no longer fight. A week after the Renville Agreement had been signed, the commander in chief of the republican army announced that the agreement committed the government in Djogjakarta but not the army. Now, under those circumstances you can perhaps understand that those who were responsible for law and order would ultimately come to a point where they felt that they were compelled to exercise some of that responsibility.

The record shows that during the 12 weeks before the Dutch military action began on December 18, there were on the average 50 Indonesian officials a week killed by guerrilla action. That was done deliberately to frighten the Indonesians from participating in the government administration in the Dutch areas, so that they would be intimidated and refuse to play that game any longer. The whole military action of the Dutch, the first one a year and a half ago and this one now, has cost less than 100 casualties, and this last one, counting the Indonesian casualties on both sides, less than 250. When you remember that the total population is 75,000,000, that there were 50 casualties a week among Indonesian officials right straight through the period before the police action took place, these figures are not as serious as they might sound at first, certainly not serious enough to speak of full-scale war in Java as some of our papers have done. One of the things we might remember is that 75,000,000 is a lot of people, and that 250 is less than the total death record in the United States, say on a New Year's weekend for automobile accidents. You have to see these figures in the perspective of the total scope of the problem and of the kind of things that went on before the military action was undertaken.

I will skip a number of factors that might be interesting and contribute to perspective if we had the time, and I will discuss one other angle that I think has been grievously misunderstood or twisted in our American public thinking, and that is the relationship to the Marshall plan. You find it said that we should "punish the Dutch" by withholding Marshall plan aid. Now, that suggests, first of all, a very strange perspective on what the Marshall plan is for. The Marshall plan is not designed to help the Dutch. The Marshall plan is designed to help the United States achieve a major foreign policy of the United States and that is the reconstruction and the restoration to self-support of western Europe. When we, therefore, talk about withholding Marshall plan aid to the Netherlands, we are talking about weakening our own determination to follow our foreign policy in western Europe. Part of that foreign policy is, as I said, to put western Europe back on its own feet. You get back to self-support and to independence from continued American aid by restoring markets and the supply of raw materials, and there, of course, Indonesia plays a large role. We must not forget that a very large part of the world's and western Europe's rubber, palm oil, tin, tea, tobacco, etc. come from Indonesia, and that the restoration of the flow of raw materials, not to speak of the markets that you can find there in return, depends on conditions of sufficient security on the islands to warrant new capital investments. Capital investments in the past have come heavily under Dutch auspices at low rates of interest because the Dutch took a confident view of the security of their investments. Today you can't get capital for Indonesia except at high rates of interest, and the rates will go down in proportion to the confidence that is restored, and it will go up to the extent to which people distrust the situation. That holds not only for profits as far as the Dutch or the bankers are concerned—that holds for the flow of raw materials which

are essential for the continued hope of a self-reliant, resilient, independent western Europe, and it holds for the population of Indonesia itself because it has grown tremendously and it is dependent on peace for its own productivity and self-support. Take Java alone, which has grown from 4,000,000 to 48,000,000, in 100 years. That does not exactly suggest that these people are being starved to death. There has been no physical starvation in Java—under the Dutch—as there has been, and is, in India and China continuously—because the Dutch have built a sturdy native agriculture for the food supply of Indonesia. But there is starvation today in Java, and especially in the republican areas.

Incidentally, to pin prick another one of the propaganda illusions, most of the rice Indonesians eat is grown in Java, and most of it in Java in the so-called Republican area. If, therefore, there is starvation, and there is in the Republican area, it is not due to any economic blockade which the Dutch are conducting against the Republic because the very food which would relieve starvation is grown in the republican area. That is where the rice comes from. If there is starvation there, it is the structure of government (and communication and transportation and all the other factors that go into the growing and distribution of new crops) that has broken down to such an extent that the rice box of Indonesia isn't any longer sufficiently filled to feed its people.

The Marshall plan requires for its success a continued supply of raw materials to western Europe, and it requires for its success a restoration of the dollar earning capacity of western Europe, and the Netherlands are a significant part of that balance because their standard of living and productivity has been higher than that of most of the Continent. When the flow of the Marshall plan dollars ceases Europe must be able to earn its dollar exchange by increased exports and imports, and since we in the United States are not likely to absorb all of Europe's additional exports, we must think of European recovery in the perspective of world markets. A very large part of the vitality of the Marshall plan concept requires that there be some kind of restored order, some kind of restored productivity in those areas of the world economy from which western Europe has drawn part of the dollar exchange with which it can continue to buy its goods in the United States.

In the United States we are not as yet sufficiently sold on Cordell Hullism and lower tariffs to restore markets in the United States to the extent required for a balance in European trade, so foreign exchange—in this case dollar exchange—has to be earned by Europe as a whole in the world economy as a whole. A large part of this dollar exchange has always been earned by imports into the United States of America from the Malay-Indonesian area. The standard of living of the people in Indonesia is interdependent with the standard of living in western Europe—and they are all a closely interwoven whole with the economy of the world, including this country.

There is one other large factor that I would like to touch on in these sketchy remarks, so that we might have a little bit of common perspective on it. I probably shall be saying something that some of you already very well know. I refer to the whole argument before the Security Council. In the Security Council Charter there are no provisions given to the Security Council in domestic issues. Several of the powers represented on the Council believe that the Security Council has no competence in the Indonesian issue. The Dutch have all along challenged the legal competence of the Security Council. They have said, "Let us go to the Court of the Hague and have the Court say whether the Security Council has authority in this issue." The UN delegates have frequently said they

would like to leave that question open. They don't want to commit themselves on it, although Mr. Hodgson, from Australia, has been very vigorous in saying that what the Dutch have done in Java is worse than what Hitler did to the Netherlands. Did Hitler ever propose to go to the Hague to find out whether he had any legal rights in the Netherlands? Mr. Hodgson speaks for Australia, the domestic politics of which we do not understand too well in the United States. It has a Labor Government which is coming up for elections very shortly, and the margin is small. Several of the large trade-unions—particularly in the maritime and dock trades—are Communist-controlled to a great extent, and everybody knows that, and they are stipulating that the foreign policy must be what they want it to be. Does America know that Australia—the Australia of the "white Australia" which contrasts so curiously with the racial tolerance of the Dutch policies in Indonesia—in Paris a month or so ago was the only country, outside of the Soviet Union and its satellites, that voted against the Greek frontier report? It was the head of the same Australian delegation, Mr. Evatt, who created an opaque picture about the Berlin situation in the Council a month or so ago. Mr. Hodgson and Mr. Evatt rather consistently follow in the United Nations what I would call a "Trygve Lie line," leaning over rather significantly toward the side of an issue in which the Soviets are interested—not militantly, not by complete identification, since that, too, would lose votes in the Australian election, but by association, by "running interference," so to speak.

Then there is India which has been eloquent in its denunciation of the police action of the Dutch and seems to have forgotten its own police action against Hyderabad which led to casualties at least 10 times as high as the Java episode. Perhaps American opinion has forgotten that when India became independent, the grand parade that took place at Delhi gave the most featured place in the parade to the military contingent of Indian troops that had fought on the side of Japan in the last war. The pictures were in the New York Times. They have never been denied. That is very clearly and emphatically a picture of the type of power politics that gives it special flavor to the element with which the American representatives were cooperating against the Dutch in the Security Council.

The reason I used the words "ideological hypocrisy" in describing American policy is the contrast between the final conclusions which we support and the resounding rhetoric that precedes them. We seem to have our eyes primarily on the competitive ideological politics of the Voice of America rather than on the realities in Java. We make orations about good words like "freedom," "democracy," and "elections" without inquiring as to the meanings behind this vocabulary in Java. But the final action we support calls for a schedule of dates upon which interim governments and the ultimate Indonesian federation are to be established that do not differ in substance from the program announced by the Dutch themselves. The action we finally support is not mandatory but advisory. We recommend. We urge. And we do not dare to follow the rhetoric about the defiance of the Charter of the United Nations with specific mention of penalties or sanctions—we merely dress up the advisory machinery of the good offices, with a new verbal varnish to describe the same mechanism. In other words, we apparently preach for ideological effect on the gallery, but in the substance we are saying: "Go ahead and see whether you can get away with it." Meanwhile, we ignore the effect of this play to the gallery on the morale of the Dutch themselves, who are responsible for order in Java, and no one else is willing to undertake this responsi-

bility in their place. This seems to be a feeble way of translating the lessons of diplomacy which we should have learned from world affairs during the last 5 or 6 years. We can, perhaps, excuse our position at Yalta when we accepted the promises about freedom and democracy in central Europe, because it could then be argued that we had to give the Russians a chance to prove their good faith. Well, they went along and showed us what they meant by "freedom and democracy" in Poland. We got another lesson in the Jan Masaryk episode in Prague. But apparently we have to go through a mess of Yaltas to learn the same lesson all over again in the Far East.

If we had been clear in our policy, determined in our action, and had the courage of our convictions some years back, certain things could have been stopped in China which now, of course, are water over the dam. It may well be that we shall sacrifice another generation of young Americans; another wasted generation, as the fruit of that tragedy sometime in the future. Here we are allowing ideological rhetoric of the same sort to undermine the position of the Dutch who in their record of 50 years of progressive colonial administration, have proved that they mean what they say. Rhetoric on the one hand, realization and achievement on the other. Isn't it about time that America should see that its actions and its words are alined together? How many Yalta betrayals must there be to force us to a policy of action that is alined with realities, alined with the interests of America itself as well as of the Dutch and the peoples of Indonesia, rather than with Soviet propaganda mirages? Is there any evidence at all that fellow travelers and Japanese puppets are reliable allies in accomplishing the purposes for which America has always stood, the purposes of accomplishing real freedom, and democracy, real self-government?

It is a sad mistake to play competitive ideological politics when we undermine in the process the effectiveness of old friends tried in action, willing to back by action the things they say they believe in, and when the things these old friends are doing are, in fact, strictly in accord with American policy with regard to dependent countries as we have always defined it. Whether in the words of Cordell Hull, or Francis Sayre, our policy has not been a policy of giving independence immediately, which we didn't do ourselves in the Philippines, but of creating continuously circumstances through which the natives in the dependent country could work themselves into independence and self-control. Let's remember that in Indonesia 50,000,000 of the 75,000,000 are in the areas favorable to the Federal formula of local control; only 25,000,000 were in the area controlled by the Republic which favored centralized control from Djogjakarta. The Dutch advocate a decentralized administration, preserving the local privileges and self-government of these diversified cultural groups in the islands. Americans who remember the historic vitality of States' rights should have an understanding, if no one else has.

Holland had its declaration of independence in 1581, almost 200 years before we had ours. Her devotion to freedom and self-government is unsurpassed anywhere in the world. Holland has a record in the support of international law, legal procedures, progressive humanitarian ideas that matches that of any other people, bar none. Holland has over the last 50 years made as distinguished a record in the management of Indonesia as can be found anywhere in the colonial experience of the west if you consider the nature of the challenge and what was in fact done.

I submit it is time for America to put its policies, its actions in line with realities rather than with rhetoric, to recognize where its real allies are, and to remember priorities.

Priority No. 1 with us is a resilient self-controlled, independent, reconstructed western Europe. All the rest falls into perspective once you keep that in mind. If you get involved in side issues of an ideological sort in an effort to capture the votes of uncertain new friends while you sacrifice the old ones, you discredit the international machinery that is used to pursue such policies, and in the end you will sabotage and undermine the basic objectives of policy in the area of western Europe.

Thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, thoroughly respecting the motives and views of my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in offering his amendment, I am constrained to take the position that its adoption would be harmful, and I hope the amendment will be defeated. There are compelling reasons which bring me to this conclusion.

In the first place, in the consideration of the passage of this legislation those of us who support it—and I respect the views of those who do not, and I am expressing only my own views—do so because we consider that it is directly connected with the national interest of our own country. The principal effect of this amendment would be to force the United States into the position of enforcing decisions of the Security Council by economic sanctions unilaterally applied.

Having in mind the national interest of our own country, there is a provision in the bill, section 118, which instructs the Administrator to terminate aid to a country whenever "because of changed conditions assistance is no longer consistent with the national interest of the United States."

We cannot ignore the fact that the people of the Netherlands are a constructive influence in the world. I do not know whether they have made a mistake in Indonesia or not. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances yet to determine in my own mind whether they have made a mistake. But I will assume that they have made a mistake for the purposes of my discussion now. If the Dutch have made a mistake in Indonesia, there is no reason why we should make a mistake in connection with this bill. The national interests of our country, in connection with the passage of this legislation, is consistent with joining the issue with international communism in its attempt to subjugate the peoples of different countries and to enslave them and ultimately extend their control of communism over those countries to the point where it is directly opposed to the national interests of the United States. That is the goal we always have to keep in mind.

Assuming that the Dutch have made a mistake, which I am only assuming for the purpose of argument, then I believe we would be making a mistake if we were to adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman think it would be extremely unwise for the United States unilaterally to impose sanctions on a country which is also a member of the United Nations before that body, itself, has voted to impose any sanction on that country?

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman for his very gracious reference to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have profound respect for my friend, not only on this, but on all occasions.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman does recognize that I have tried in my amendment not to make it absolutely mandatory in the law that the President or Administrator immediately cut off aid, but I have made it a matter of policy.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I absolutely respect his views and his motives, but the gentleman's amendment rests on the premise that the Dutch have made a mistake, and if that is correct, I am not admitting it, but I am assuming it, for the purpose of the position I take, I think if we were to adopt his amendment, from the point of view of our own national interest, we would be making a mistake.

For the reasons that I have briefly expressed, Mr. Chairman, I think the adoption of this amendment would be unwise and I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Massachusetts, I, too, have great respect for my good friend from New York. I, too, am willing to make the same assumption in respect of the Indonesian situation. I make no defense of the action of the Netherlands in Indonesia. But I question very seriously whether this is a proper method for us to adopt in our desire to restore order and preserve freedom in that area. I call your attention to a part of section 121 (a) of the act which says:

Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to delegate to, or otherwise confer upon, any international or foreign organization or agency, any of his authority to decide the method of furnishing assistance under this title to any participating country or the amount thereof.

I think that is very important. I think that section 118 is important, and it has already been referred to.

I also call your attention to the fact that section 104 (a) of the act subjects the Administrator for Economic Cooperation to the control of the President, and I believe it would be a mistake to subject him instead to the control of the President of the Security Council.

Furthermore, section 105 (b) enjoins the closest collaboration between the Administrator and the Secretary of State, and authorizes the Secretary's interposition and reference to the President in the event of any inconsistency between the operation of the program and the foreign-policy objectives of the country.

I believe that there are other ways of dealing with this situation. I believe that we should think first and foremost of the over-all purposes of this program and of our own national security, and then take whatever action is appropriate in the circumstances. We should keep our eyes on our main objective, recognizing our opposition to imperialism and predatory colonialism.

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

Mr. LODGE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman agree that the Dutch, even considering the mistakes they may have made, have done a better job in Indonesia than any other colonial country anywhere in the world, except the United States in the Philippines?

Mr. LODGE. I am certainly interested to have the gentleman's statement on that.

Mr. JUDD. I believe the gentleman will agree that they have not killed nearly as many people in the areas they seized by force as we killed in the area that we seized by force—meaning these United States and the American Indians.

Mr. LODGE. I think this: We know very little about the so-called republican government there. But we do know one thing which is very shocking and that is a certain predatory contract with respect to the control of the exports and imports of that country. It is a contract of exploitation of the most reactionary kind. The republican government which represents at the most only one-third of the people of Indonesia, will by this monopoly contract be surrendering some of the most precious sovereign rights of the people of Indonesia.

Mr. JUDD. And that contract was not the work of the Dutch, it was cooked up by an American; is that not correct?

Mr. LODGE. By an American lawyer in New York City, and certain representatives of the so-called republican government of Indonesia.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that if the Dutch had treated their minorities the way we treated the American Indian, there would not be enough natives left there even to revolt?

Mr. LODGE. I might also say that if the Marshall plan could have operated on the basis on which this New York lawyer has operated in Indonesia, it would simplify our problems but it would most certainly not be fulfilling the purposes of the European Recovery Act. But it is an established American axiom that a country cannot abdicate its power in such a vital sphere of government action.

Mr. JUDD. I am opposed to European or American imperialism. I have spent most of my lifetime trying to help those people to freedom and better living. Colonialism is dead. But this is not the place or the way to handle that problem. And I despise self-righteousness.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I think it is important to point out to the Committee that no money under this bill will go to Indo-

nesia until the Netherlands have complied with the UN Security Council decision.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is very important.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. If an agreement is reached between the Indonesians and the Dutch then a limited sum will be made available.

Mr. LODGE. That is highly significant. If in adopting this amendment, aid were to be withheld from Holland, it might very well jeopardize the entire program; and that, personally, I am not willing to do.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me odd that there is now being used an argument to defeat this amendment on the ground that the money is going to be kept from Indonesia itself. Those are the very people we want to help; we should do everything possible, including the passage of this amendment, to see that they get money and fair dealing by seeing that the Netherlands comply with the resolution of the Security Council, because that is exactly the purpose we ought to serve.

Mr. LODGE. I, too, am interested in the effectiveness of United Nations decisions and resolutions. However, I may say to the gentleman that even if his amendment were acted on favorably, Indonesia would get no money under present circumstances.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very sorry, but the Dutch will.

Mr. LODGE. Depriving the Dutch of ECA aid may not solve the Indonesian conflict, but it will surely jeopardize the European recovery program.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 5, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] saw fit last Saturday to brand the bill now before us as a war program. He intimated further that to pass the bill might be a matter of insanity. He then singled out the economic conditions of the Republic of Italy and other participating countries for his studied abuse and castigation. The gentleman finally satiated his spleen by urging upon his colleagues the astounding proposition that notwithstanding our generous help, the working masses of Italy and the rest of Europe are in the throes of hunger, unemployment, and fascism as the result of ERP aid. It is evident from the remarks of the gentleman that he is misinformed both as to results of ERP aid and to the over-all objective of ERP in all participating countries.

The gentleman did not brand as a war program the billions of dollars appropriated by this House in the pre-Pearl Harbor days for the deliverance of communistic Russia from the assaults of European fascism. I wonder whether

the gentleman would brand as a war program the appropriation of a few billions of American dollars to assist communistic Russia to a more expeditious subjugation of the free Governments of China, Iran, Italy, France, England, and all ECA participating countries?

Mr. Chairman, if it is insanity for Members of this House to authorize funds to keep alive the spirit of freedom in the breast of man, if it is insanity to vote these funds to save the free governments of all Europe against subjugation by the hordes of communistic Russia, if it is insanity for this Christian Nation to provide funds to deliver the Christian civilization of Europe from the paganistic assaults of communistic Russia; then, I ask, was it insanity that motivated the intrepid Patrick Henry when he said "Give me liberty or give me death"? Was it insanity that induced men to risk the gallows when they wrote and signed the Declaration of Independence? Was it insanity for men to bare their breasts to sword and gun at Lexington, Bunker Hill, Germantown, and Valley Forge? Was it insanity that led Charles Martel and his brave Christian Franks to rout the Moslem hordes at the Battle of Tours? Was it insanity for the brave Germans and Poles to bar the Mongol hordes of Genghis Khan at the Battle of Liegnitz, and turn back the Ottoman Turk from the gates of Vienna? And was it insanity for Christ to seek the cross and for His followers to embrace the Decalog as man's only hope for peace on earth and a fitting reward beyond?

On the contrary, it is insanity to believe that a widespread condition of hunger and unemployment could long exist in Italy and the participating countries without it becoming known to the many uncensored radio and newspaper correspondents that have freedom of passage in and out of these countries. On the other hand, I speak as one with personal knowledge of the matter. My uncle, 3 aunts, and 36 first and second cousins whose lot it is to live in Italy have advised us nearly a year ago that there was an abundance of food in Italy and for us not to send any more food packages. Members of my family have visited Italy in the past 6 months and on their return they report that there is plenty of food but there is a slight shortage in shoes and articles of clothing.

From the Alps to Mount Etna, the communistic vermin in Italy are frantically trying to create the belief that fascism is again nascent in that land. I can well understand this communistic fear. It was fascism that drove communism out of Italy. It was fascism that drove that same vermin out of Spain. It was fascism that drove it out of Germany. It was fascism that drove the Red hordes from the eastern borders of Europe to the Asiatic ramparts of Stalingrad where the bear that walks like a man staggered, whining and cornered, until American war-program money provided the vitamins that brought the bear back roaring and triumphant to the heart of Christian Europe where the treacherous beast now deigns to enthrone his pagan gods upon the altars of Christian shrines.

Mr. Chairman, if the money authorized by this bill is intended to encourage the

free and Christian people of Europe to drive the treacherous bear back to the mongol dens of Asia, whether the bill be called a "war program" or by any other name, its passage would be the act of courageous men and women whose love of God and freedom transcends the bounds of country and sectarianism. I personally hold no brief for fascism. I am against it. But in its ugliest form it may offer greater hope than communism.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last few words.

Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to state for the RECORD that a number of Members from New York were not present in the Chamber last Saturday when there was a number of roll calls. They were unfortunately absent attending the funeral services of our late lamented colleague, Andrew L. Somers, so that they could not be present.

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

Mr. Chairman, after the First World War when Russia could not whip a cat, the people of the United States were worked into a frenzy so that for many years thereafter we had no trade and commerce with Russia and a good portion of that part of eastern Europe. However, some one profited from this trade and commerce. It was England and Germany that took advantage of the situation and they profited from trade and commerce with Russia during those years.

We find ourselves again whipped up into a great frenzy. I am not going to get all excited about this thing or get upset about it. This is a business proposition. Today we are restricted in our business and in our trade and commerce to less than one-half of the world. We are doing our business, trade, and commerce, with Treasury dollars, that is, taxpayers' dollars. It is not really business at all. If a private businessman was to operate his business on the basis we operate the Marshall-plan business today, he would go broke. It would be impossible for him to operate a business on that basis.

I see a lot of old Members of Congress present who were here when we had the old British loan up for discussion. Nearly all of us agreed that that was the last bit of money we were going to give away for nothing. I see a lot of Members here who were present when we voted on the second UNRRA appropriation bill. At that time you Members said: "Now, this is about as far as America can go. This is as much as we can stand. We have to protect our own people, our own Treasury, our own business, and the welfare of our own Nation." Also you said that you were not going to appropriate these moneys that way any more, that the thing would be done on a businesslike basis from then on.

I remember when the message came in from President Roosevelt stating to us that after that second UNRRA appropriation bill there would be no more free gift moneys going out from the United States Treasury; there would be no more

lend-lease; that the economy of the United States of America could not stand so much; that from here on there would be no more of this gift money donated and shoveled out of the United States Treasury. That was the understanding here. So, right after that a plan was worked out to which I think we all agreed on that there would be an International World Bank established, through which bank money would be loaned to the various nations for their reconstruction and rehabilitation. It was supposed to be done on a business basis. The United States of America would have 75 percent of the stock in that bank, and the remaining 25 percent of the stock would be held by all the other nations of the world. All the nations agreed except Russia to participate in that bank. Now, that was a good set-up; that was a business set-up under which there would be no burden put upon our taxpayers and we would not have to dig into the Treasury of the United States for those dollars, or so that the nations of the world could not say, "Good old Uncle Sam, he has a lot of money; we will never pay him back," because they would have to return this money, the money which they borrowed from the International World Bank. They would have to return it or these nations would lose their credit and standing in the family of nations. They would have to return it even though we were the biggest stockholder in the bank.

There was another plan worked out, a plan for the International Trade Organization. This was a plan that was worked out in Habana wherein all the nations again agreed to participate except Russia. Under this plan we would have trade flow freely and on a business basis between all the nations of the world. It was a live and let live proposition, but no nation would be shown preference by us as against another. All nations were to be our friends, and it was a program for peace. The World Bank and the International Trade Organization are the two programs for world peace. They aim to bring the people and the nations together, not to disunite them, not to create blocs, not to create cold wars, not to create the kind of condition that exists today.

But, what has happened? Where have we gone? Yes, where have we gone? Is it too late to turn back? Can we not get back to a sensible basis again?

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Can we not understand that the debt of the United States of America today is \$252,000,000,000? Our debt is twice as big now as the entire debt of all the Marshall plan countries put together, including England. It must be paid.

You people were here when the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri

[Mr. CANNON], spoke the other day. Here is what he said:

While on this subject, how many are in favor of repudiating the national debt? How many will vote to confiscate the Government bonds which constitute the national debt? We must either pay these bonds or repudiate them. We owe \$252,000,000,000. If we start paying them and paid only \$5,000,000,000 a year, it would take over 100 years to pay off the debt.

Now, I do not know how you people feel about it. I am not going to go back to my district and face the taxpayers and voters of my district in the next election and say, "Yes; I did vote for the expenditure of all these moneys under the Marshall plan." I am going to vote for old-age pensions for the people of America. I am going to vote for veterans' benefits, and I am going to vote for hospitals in the State of Michigan, schools, aid to education, public works, St. Lawrence waterway, housing, and all of those measures for the benefit of our citizens and our national welfare.

By the way, do you know that we were to get two hospitals in the State of Michigan, one for our tuberculosis patients and one for our mental patients? That program was cut out. They said, "We have not got the money to build these hospitals." We asked for two little harbors, one at Port Sanilac and one at Port Austin, amounting to some little amount of money to build these two little harbor projects in Michigan. Here they ask for \$6,000,000,000, and you will just shovel it right out and give it to them.

Yes, the United States of America is strong, but you cannot be like the old father who was so generous with his children that he gave them everything he had, and then found himself living in a poorhouse in his old age.

Do not forget that our national income is down 8 percent for the first quarter of this year as compared to last year, and the arrow is pointing downward. The national income may go as low as 20 percent below that of last year. What does that mean? Where are you going to get these tax dollars? You are not going to get them out of a reduced national income, and you are going to find yourself taking probably 85 to 90 cents out of the businessman's profit dollar, and then expect that businessman to go ahead and do business and be in competition with the businessmen of Germany, the businessmen of England and France and other countries who will probably be paying only 10 to 15 cents out of their tax dollar.

In 1948 British exports climbed to \$6,600,000,000. Four times as much as 1945 and the highest figure ever attained. In 1948 Britain sold nearly 300,000 motor vehicles abroad. Thirty-eight thousand of them coming to the United States of America.

During 1948 we sold only 430,000 vehicles overseas. So now with Marshall plan aid, the British automaker, sold 40 percent of the total export business. That is not all. Now the German Opel and the Volkswagen are being pushed by the Marshall planners and by General Clay to give us further competition in the automobile business.

In the field of textile manufactures Britain's sales eclipsed American sales almost 50 percent—\$1,300,000,000 against \$800,000,000. Americans have long prided themselves as manufacturers of machinery and machine tools, yet in 1948 Britain sold for export \$1,016,000,000 while the American makers sold only \$1,670,000,000.

In 1947 this country exported to Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay seven times as much as did Britain; but by the end of 1948 the South American nations were buying virtually the same amount of goods from both countries. In Argentine sales Britain led the United States by a substantial margin.

In the prewar years two of the toughest competitors for world trade were Germany and Japan. These defeated nations were almost entirely out of the market from 1945 to 1947, but in 1948 they started a come-back which is making itself felt all over the world.

"Made in Japan" and "Made in Germany" were very familiar marks throughout the world prior to 1939. Those same marks are showing up on store counters again. Japan gained almost a monopoly in the field of low-priced vases, Christmas-tree ornaments, cheap toys; and was a very important factor in such fields as electric-light bulbs, rayon, and cotton textile. Western Germany is again pushing the market in dyestuffs, chemicals, and cutlery, fields in which it has been dominant for nearly 50 years.

The military governments of Japan and Germany have been carrying out a policy of making both regions self-sufficient since the close of the war on both fronts. The American taxpayer has sent billions of dollars to those areas to accomplish this self-sufficiency; but the same taxpayer now finds he has erected competition to himself, which is being felt especially in South America and Asia.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill calls, as I understand it, for \$5,580,000,000.

Mr. VORYS. At present only \$5,380,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that all? You cut it down and saved a lot of money on that?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEE. What is the parliamentary situation with reference to this section? As I understand, the section has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has completed the reading of section 1 of the bill through line 11 on page 2. There are 9 sections of the bill remaining to be read.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to inquire whether the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to section 1.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. It is at page 2, between lines 11 and 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman proposes to insert a new section?

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I hope it is not the intention of the Chairman of the Committee to shut off from debate those who may be opposed to the bill. I have been trying to get 10 minutes to speak since the bill was taken up, and I expect to request very shortly to be given 10 minutes to express my views.

Mr. KEE. May I say that there is no intention to cut off debate. We want to try to finish this bill this afternoon if we possibly can. It is our intention to finish it as rapidly as we can and at the same time to give everyone an opportunity to be heard.

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

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will that permit another amendment to be offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot determine that. The Chair would have to recognize Members within the limitations of the time fixed by the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I propose to offer an amendment to this section.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 2, line 10, after the word "shall", strike out the word "seriously."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, at page 2, line 10, beginning at line 9, the bill reads as follows:

That, no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

My amendment merely seeks to eliminate the word "seriously"; thus leaving the language to read:

That, no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall impair the economic stability of the United States.

The Committee should accept the amendment for the reason that I believe it was originally intended that this act should in no way impair the stability and economy of the United States.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Unquestionably this act last year impaired the economic stability of the United States by increasing inflationary pressures. It seems to me we must leave the word "seriously" in, because unquestionably a gigantic effort such as this affects the stability of our country. We must weigh that against the possible benefits.

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to that, I feel that those who believe in the objectives of this bill have let it be known publicly that this act in no way impairs the economic conditions and the stability of the United States. If that is so the amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I said on the floor last year, if the gentleman will remember, that when we voted for this bill it meant voting among other things to reduce our standards of living in the United States. We knew what it meant. You cannot export steel and tools and farm machinery and scores of other things that are needed badly here at home, without impairing our stability. You cannot keep our taxes as high as they are without endangering our economy. But if we do not succeed in this program, the costs for our national defense will impair our security far more seriously. We said that frankly last year and we ought to face it frankly now, and support the bill knowing what it means.

Mr. STEFAN. Then you are serving notice on the people of the United States that if this bill passes, it is going to affect the stability and economy of our country and that the standard of living of our people is going to be lowered and impaired.

Mr. JUDD. The same words were in the bill last year.

Mr. STEFAN. And our standard of living is going to be lowered and impaired as a result of this legislation. I did not so understand it. I hope the members of the committee will accept my amendment and eliminate that one word "seriously" in order to notify the people of the United States that this act will not impair the stability and economy of the United States.

Mr. JUDD. That word "seriously" was in the bill last year.

Mr. STEFAN. That is still embodied within the act as it now stands.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Inasmuch as the members of the committee

admit that this will impair our stability, are they able to tell us how seriously and when? How far?

Mr. STEFAN. I should think they should give us some information. I understood that it was not going to impair the economy and stability of the United States. In any event the people of our country should be put on notice and prepared for coming events.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

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

The question was taken and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were—ayes 32, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAVALCANTE: Page 2, between lines 11 and 12 insert:

"SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 103 (a) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the final period and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "And provided further, That such country has filed with the Economic Cooperation Administration (as hereinafter established) an itemized account of its governmental income, expenditures, assets, and indebtedness, together with a statement of its national economic and security requirements."

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I yield.

Mr. KEE. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it is my understanding that the information the gentleman wishes to be filed under his amendment can be found in the records of ECA. If I am not correct in that I shall be very glad before the Committee rises to return to this section so that the gentleman can offer his amendment, but I feel sure the information is already with the ECA and is available.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I have implicit confidence in the chairman of the committee, and shall avail myself of the information the gentleman states is available to us.

In view of the statement made by the gentleman from West Virginia, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM] is recognized.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I am for America first and it is because of that fact that I favor this legislation.

Every course which America has followed in the past has led us straight to war. It may be that this course will not prevent war; it may finally again lead us to war, but at least it affords an opportunity for us to detour around the old road and to take a determined step on a new road in the hope that it may lead us to a different goal than that toward which we have been marching and periodically arriving. That is my main reason for supporting this legislation.

Call it a noble experiment, if you wish, call it a shot in the dark, call it by any name you choose; names are incidental, objectives all important; but even though it lead to war we shall not be any worse off than we have been in all the years past. We have always arrived at the same goal every time; namely, war.

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

Mr. BREHM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Will not the gentleman agree that if an aggressor starts war anywhere in the world his target will be America first?

Mr. BREHM. I believe there is no question about that, for America would be more of a prize than any other country. I am hopeful that the passage of this legislation might make it impossible for any other nation to win this prize, Surely its passage will not facilitate the winning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired, all time has expired on section 1.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 104 (e) of such act is hereby amended by striking out "\$10,000 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest rate authorized by such act."

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill now before us.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying that circumstances sometimes alter cases. In the case of the European aid plan, a circumstance occurred recently which definitely should alter that case.

I refer to the signing of the Atlantic Pact.

The Atlantic Pact is designed to stop the spread of communism in Europe and I am for the Atlantic Pact but only as a temporary measure. Now that Europe is on its feet, so far as food and intense suffering are concerned, and now that the Atlantic Pact has been signed, and according to high Government officials will soon be ratified by the United States Senate, and Russian aggression will be stopped by force of arms if necessary; then, I ask you, why is it desirable for this Nation to keep giving these billions of dollars to Europe?

This proposal before us now, that this United States Congress continue to dish out people's money to Europe, would not be quite so hard for me to swallow if the excess-profits tax on corporations had not been completely taken off, as it has. That tax should have been left on to the extent of at least 50 percent, in order to lighten the load of those of our people who need their tax money to buy food.

I am against the continuance of this spending because I believe the plain people of this Nation are being made the goat, just as they were after the First World War. Then it was loans to Europe which were never repaid. The big-business men of the Nation who have made so much money out of selling goods to our Government under the European aid plan are behind this plan to continue this heavy spending longer than it is absolutely necessary. It is as plain as the

nose on your face that the average people of this country are being victimized by the big-business interests again and I urge every Member of this House to join me in defeating the continuation of this unnecessary spending.

The Atlantic Pact is all right as a temporary measure but we must make the United Nations into an effective world organization for the maintenance of permanent world peace.

We must not let the United Nations suffer the fate of the League of Nations, for if we do, world war III is as sure as tomorrow's sunrise.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us stop this spending plan where it is, and get back on the road to true world peace through the United Nations, without Russia. The best way I can think of to insulate the freedom-loving nations of the world against communism is to force Russia out of the United Nations until she gives her people freedom of religion and all the other freedoms enjoyed by the people of truly democratic nations; then remove the single nation veto power from the United Nations set-up and provide the United Nations with an international armed force for the maintenance of permanent peace.

Russia as the lone nonmember of the United Nations would not dare attack the entire free world and we would have peace even without her in the United Nations. We should leave the door open for Russia to come in when and if she puts her house in order. Just as Woodrow Wilson predicted World War II when pleading for the League of Nations 30 years ago this humble individual now joins with millions of other people throughout our Nation and the world in predicting world war III if we do not make the United Nations into an effective organization for the maintenance of peace. Fellow Members, will you be able to look into the eyes of your children and your grandchildren with a clear conscience 20 years from now? I will, because I am going to vote against the continuance of this spending plan and try to get back on the road to true world peace through the United Nations.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this piece of legislation and tell you briefly why I am for it based on a personal observation that I made this last summer in Europe. I did not go as a Member of Congress because I was not a Member at that time. I was not entertained in any of the Embassies, because I did not want to be. I went as a plain citizen of the United States to try to find out whether or not the ECA was justified. I can say to you without fear of contradiction that no open-minded Member of Congress can make a personal investigation over there and come home with any other conviction except the fact that we are justified immeasurably by continuing this legislation. I could talk to you on charitable grounds; I could talk to you on the basis of the Golden Rule, but those who oppose it say, "Let us be practical; let us be sound." So, I base my support on an actuarial basis, if you please, and say that this is the cheapest

piece of insurance that the United States is able to buy in the world today.

If I were to oppose this legislation and to treat my own business in the same manner as I would be treating my country's business, suppose I owned a business block in some profitable section of my city, and the next block were on fire, and the wind were blowing in my direction, I should call my insurance agency and cancel my insurance.

I traveled through the Communist sections of Paris and the Communist sections of Rome. The reason the Communists are screaming today against the ERP is that we have stopped communism in its tracks in Europe.

Let us be realistic about it. Let us admit that we are interfering in the affairs of Europe. Let us admit that we are putting the might of America on the side of right and decency. I was in Italy a few days after the Italian elections, and every wall and every ruin, and there are a lot of them in Italy, was covered and plastered with posters saying in Italian, "Vote communistic." Where did that money come from? It came from Russia. The Communist leaders of Italy are frank to admit that is where it came from. Russia would like to get Italy and the rest of the western European countries as easily as possible.

You talk about spending \$15,000,000,000 for the armed forces. Yes, I am for that. You talk about the lowering of our standard of living. If we permit the democratic nations of western Europe to become communized, and if we permit Russia to grab them off the same way they grabbed off Czechoslovakia and the rest of the free nations of Europe, we will have an enemy bent on our destruction standing only 5 hours by fast bombers from our shores. It will not be a question of a standard of living but whether we are living with this great Nation of ours standing with its back to the wall, as it will be if we take the easy way out. It is the easy way out if we do not adopt this legislation. It is the way we have taken in the past, when we played the ostrich and hid our heads in the sand and refused to adopt a positive foreign policy.

I listened with interest to some of the opponents of this legislation, and I have not heard any positive alternative broached. I have been a member of a minority party in the legislature of my home State. It is easy to be against something, it is easy to be negative, but it is difficult to present a positive policy. Perhaps those who are taking a positive approach will make mistakes, but I sincerely believe that if we do not take a positive approach we will not, to paraphrase the words of someone who preceded me, be able to look our children and grandchildren in the face, because we will have let them down, and we will have opened our gates to the kind of government that this Nation has abhorred since it has been a nation, a dictatorship of the worst order. I care not whether it be a dictatorship of the proletariat or a dictatorship of the Fascist-Nazi type, it is still a dictatorship, and it is against everything that democracy stands for and everything this Nation has been

founded upon. Even if this legislation demanded that we lower our standard of living, and it does not, it promises to improve not only the standard of western Europe but our own, is it not better to take a positive approach, knowing what we are doing, deliberately, than standing defenseless against our enemy?

It seems to me the United States, in a realistic Christian approach, is answering affirmatively the age-old question, Am I my brother's keeper?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I find it most difficult to speak this afternoon in opposition to two distinguished colleagues from my own State. I have great respect for their integrity and their points of view but unfortunately I cannot agree with them on this issue.

I am in favor of the European recovery program in general and the highly desirable objectives it seeks to accomplish. I reserve, however, the right at a later date, possibly, to vote for a cut in the appropriations for ERP if the facts at that time show a needed reduction.

I have listened very carefully during all the general debate and all of the discussion here this afternoon. Fortunately, most of the discussion has been of a bipartisan nature, with both Republicans and Democrats supporting the plan inaugurated during the Eightieth Congress. However, little has been said about the specific problems facing the European nations who require assistance and the way in which our foreign aid has provided some solution to date.

For example, and I have become quite familiar with this situation, the United Kingdom has for a long time produced annually approximately 100,000 long tons, or 2,240,000 bags, of dry edible peas. Because of sorting and grading problems, close to 40 percent of the crop is not consumable by human beings in the United Kingdom. The antiquated sorting methods previously used in that country have been wasteful and inefficient and as a result the United Kingdom has been forced to import a considerable amount of dry edible peas. Better sorting methods in this one item in past years would have helped cut down Britain's unfavorable exchange balance.

Under the ECA, the answer has been partially found in 1 year. In this country American ingenuity has developed a machine which cuts down the sorting and grading costs and at the same time does a far better job. We in America have used this electric sorting machine for almost two decades and solely because of the European recovery program our friends across the seas will now derive similar benefit.

By the installation of less than 30 electric sorting machines the need for future pea importations to the United Kingdom will be cut down materially. In fact, the cost of the machines will be

matched by less need for food imports. The cost of the machines equals only what England has been paying each year for the now-estimated savings in imports. This is progress, not only for the European beneficiaries of ECA, but for us in the United States. If this program continues on such a constructive basis, giving the same benefits to other European countries, I will continue to support the principles of ECA.

I would like to say one further word. The distinguished gentleman from California has said, "Will we who are going to support this program hereafter be able to look our sons and daughters and our grandsons and granddaughters in the eye and say, 'Did we do right by them by adopting ERP?'" It is my humble opinion that we who support the program can at least look them in the eye and say, "We tried and are trying to do something by adopting a policy that is new and which offers hope of success in our fight against communism." The European recovery program involves a calculated risk, but it is not a policy which in the past has been unquestionably a failure and which has led us to two disastrous wars, to the great detriment of the youth and future of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio stated that the opponents of this bill have offered no alternative proposition. I think I did give you the alternative to the Marshall plan. I did give you the alternative to digging into the Treasury of the United States and stealing these taxpayers' dollars. The alternative is the International World Bank.

Every nation in the world would benefit from that except Russia, because Russia is the only one that has refused to go into it. As long as she does not want to go into it, that is all right with us. But other nations have all joined the International World Bank. That is the way this program should have been worked out. The reconstruction of the world should have been worked out through the International World Bank in conjunction with the International Trade Organization agreements that we reached at Habana.

In the New Deal days, when I was a Member of Congress here, under Franklin D. Roosevelt, we found many of these men who are coming up here now and who are going to vote for this exorbitant expenditure of money, as I said, we found them shouting their heads off against the CCC camps, against the HOLC, the PWA, the WPA, and all these New Deal programs. What was the total bill? What was the total tax bill at that time? What was our budget? It was \$9,700,000,000. That is what it cost us in those New Deal days under Roosevelt. Congressman after Congressman got up in the well of the House and shouted his head off about those terrific expenditures. What is our budget now? It is \$42,000,000,000, and it is going to reach \$45,000,000,000. That is 4½ times as much. Do you have a national income to pay that kind of money? You cannot expect to keep on raising this money out of the taxpayers on the basis

of war-profit dollars. That is over with. You have to get back on an even keel, and on a solid business basis from now on. You are not going to have these free and easy dollars to pick up out of the taxpayers' rockets. They will not be able to afford it. You have got to get down to business. Let me see what Mr. Hoffman said here. Mr. Hoffman lists the first year's achievements as follows:

1. Industrial production for 1948, for all the participating countries, was virtually at the prewar figure and it was 14 percent above prewar in certain countries. For the last quarter of 1948 industrial output was at a rate 5 percent greater than prewar.

How far do you intend to rebuild these countries? To what extent? Where are we going to stop? When you talked about Marshall plan funds last year, you were talking about countries devastated by war and we were going to restore their economy. We have restored them; we have them right back where they were before the war. Where do we stop? Western European coal production reached 398,000,000 metric tons in 1948. Steel continued to set the production pace among heavy industry, the output for 1948 totaling approximately 40,000,000 metric tons in ERP countries, or 30 percent more than in 1947. In Bizonia a large balance of funds allocated for western Germany will remain after the first 15 months of Marshall plan aid ending June 30. The latest statistics on Bizonia show that of \$519,600,000 allocated, only \$248,000,000 had been contracted for by March 15, with very little likelihood that Bizonia will make use of or expend the other millions by June 30. The \$270,000,000 allocated for Germany is still unspent. They cannot spend it, they cannot find a place to spend it; they cannot spend it before June 30, yet they are coming in here asking for more money. The Christian Science Monitor of last Tuesday contains an article stating that the Marshall planners for Austria have pledged themselves to build a big new opera house in Vienna. They have pledged it, they are going to do it; they are going to spend money to build an opera house in Vienna. We cannot get money to build schools and hospitals to take care of our own people in this country, yet we can afford to give money to build opera houses in Europe, probably to give the Europeans spiritual uplift, not only an economic and financial uplift but we must build them up spiritually.

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

During the past few weeks we have been passing appropriation bills here in the halls of Congress. We are now faced with two measures that will cost the people of our country a large sum of money. I have reference to the military outlay and the economic aid program to the countries cooperating under the Marshall plan.

I am not and do not pretend to be an economist but I do try to analyze as best I can the trends of our business conditions here in America and base my judgment on the findings of improvements or slackening of general business conditions.

Recently farm prices have been steady than industrial prices and a noticeable down-trend in the price of some of our metals has been noted.

According to the Census Bureau's estimate recent unemployment figures were around 3,200,000. This has been accentuated somewhat by the shut-down order on coal mining. But the unemployment compensation rolls seem to be levelling off according to the latest weekly figures by the United States Department of Labor and this Department seems confident that little or no further increase in unemployment will develop within the next few months and it is generally believed that we will again reach the 60,000,000 employed which existed during the summer months of 1948.

Inventory fluctuations are always a powerful factor in determining our business swings. The best estimate of our inventories shows a large reduction in practically all lines.

The latest figure on personal income is around \$220,000,000,000 or more. This is very close to an all-time peak.

We have also noticed a reduction in prices of manufactured goods in the past few months, more than at any time since the inflation period started and I believe a new balance is being worked out on a firm basis on the over-all problem of inventories and commitments.

In cotton goods this adjustment has been running for more than a year. Metals and heavy industries only began to face it early this year. So it seems evident that this downturn in business will not be deepened and prolonged by drastic liquidations as it is evident that most business has been very cautious and properly so.

I feel that the strong point in the outlook is that familiar causes which in the past produce these recessions do not appear today to exert such a heavy weight. An enormous amount of work is in progress throughout the country at the present time and we have had very few cancellations. Public expenditures on construction are still large.

Interest on money is neither high nor is it very tight as it has been before in nearly all major business depressions. The reports show that banks are nearly all liquid and are in a position to take on new loans if the right borrowers request the loans. The Federal Reserve is in a position today to quickly relieve any strain in the supply of credit and it has already expressed this desire and willingness to cooperate in that direction. Also annual reports show evidence of satisfactory corporate earnings. Most of these corporations have recently made their annual reports.

It is these factors, coupled with the necessity of building up a sound European economy and those countries that desire to remain as members of a group that value freedom and desire to remain so, which make this measure necessary. World conditions being what they are at the present hour it still remains a fact that we must continue to remain in a strong position with an Air Force, Army, and Navy adequate to meet any emergency.

This measure which we are considering today and the armed services appropriation which will come before us in a few days will go a long way toward promoting and carrying out the American ideals of a peaceful world. This is my reason for supporting the measure.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, is the opposition going to get 5 or 10 minutes on some of these amendments?

Mr. KEE. There is no amendment before us.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I object to closing debate in 5 minutes.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

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

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

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

Mr. HUBER. I am glad to note a quorum is present and that the Members are showing their interest by keeping a quorum present because I know the committee will have a very interesting message from my colleague.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to delay the Committee, but there is nothing closer to my heart than the appropriation for this important work. I hope I may paraphrase a great Britisher, Winston Churchill, when he made the statement with regard to the Royal Air Force that, "Never in the history of mankind was so much owed by so many to so few."

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that never in my humble opinion in the history of mankind was so much given to so many by so few. When I think of 140,000,000 Americans trying to bring rehabilitation and help to practically the rest of the civilized world, in my opinion it is one of the finest concepts of true charity I know of in the history of the world. But we are not predicating this entirely on thoughts of charity. We are trying to build back into the economic structure of these countries a new life for them and we hope a new life for all the world.

I do not want to stand here as an American Pharisee and say that we are the privileged few; that we are better than other peoples; but I think Americans have shown to the world as fine a concept of the principles of Christ as has ever been shown by any of the peoples of the world. We were smitten on one

cheek by our enemy, Japan, and we immediately turned the other cheek and tried to help these people who had smitten us.

So that has been our program. When we start thinking about cost, we must also think about the result. One of our earlier Presidents, when we were discussing a pension program, said to the people of America that there are two views to the pension question: One from the Little Round Top at Gettysburg, and the other from the statistical tables of some of our accountants. So, today, I do not want to dramatize this very important measure, but I think there are two views to this great question: one from the standpoint of a devastated Europe and one from the point of view of what we can do to bring back to that devastated Europe some opportunity to regain their place in the world.

If I could in my humble way convert a man who I feel has the great ability and great linguistic power—and I refer to that distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]—if I could just have one person feel as I do about this great question I would be satisfied. I would like to feel that he is like Paul going down to Jericho and is being converted to this new concept of world leadership for America. I appeal to you with all sincerity I have to have sympathy for this great, great question. I do not want to be melodramatic about it, but to me this is the most important thing that we will be faced with in this session of Congress. If we can bring back to Europe an opportunity to take her place in the sun and if possible to lessen the chance of another war, I feel that it is worth the venture. So, my colleagues, let us with all sincerity realize that we are taking the money of our taxpayers. That we have a responsibility to spend that money as judiciously as our hearts and minds can direct, and I feel that if we go into our inward thoughts we will find that we will never spend that money more judiciously than in trying to bring back to the countries of Europe new hope and a chance to be rehabilitated and at the same time try to eliminate another horrible war.

One of the speakers referred to Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Administrator. I have only met that gentleman twice, but I feel that in meeting him you realize his sincerity, and if you and I could find his inner thoughts, I think he would agree that he has given more time and energy and heartfelt enthusiasm to this task than he ever gave to the creation of his own fortune in private industry.

I think we should carry out Lowell's precept when he said:

It is not what we give but what we share
For the gift without the giver is bare;
Who bestows himself with his aims feeds
three—
Himself, his hungering neighbor, and me.

We have really shared these gifts. We have sent our talent and our capable men to help in the administration of the program, and I do not think anyone can say that the past administration of this worth-while project is in any way to be criticized.

So, I say please let us support this great program.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 105 (c) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out "section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Export Control Act of 1949."

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 108 of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "There shall be a Deputy United States Special Representative in Europe who shall (a) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (b) be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and (c) have the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. The Deputy United States Special Representative shall perform such functions as the United States Special Representative shall designate, and shall be Acting United States Special Representative during the absence or disability of the United States Special Representative or in the event of a vacancy in the office of United States Special Representative."

SEC. 5. The last sentence of section 109 (a) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and the chief of the special mission shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, or a chief of mission, class 4, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or compensation and allowances in accordance with section 110 (a) of this title, as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or appropriate."

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

Mr. Chairman, when the bill was before the Congress last year which became the four packages of aid, as you will recall, I supported that legislation. I did it as a result of knowledge which I gained as a member of the deficiency subcommittee, which was conducting hearings in order to report the appropriation bill prior to the passage of the authorization act itself. When that act was on the floor for discussion last year, I recall so vividly, I could walk right from the committee room of the Committee on Appropriations onto the floor, after hearing the evidence that was submitted by the proponents of the appropriation, and then listen to the argument that took place here on the floor. I heard man after man stand in the well of this House last year and proclaim this as a program of charity, to relieve suffering, to relieve disease, to succor the wounded and provide them with food, and so on and so on. Some of you will recall I took the floor at that time to announce my position with respect to this bill. While I had great pride in all of the charitable impulses which prompted those who made that sort of argument, I knew at that time that I could not predicate my support of the legislation on such narrow ground. I told the Congress then that I was supporting it because I was convinced it was an implementation of the military strategy of the United States, and an implementation of our accepted and announced foreign policy and that

not to support it, to my mind, would be to vote against the best interests of my own country. I challenged anybody to stand up on the floor at that time and tell the Congress what the alternative was to the program which was then before the Congress. I listened attentively to all the debates last year, and you can scan through that RECORD as you will and you will not find any alternative there. Neither will you find any alternative offered in the debates this year. They spent 14 days debating this thing in the other body at length, and all of the arguments that could possibly be thought of were raised. When the final vote came, there were seven Members of the other body who voted against the program.

I can stand here from now until the end of next week and point out what I conceive to be mistakes of administration, perhaps, but on the question as to the over-all policy, now that we are in this program, I do not intend, so far as my vote is concerned, to stop. I cannot see how we could possibly do that and act consistently in accordance with our own self-interests. The gentleman from Ohio who spoke a few moments ago explained the situation and made it just as clear as a bell. I say to you, my colleagues of the House, coming from the State of Wisconsin, where it has been alleged time and time again we were isolationists and all that sort of thing, we know that the die is cast. We fought certain things back in 1941 and 1942. But the policy of this country was announced. We went into that war and gave everything we had for it. So far as I am concerned, no one has brought forth any program to substitute for that which is suggested by both parties in this program. Until such an alternative is forthcoming, I can do nothing but support the program which has been given to us and which has the united support of both parties in both platforms.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) Paragraph (2) of section 111 (a) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out the final period and inserting in lieu thereof "for United States flag vessels, not to exceed a reasonable differential above current world market rates."

(b) Paragraph (3) of section 111 (b) of such act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

(1) By inserting after "projects" a comma and the following: "including expansion, modernization, or development of existing enterprises" and a comma;

(2) By inserting after "media" the following: "consistent with the national interests of the United States";

(3) By striking out "in the first year after the date of the enactment of this act" and inserting in lieu thereof "made in any fiscal year";

(4) By amending subparagraph (i) thereof to read as follows:

"(i) the guaranty to any person shall not exceed the amount of dollars invested in the project by such person with the approval of the Administrator plus actual earnings or profits on said project to the extent provided by such guaranty;"

(5) By inserting after subparagraph (iii) thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(iv) as used in this paragraph, the term 'investment' includes the furnishing of capi-

tal goods items and related services, for use in connection with projects approved by the Administrator, pursuant to a contract providing for payment in whole or in part after June 30, 1950; and

"(v) the guaranty to any person shall be limited to assuring the following: (1) the transfer into United States dollars of other currencies, or credits in such currencies received by such person as earnings or profits from the approved investment, as repayment or return thereof, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof; and (2) compensation in United States dollars for loss of all or any part of the approved investment, which shall be found by the Administrator to have been lost to such person by reason of one or more of the following causes: (a) seizure, confiscation, or expropriation, (b) destruction by riot, revolution, or war, (c) any law, ordinance, regulation, decree, or administrative action (other than measures affecting the conversion of currency), which in the opinion of the Administrator prevents the further transaction of the business for which the guaranty was issued. When any payment is made to any person pursuant to a guaranty as hereinbefore described, the currency, credits, or assets on account of which such payment is made shall become the property of the United States Government, and the United States Government shall be subrogated to any right, title, claim, or cause of action existing in connection therewith."

(6) By amending the next to last sentence thereof to read as follows: "The total amount of the guaranties made under this paragraph (3) shall not exceed \$300,000,000: *Provided*, That any funds allocated to a guaranty and remaining after all liability of the United States assumed in connection therewith has been released, discharged, or otherwise terminated, shall be available for allocation to other guaranties, the foregoing limitation notwithstanding."

(c) Paragraph (2) of section 111 (c) of such act is hereby amended in the following particulars:

(1) By amending the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "In addition to the amount of notes above authorized, the Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section, to issue notes from time to time for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$300,000,000 less any amount allocated prior to April 3, 1949, for such purpose, until all liabilities arising under guaranties made pursuant to this authorization have expired or been discharged."

(2) By striking out the first two words, "Such notes" in the second sentence thereof and inserting "The notes hereinabove authorized";

(3) By inserting after "Washington" in the sixth sentence thereof "for assistance on credit terms."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATTERSON: On page 7, after line 4, insert the following:

"(d) Section 111 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof new subsections as follows:

"(e) No assistance shall be furnished under this act to a participating country or protectorate during any period with respect to which the Secretary of State determines that such country or protectorate is violating any treaty with the United States.

"(f) No assistance shall be furnished to a participating country, or a major political subdivision, or dependent area thereof, which is discriminating in the distribution of com-

modities or materials provided as assistance on grounds of race or religion.

"(g) No assistance shall be furnished to a participating country or a major political subdivision, or dependent area thereof, which is discriminating against American enterprise located in such area."

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill at the place where offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this deals with the administration of ECA funds. I believe, therefore, it is germane to this particular section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has had an opportunity to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, and the Chair feels that the amendment is germane to section 111 of the act. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment very simply stated seeks to do three things—to assure that assistance under ECA will not be granted to participating countries who act in violation of treaties in effect between those countries and the United States; to assure that any assistance under the act will not be denied to persons because of their race or religion; and that there will be no discrimination against American enterprise doing business in any of the participating countries.

The necessity for this amendment is indicated by a condition that currently exists in French Morocco. It is hoped that by the adoption of this amendment conditions such as these which exist elsewhere will also be corrected. There are in Morocco 36 members of a trade association, all of them American citizens, 31 of them American veterans. They returned to French Morocco after the war feeling that there were many opportunities available for trade and hoping, by the use of American enterprise and initiative, to establish themselves in the economic pattern of Morocco. Events have proved since the enactment of ECA that discrimination of the most unfair kind is practiced.

All of these veterans are engaged in small business about which we in Congress proclaim our faith and good intentions. Here is the opportunity for us to help not only small business; but the veterans. Our trade treaty with Morocco specifies that an ad valorem tax of 12½ percent on imports shall be levied. Yet these American citizens are required to pay duties in excess of 150 percent of the value of the merchandise landed at Casablanca. If the duties are not paid promptly, the material is confiscated and, although payments have been made under protest for a year and

a half, they have been to no avail. The sums which are unrecovered in these protest payments run well into seven figures. There is an accumulation of 3 months' supply of merchandise in Casablanca, much of which has used up the entire liquid capital of the American veterans and American businessmen doing business there.

On March 17 of this year the United States Minister called on the Governor General to protest the high-handed action of local officials and found him in agreement that such actions were illegal. He stated that he could not deviate from orders which had been handed to him directly from Paris.

American flags, which were to be used in celebration of the fifth anniversary of American landings at Morocco, Casablanca, and Fez were held up by local authorities until the time for such celebration had passed. Penicillin tablets, which were necessary for the treatment of illness and disease, were impounded and an American veteran was refused gasoline rations for his Greyhound bus business at a time when French competitors were given adequate allocations. The gasoline supplied was contributed by the ECA. An American representative for Remington Rand received an allocation of 7½ percent of the ECA funds while his French competitor, representing Underwood, was allocated 31 percent. This happened in spite of the fact that the American veteran's business had averaged well over two and one-half times that of his competitor. In Algeria, the exact opposite condition prevailed when a French representative of Remington Rand was allocated 55 percent of the ECA funds.

All of these actions are in direct contradiction to the spirit of ECA. Should the American people realize that their hard-earned money is being taxed to grant unfair advantage to foreign agencies where discrimination is made against American veterans, they would certainly rebel.

It is necessary that we legislate these provisions for the simple reason that both the ECA and the Department of State have been passing the buck to each other in this proposition. Both admit that there is discrimination against American agencies; but neither wishes to take the initiative.

In the bill now under discussion, the Foreign Affairs Committee has seen fit to write in guaranties of \$300,000,000 to expand American enterprise in undeveloped areas of the world. At the same time, the committee refuses to recognize the injustice being committed against one American group now attempting to carry out that proposition.

Under my amendment, no additional sums are allotted. It is not a question of money but of principle.

The people in Morocco are being assailed on all sides by Communist propaganda which is nullifying all of our efforts under ECA. The French officials at Casablanca have refused to allow the distribution of matzo for the Jewish Passover. This is being held up, at the

present time, in an entirely discriminatory manner and allows the Communists to make capital of the fact. Jews and Moslems are not allowed to obtain foods and medicines which have been allocated and which are paid for by ECA funds.

Justice dictates that we provide in this act for safeguards against these discriminations. Our veterans, who have taken the initiative in spreading American enterprise throughout the world, are not seeking any unfair advantage, but they do want to be in as favorable a position as other foreign agents.

When this measure was first enacted, we did not specify that only Caucasians or Protestants or Catholics or any other group should receive its benefits. How can we allow the discrimination which is now practiced under the act? I say to the committee that it is necessary to spell out these provisions in the act because those charged with its administration have failed to take jurisdiction over these matters. There are over 400 Members of this honorable body who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The committee's united action in opposing amendments should not keep us from exercising our own good judgment in legislation where we are asked to appropriate billions of dollars annually. I hope that, in the name of justice and fair play for our veterans and for people of all races and creeds, the amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATTERSON) there were—ayes 61, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 7, before line 5, insert the following:

"Sec. 7. (a) Section 112 (a) of such act is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator shall prescribe such regulations with respect to, and impose such conditions on, procurement in the United States under this title as will secure to 'small business' in the United States, especially the producers, a fair and substantial share of the production and business resulting from any such procurement. For the purpose of this paragraph, 'small business' shall include any small-business enterprise, and only such, if (1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of the employees does not exceed 500, except that the Administrator shall, where appropriate, specify a smaller number for any particular trade or industry, or subdivision thereof, and (3) it is independently owned and operated."

And in line 5 strike out "Sec. 7. (a)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)," and reletter the remaining subsections accordingly.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I know that three other Members on the Committee on Small Business have statements they would like to make on this amendment.

They have not spoken on this bill, and I do not feel like it would be fair to cut them off. I hope the gentleman will not insist on less than 20 minutes for our side in presenting the amendment.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, with the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is it understood then that the proponents will have 20 minutes and the opponents the last 10 minutes?

Mr. KEE. I will make that as a part of my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], want to speak on the amendment, and we can divide the time accordingly.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] claimed just now that it is understood that 20 minutes' time would be allotted to the proponents and 10 minutes be reserved for the opponents. I understood the unanimous consent request to be that the last 10 minutes should be reserved to the committee. There was no division as to time for the opponents or the proponents.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas correctly understands the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it seems that we are trying to get this time allotted before we hear the debate. Something might develop that we may want to discuss at some length. Since the Senate took 3 weeks to debate this bill, and they are seeking to pass it here in 2 days, it does not seem justifiable. Therefore I object, Mr. Chairman.

SMALL-BUSINESS AMENDMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is very easy for a department or agency to deal only with large concerns. We found that to be true in the beginning of the emergency preceding the Second World War. It was necessary that we pass special acts of Congress in order to compel these agencies to give small business a fair share of the production of the business that they could procure and deliver. We had to compel them to do it. Even in wartime it was necessary. It was in the public interest, and there has never been a time that small business is pressed harder than it is pressed today. The huge concerns have every advantage. If you were in a position of authority and dealing with billions of dollars, and buying billions of dollars' worth of goods and commodities, the easy way for you would be to deal with the huge concerns that could make the deliveries and have the minimum number of contracts to deal with. It is perfectly natural. But this Congress has a good record of trying to protect the smaller concerns of the Nation.

I invite attention to the fact that we passed the Smaller War Plants Act, we passed the Small Business Mobilization

Act, and the War Production Board was given specific small-business mandates by Congress under this act. That was during wartime, if you please. In addition, in the Surplus Property Act, after the war, we made sure small business was given an opportunity to purchase surplus property. The Reconversion Act and the Contract Settlement Act also had provisions favoring small business. The Armed Services Procurement Act had a similar provision. The Selective Service Act had a similar provision. This is the only major bill I know of to go through Congress without some good, strong, compulsory provision relating to small business concerns. I hope there is no objection to this amendment. I do not believe there should be.

After dealing with ECA, my findings are that if we do not have this provision in the bill small business will not have an equal or a fair chance. There is no provision in the present act that requires it, and this must be inserted in order to protect the small concerns of the Nation.

MR. HOFFMAN

I know Mr. Paul Hoffman, Administrator of ECA, and I have confidence in him. I have known him for many years. I have been in many conferences with him. He demonstrated sincerity and honesty of purpose. I know if he were to have charge of this Act himself, directing every part of it, small business would be given the right chance. Obviously, however, he cannot personally look after all these things. He must delegate this power to others. The people we have been dealing with in ECA have not demonstrated too much sympathy for small business.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I am quite sympathetic to the gentleman's proposal. Certainly it is one worth while considering at this point. However, can the gentleman advise the Committee just how a determination might be made as to what would be a fair share for small business?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. Anticipating such a question as the gentleman has asked, if the gentleman will refer to the RECORD of last Saturday and turn to page 4192 he will find the amendment I have proposed, and on the next page he will find definitions of all the words and phrases used in this amendment, to indicate how they should be construed, about "procurement," and about "in the United States" and "producer" and especially "producers," and "a fair and substantial share" and what is a fair share. So refer to the RECORD at page 4193 and you will find a definition of all the words and phrases that are used in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that my request that debate close in 30 minutes was objected to, I now move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House who have served during the past three or four terms will recall, I am sure, the great personal interest I have had, along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and many others, in behalf of small business in our economy. That evidence was seen first before our entry into World War II when we joined in the Committee on Small Business to do what we could, not only to protect the interests of small business, but to see to it that the great productive capacity of small business could be brought into the then developing war effort. We went through those years before the war, during the war, and since the war doing what we could to bring about administrative support and assistance for small business in connection with the various programs. We brought to final enactment legislation designed to protect the interests of small business and promote the interests of the country.

The gentleman from Texas has referred to certain precedents which I say clearly establish the reasonableness of the offering of this amendment. I recall it was said on some of those occasions that the proposals were not administratively such that they could be put into operation. Frequently it was said they would hamper this and that effort, which was of primary importance.

As I look back, I do not concede that any single one of those acts did anything except help promote the fundamental purpose which was before us and at the same time help preserve and protect that great stalwart segment of the American economy, the small-business man.

What is the situation which here confronts us in connection with the European aid program? The program involves principally the shipment of supplies from this country to foreign countries. When we undertook this program a year ago we wrote into the act certain requirements as to procurement which were designed to relieve, so far as possible, the impact of such procurement on our short supplies here at home. In the meantime, in the short space of a year, that economic situation has changed. Instead of having short supplies in many fields in the country, today we are now having surplus supplies. Whole segments of our economy find their products backing up on them. Now then, having a year ago written what I thought was a good provision of the bill to meet the situation then existing, why is it not good sense and sound judgment today to write into this legislation provisions which will, so far as possible, bring about the distribution of these procurement programs over the economy as a whole with particular reference to small business?

Bear in mind this amendment does not undertake to say to the ECA that they have to buy any particular commodity in this country. All it seeks to do is to provide that if ECA allocates money to be used for purchases in this country,

then the ECA itself, so far as it can, should see to it that the great productive capacities of small business shall likewise be utilized in this program. I do not think there is anyone here who would contend other than that this foreign aid program is today, rightly or wrongly, supporting much of our economy insofar as employment is concerned. If that is true, then why is it not desirable that, so far as it can be worked out, the productive capacity of small business should be devoted to this effort which we are carrying on in foreign lands?

I am not against anyone in connection with that operation. Here again, as I have throughout the years, I want to do what I can to see to it that small business is protected in a fair way. I speak as one who voted for this program a year ago. I speak as one who expects to vote for it this time.

But I do not believe it can be said of these various amendments, as they come along, that they should not be given fair consideration. If they are found to be in the public interest and not destructive of the fundamental purposes of the act, I can see no reason why they should not be written into the law. I know, as many of you undoubtedly know, that small-business men have been coming to us complaining that they have not been able to get the door open to get into this business in the ECA program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

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

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly on the spot here. Like the rest of you I am strongly in favor of small business, and I am most reluctant to tangle with my distinguished and respected friend who invented the idea of having a Small Business Committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. However, I greatly prefer the small-business amendment in the bill to the one proposed here. It may be that a little pride of authorship is involved; I had something to do with what our committee conceived as the proper way to handle the small-business situation, an amendment which appears on page 7, lines 14 to 18 of the bill as follows:

And, insofar as practicable, make available or cause to be made available to suppliers in the United States reasonable information, as far in advance as possible, of purchases proposed to be financed with funds authorized under this title.

I was the author of the provisions in the original act providing in sections 111 and 112 for the maximum use of private channels of trade, and it seems to me that the concept of private channels of trade is most important in this bill.

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

Mr. VORYS. In just a minute.

I believe I am correct when I say that five-sixths of the program is conducted through private channels of trade. The problem involved is this: if you are going to permit a purchaser in Europe to come over here and buy something in

private channels of trade from a seller here, how are you going to impose conditions or limitations upon his purchases such as you would provide for government purchases? I thoroughly approve of the magnificent work our committee on small business has done in writing provisions for participation by small business in government purchases. The problem we face, however, is how to write such provisions into a law which attempts to stimulate private channels of trade which, in my judgment, is the cornerstone of the future of international trade. The proposal before us is, I greatly fear, extremely unworkable. What is a "fair and reasonable proportion," for instance? At present small business, firms employing 500 persons or less, predominated in 44 percent of the trade financed by ECA, involving \$1,672,500,000. In 5.9 percent of the ECA trade small business got the largest share; in 24 percent a moderate share went to small business and in 15 lines of endeavor, comprising 23 percent and valued at \$955,000,000, small business got a small share.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VORYS. In just a moment. You and I know that small business cannot participate in the making of locomotives, turbines, or in the building of harbor installations, and a number of other items that are in this program. I am greatly concerned that in our interest for small business we put a lot of regimentation upon all private business abroad and at home that we do not want to impose.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I may state to the gentleman from Ohio that our committee has conferred on that, and we are convinced that the language inserted by the gentleman on page 7 will not get the job done. We are convinced that it is not sufficient; that unless there is a mandate so plain they cannot escape it, they will not follow it.

If the gentleman is interested further in the facts I refer him to the statistics appearing on page 4193 of the RECORD where he will find that the proposition we have is in conformity with the rules and regulations heretofore made by the Department.

Mr. VORYS. I have read with great interest the gentleman's speech and extension of last Saturday, but I still feel that the determination of a fair share to be imposed on private business here and abroad is a very difficult proposition administratively, and we have been told by the ECA that the amendment proposed is practically impossible of administration.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Texas and I have just pointed out—and the gentleman was here and heard the arguments—time and time again in connection with the program for World War II, when we had very critical problems before us, language similar to this was inserted,

and it did the work; it worked not only for the benefit of small business but for the benefit of the country and for the benefit of the program.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, from what has been said here it is certainly apparent that this is not a partisan issue, for both sides are speaking in favor of small business in this case.

A gentleman said a while ago that a certain Member was the author of the Committee on Small Business of the House. I want to say that no one individual was responsible for it; this House of Representatives created this committee and charged the committee with the duty of inquiring into problems relating to small business and to report back to the House. It cannot enact legislation, but it can report to this House and make recommendations. We have found in our experience that small business is having the door closed in its face, so to speak, by ECA; they cannot get a fair or proportionate share of the business.

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently favored the high objectives and purposes of the European recovery program. I have felt that the program was not only necessary but that it was of vital importance and in the best interest of the United States—that it is a humanitarian program, and not only this but such a program that was designed to aid and assist our friends abroad and stimulate economic recovery at home and to serve as a bulwark against the spreading and onrush of communism.

For these and other reasons I have supported the ECA program.

In the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 Congress in no uncertain terms stated its purposes, which were as follows:

It is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to encourage these countries, through a joint organization, to exert sustained common efforts * * * which will speedily achieve that economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity.

It is further declared in this act to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty—free institutions—and assistance to those countries of Europe which participate in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation, provided—and I call particular attention to the following statement of policy and intent:

Provided, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

The act further provided that—

The Administrator shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the accomplishment of the purposes * * * utilize private channels of trade.

Private channels of trade have not been utilized to any appreciable extent as relating to small business in the United States.

I have carefully read the letter of March 29, 1949, to the House Small

Business Committee from the ECA in this connection. The committee had asked what regulations or statutes would be necessary to insure small business a fair share of participation in procurement made in the United States. ECA replied, in substance, that any statutory mandate or regulation which would accomplish this purpose would be impracticable and would discourage the use of private channels of trade.

I am a great believer in the use of private channels of trade, as opposed to governmental usurpation of private trade channels. First let us see what countries are not using private channels of trade. This information is taken from a document supplied to the House Small Business Committee by ECA. The following countries used governmental or quasi-governmental agencies to handle procurement for the commodities indicated:

Austria: Feeds, grain, coal.

France: Substantially all procurement through these sources.

Greece: Food, medical supplies, technical items, and petroleum products.

Italy: Pharmaceuticals, spare parts, tin plate, coal, petroleum and petroleum products, wheat and flour.

The Netherlands: Wheat, flour, fats and oils, oil cake and meal, dried fruit, and meat.

Norway: Wheat, flour and rye.

Turkey: Coal-mining machinery and port construction machinery.

All of the purchases of Great Britain are handled through governmental agencies.

It will certainly be no imposition on these governments to require them to do what our Government does—and that is to give a fair share of procurement to small business.

As to those items which are procured through private channels of trade, I cannot see how it would interfere with those channels to require that they in turn give a fair share of their orders to small business in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this idea is not new. During the war and in the midst of hostilities when nothing was to be allowed to impede in any way the progress of our forces, this principle of attention to business channels was a customary practice.

We imposed a mandate to utilize small business wherever possible upon the Armed Services and certain other agencies. This was clearly set down in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947—to require a fair proportion of purchases to be placed with small business concerns.

Similar provisions have been inserted into the Reconversion Act, the Surplus Property Act, the Contract Settlement Act, and even the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act as amended.

Mr. Chairman, if this country—this Congress—could impose such provisions upon ourselves as a Nation during the war—and demand that our own governmental agencies observe the requirement to share business with small-business operators—then, certainly today we should require that the ECA insure that small business be given its fair and equitable share of contracts of procurements.

I believe that the importers in these participating countries, wherein small business is the backbone as it is in ours, would be willing to cooperate to this extent.

I do not believe that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas would in any manner destroy the intent and purpose of this act which, mind you, requires that we look to the economic stability of this country in our activities on behalf of the European recovery.

I am very much afraid that the authorities of ECA have improperly presumed that private channels of trade will be interfered with by trying to assist small business and have springboarded from that conclusion to their present position of resistance.

It is apparent that a congressional mandate is the only thing that will change that opinion, and I am, therefore, heartily in favor of the amendment proposed.

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

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

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for the position he has taken on this amendment. As a member of the Small Business Committee on which he has served and served well, he knows the many problems that are facing the small-business men of this country. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that it is of far more importance that we preserve the economy of the small-business men of this country rather than looking first to the economy elsewhere.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

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

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

Mr. RIEHLMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], as a member of the Small Business Committee of the House, knows the deep interest I have in the welfare of the small business concerns of our country. I am in favor of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and intend to support it.

IN RE PATMAN AMENDMENT FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing the Ninth Report of the Economic Cooperation Administration, on page 68 I find that procurement authorizations issued by ECA for purchases in the United States, up to February 28, 1949, totaled \$2,897,000,000. This was out of a total expenditure of \$4,839,000,000 for procurement in all countries.

I am advised that ECA is unable to determine what portion of the expenditures in the United States went to small business. I am further advised that they cannot even say what proportion could have gone to small business. If the complaints which I and other Members have received are indicative, it is reasonable to assume that small business received very little. It is further reasonable to

assume that they will get no more in the future since most of the purchase orders and contracts for this procurement are made in foreign countries and with large businesses that are able to maintain agents and representatives abroad. The very nature of the operation limits the possibilities of small business. It is my sincere belief that, any time \$2,800,000,000 changes hands in this country without small business getting a fair share of participation, our economic stability is shaken, and if things continue, that phase of our national economy will ultimately be seriously hurt. ECA has demonstrated that it will not on its own do any overt act to assist small business. I am tired of sympathy and lip service. I am tired of being told how things cannot be done and would welcome the refreshing change of ECA showing me how things can be done to assist the little fellow. It is my belief that the mandates of the amendment proposed by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], are the only means of producing effective results.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, in considering a new appropriation for ECA, I want to remind my colleagues of a study conducted by the staff of the House Select Committee on Small Business last December. The results of the study indicated that through December 3 less than 500 firms had participated in the program as suppliers of goods to aid countries. That of the total 500 firms approximately 150 were foreign firms.

During the period of ECA existence, prior to December 3 roughly \$4,000,000,000 was expended. In providing new money for foreign aid through ECA let us be certain that a privileged few do not receive a monopoly of this business. Let us guard against profiteering by political favorites in a charity program.

At one point in our investigation last year our staff discovered that the firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co. had 71.2 percent of the total cotton procurement of the aid countries. One British tobacco firm had 80.98 percent of tobacco procurements, and four coal firms had 57 percent of all of the coal shipped.

Would it not be helpful for us to write specific provisions into the appropriation of new moneys to include small and independent businesses in this expensive aid plan in which small business is called upon to contribute many tax dollars?

Mr. Chairman, small business institutions have ever been the keystone of our business economy. From the beginning of our history, our country has thrived and grown only when our farmers, craftsmen, and tradesmen were producing and selling in abundance.

Today we are faced with a situation in our business world which demands recognition. Giant corporations, with far-flung organizations, can more than take care of themselves in both the domestic and foreign fields of trade and commerce. So we are not concerned, at the moment, with such organizations. We are, however, deeply concerned with the maintenance of a vigorous and prosperous business structure in its entirety. To maintain such a structure, small

business must have a fair and proportionate amount of the total of our foreign as well as of our domestic trade.

In recognition of certain compelling facts, we have provided funds for a European recovery plan. We are now asked to renew and further implement this plan by supplying more dollar credits, many more dollars which are furnished largely by the rank and file of smaller American business institutions.

It is too much to ask that small business share proportionately in the dollar volume of goods and merchandise purchased in the United States by way of authorizations under the Marshall plan?

Is it too much to ask that the Economic Cooperation Administration be required—since it has taken no steps on its own motion—to use its organization and influence to properly propel and implement such purchases from small producers, processors, manufacturers, and fabricators?

I think not, nor do I see any danger to the Marshall plan by merely providing a means through which the intent of Congress with respect to the preservation of small business is made manifest. To the contrary, I believe that the European recovery plan is strengthened by a congressional mandate which in effect impels a wide distribution of purchases in this country, a mandate by which Congress takes a further and positive step to insure that the economy of the United States is not impaired while, at the same time, the European recovery plan is in no way ruffled.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to rise in support of the amendment of the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business I endorse his amendment wholeheartedly and trust it will pass by a large majority.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a list of suppliers just came over from my office. There are 75 pages in one and 43 in another. I thought that possibly the members of the Committee would like to take a look at this and see just who all are furnishing this procurement.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I also would like to say to my colleague that I, too, have a list of where they bought their agricultural products, and the gentleman from Colorado is absolutely correct. So far as this procurement is concerned, it is pretty well confined to a few big companies.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman that the part of the bill that was read by the gentleman from Ohio which reads "as far as practical" means nothing at all. They are not going to buy it from small business firms anywhere, especially in the territory where I live. They say it is too far away; "we cannot police it;

we cannot tell what they are going to do." So, they buy from the big firms, and the little firms just getting started never get a dollar's worth of business from the ECA, and that is why it is important to write this amendment in the bill.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. If we enacted such legislation in the procurement during the war, should we not do it now that the war is over?

Mr. HILL. It is more important now.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would this not require that the Government step in both on this side of the ocean and on the other side of the ocean and set up a governmental agency, which I know the gentleman does not want to have? Would it not require that a governmental agency be set up on both sides in order to see that whatever percentage you want from that source is bought?

Mr. HILL. It does not take any more business organization to buy from a little firm than from a big firm or to buy automobiles from a little firm than from General Motors. It just takes a little brains. If they do not have the ability they should not be placed in these important positions.

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is absolutely correct in his statement. They set the rules so that under the present purchasing program they cannot buy from the small firms.

Mr. HILL. In one instance they wrote into the contract a provision that prohibited a small firm that made fine trucks from bidding.

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

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

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Commerce conducted a field survey to learn the experience of small business participating in the European recovery plan. The complaints of small business can roughly be divided into two categories: First, the lack of information emanating either from the Economic Cooperation Administration, or from other sources, as to foreign trading methods; second, the lack of information as to what was to be procured in the United States under an ECA-approved authorization in time to seek the

business. This second complaint emanated not only from those unfamiliar with the export trade but from firms, manufacturers, and other producers long engaged in shipping abroad.

The upshot of the whole business has been that the powerfully entrenched corporation or exporter has been able to obtain a lion's share of all European recovery business ending in this country.

I am not trying to say that such organizations are not entitled to receive business under the plan. I am saying, however, very positively, that no evidence has been adduced which would indicate that small business has received any share of business under its authorizations.

ECA authorizations have been made, in most cases, after sales have been consummated. How, I ask you, can small business ever hope to share in the dollars spent in the United States unless a mandate of Congress is written into this bill?

There is a very definite need for a widespread dissemination of information regarding ECA procurement authorizations. No agency of the Government is in a better position to accomplish this task than ECA. The weak and invalid excuse has been advanced by members of the ECA staff that it is impossible to break down a procurement authorization or to spell out the component parts so that a fair idea of the types, kinds, and qualities of goods to be purchased in the United States may be made available.

The matter of ECA regulations and their interpretation, while perhaps not too difficult for the initiated, are certainly not as thoroughly clear as they should be to the entire business structure. This is a task ECA should welcome: the job of making known to every businessman in the United States the story of how his dollars are being spent and how, as a businessman, he can have an equal opportunity to obtain his proportionate share of the dollars spent in the United States. It may well be that many small-business institutions are not interested in business under the European recovery plan or in export business, for that matter. But those who are should have an equal opportunity to compete for the business. Unless they know where, what, and how, there is certainly an impediment which cannot be overcome.

The ECA bill now under discussion has my unqualified endorsement as one of the best security investments we can make.

The amendment simply provides for a distribution of purchases on the portion of procurement made in the United States and gives opportunity for small business to compete.

For these and other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], known and avowed friend of small business, and am happy to join him in the advocacy of a fair and equal opportunity for small business at home and abroad.

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

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I am in support of this amendment. I believe it is fundamentally sound. I believe it is necessary. If it gives some inconvenience to the Administrator of the program, then, nevertheless, if considerable inconvenience and even some increased expense in matters of administration can well be had, and caused, as compared with the fact that the effect of this amendment will be to strengthen the sinews of small business in the United States, the strengthening of small business in America is more important than it is to have less inconvenience in the matter of administration of this important bill. With the evidence indisputably showing that small business, as defined by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], has not to date had its reasonable share of the ECA resources in purchasing in America, I vigorously urge that this amendment carry and that, thereby, we vigorously declare that it is the continuing policy of this United States Congress that small business shall be strengthened and perpetuated in America at every reasonable turn of the road.

There is no other way provided where-by there is security for big business in America if, in fact, small business in America is either destroyed or deteriorates or disappears for any reason whatsoever. The sinews and the American way of life in competitive, free enterprise started in the places of small business in America and only by perpetuation of the intent and spirit of small business in America can our free, competitive enterprise be perpetuated in America. Neither disappearing small business nor increasing monopolistic capitalism will strengthen the sinews of free, competitive enterprise. It takes both sound small business and sound big business to perpetuate that.

I urge the overwhelming approval of this amendment which I believe to be imperative in the best interests of the business of America, and, therefore, of the people of America, and, therefore, in the best interests of the taxpayers of America.

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

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas that is intended to permit the group of what is known as small-business men to participate in this program. I disagree with those who insist the program will cost more if small business is allowed a share. It will cost less for the reason there will be more competition on

thousands of commodities included in this program. Of course, such things as locomotives, trucks, automobiles, will go to big business. But where small business can share, it should not be ignored.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had time to recite a number of experiences that have come to my attention. Let me tell you about at least one of them. Under the present program, Greece has been allocated several million dollars for the purchase of mules in this country. These mules are for farmers of Greece. Ordinarily you would think reputable dealers in this country would have a chance to submit offers, and there would be competition and a fair chance for all dealers of ordinary size, interested. One of my constituents, who is a pretty good-sized dealer, and who knows the business thought he might have a chance at bidding, especially since he is near the area where mules are raised and since he has been in the business for many years. Briefly, here is what I have found. The mules for Greece are being bought, not by a representative of Greece, but by a Turkish concern. I find also that the Turkish representative will deal only with less than a half dozen dealers who are exporters of mules, and that the ordinary dealer does not have a chance at the business. In other words, American taxpayers' money is being used to buy the livestock but American small-business men do not even have a fair opportunity to compete for the business. It has been reported within the last few days the price of the mules when they reach their destination is excessive. I suggest this committee look into this matter. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I would like to say that I, too, am interested in small business. That is the reason that in committee I proposed an amendment along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS] on this subject.

However, we must be primarily interested in the workability of this program. We cannot endanger the entire ECA program by hamstringing the Administrator in this manner. It would be impossible for them to administer and to obtain the objectives of this amendment; it would take additional time and more money which would decrease the effectiveness of the operation. It would mean that the ECA would be taking the majority of its time in the field of procurement, and it is not the purpose nor the objective of this plan to get into the field of procurement to such an extent. In the long run it would hurt small business. Under this amendment it would be necessary to stop dealing through private channels necessitating additional concentration of business in the hands of the Government. The Department of Commerce has a full-time job of promoting the interest of business and it is doing a good job. The ECA also has a unit which is looking for the interest of small business.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It would be very difficult to administer the Patman amendment, but I think if after the word "producers" the words "so far as practicable" are inserted, it could be administered. I think that will carry out the idea in the Patman amendment.

Mr. BATTLE. The amendment we put in the bill in committee provided in effect that information on pending purchases by individual countries would be made available to the small-business men of America as far as possible in advance, so that all would have a fair chance in competing for the commodities to be supplied under this program. I believe it is the only way this can be handled. I am surprised to see the gentleman from Indiana is backing up the amendment which would allow for additional concentration of power in the Federal Government and which would allow an agency of the Federal Government to further regulate and control business.

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

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not the purpose of the ECA program to revive the normal channels of trade not only in Europe but here in the United States?

Mr. BATTLE. That is certainly the purpose of ECA.

Mr. SMATHERS. If this amendment were adopted, would it not mean that, as in the war, when the Government bought a lot of equipment for the Army actually a governmental agency had to do it, this would require a governmental agency to be established to act here in the United States, and a governmental agency would have to act in the countries of Europe, so that we would defeat the whole program of trying to reestablish the private channels of trade?

Mr. BATTLE. That is absolutely correct. It would be impossible for ECA to use so much time and money in the field of procurement, which would mean that the effectiveness would be lessened to that degree. I believe the amendment we have in the bill, making available the information to all small business all over the country, would take care of that situation. If we use the words of the amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Texas we will hamper the program seriously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired on the amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were—ayes 120, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) Section 112 (c) of such act is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 112 (g) of such act is hereby amended by striking out "section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), including any amendment thereto," and "section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended," and

inserting in lieu thereof "the Export Control Act of 1949."

(c) Section 112 (h) of such Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out the period, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding "and, insofar as practicable, make available or cause to be made available to suppliers in the United States reasonable information, as far in advance as possible, of purchases proposed to be financed with funds authorized under this title."

(d) Section 112 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) No funds authorized for the purposes of this title shall be used for the purchase in bulk of any commodities (other than commodities procured by or in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to price-support programs required by law) at prices higher than the market price prevailing in the United States at the time of the purchase adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination, quality, and terms of payment."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. IRVING: Strike out the following words after section 7 on lines 5 and 6 of page 7:

"(a) Section 112 (c) of such act is hereby repealed."

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer reinstates the provision which was in the original act of last year. It will continue the provision that 25 percent of the wheat and whole grains shipped abroad under ECA shall be milled in this country rather than in foreign countries. I believe that the Senate has recognized the necessity for this provision, although it has cut it to 15 percent. I am not in favor of cutting the percentage from what it was in the original act. There is nothing new in the proposal that I am making. It is bipartisan and nonpartisan, and everyone must have been in favor of it last year when they passed the act. Cutting this provision will cause unemployment in this country. It will also hurt the small-business people that we have heard so much about here this afternoon and over the last few years. Generally speaking, I think the provision as called for in section 7 should not be repealed. My amendment will reinstate that provision.

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

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Has the other body put this provision in the bill?

Mr. IRVING. The other body has this provision in the bill.

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

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. REES. The provision in the Senate bill provides for 15 percent, does it not?

Mr. IRVING. I mentioned that, and I said too that I was not in favor of the reduction, but was in favor of the 25-percent figure.

Mr. REES. Your amendment is for 25 percent?

Mr. IRVING. Yes; as it was in the original legislation.

Mr. REES. In other words, this brings it back to what it was last year?

Mr. IRVING. That is right.

Mr. REES. I think the gentleman's amendment ought to be supported.

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

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I rise to speak in favor of the amendment the gentleman has offered. I offered a similar amendment in committee, but was not successful in having it adopted by our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. IRVING. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRVING. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It was my intention to offer a 15 percent amendment, but of course I shall certainly support the gentleman's amendment providing 25 percent.

Mr. IRVING. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I have a full appreciation of what the chairman and members of the committee have done. There is no personal criticism of them or of their efforts intended in my statement wherein I say there is a weakness in their report. I meant nothing critical of them, except to say that they had not given full consideration to this matter, and for that reason did not have a full understanding of the proposition.

To show my interest in the matter, I wrote all my colleagues of the House on February 23 of this year calling their attention to the possibility that this provision might be dropped from the act. I am advancing this proposition, not alone from the point of view of the people who are employed in these mills, although there will be many hundreds and thousands of them unemployed, if this provision is deleted, but because I am also in favor of the employers and the business people who have their money invested in these mills. I have a telegram which states that since October 1948, 22 mills, representing a capital investment of \$15,000,000, have shut down. Twelve hundred of our people have been permanently laid off. This affects not only my district in Kansas City, Mo., but it affects the North, the East, the South, and the West, wherever mills, either small or large, are located. I can picture the small mills on the Red River in North Dakota, the large mills on the Mississippi River in Minnesota, and the mills in Oklahoma and all over the country. I can picture those mills fighting to maintain their foreign trade. We have information from the testimony of Mr. E. W. Reed, president of Shellabarger's, Inc., millers in Salina, Kans.—testimony was given at the hearings before the committee and is found on pages 699 to 709—where he said that—

The mathematical average percentage of flour to the total for the 21-year period is 26.84 percent. It can be argued that a 21-year period is too long from which to draw an average applicable to the present case.

If so, a running 5-year average beginning with 1920 does not show a single 5-year

period as low as 20 percent, while the period since 1934 exceeds the 25-percent figure.

For the 10 years ending 1940 this arithmetical average is 37.7 percent.

Possibly it should be pointed out that in a comparison of this nature much can be said for each year standing on its own base, inasmuch as crops, general economic conditions, and other factors affect both wheat and flour from year to year.

Subsequent to World War II export began again with a 1945 percentage of 14.32; for 1946, 36.45 percent; and in 1947, 46.05 percent.

According to figures supplied by ECA for the 9 months of its operation in 1948, the relationship was maintained at 25.17 percent.

Based on historical records, certainly 25 percent flour should be considered a minimum of such participation in total export.

It is my information that during his testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Hoffman made the statement that ECA had sustained a loss as the result of the purchase of wheat flour.

A study of the calculations by which this loss is presumably arrived at discloses an approach that at least is subject to question.

These calculations show that ECA actually paid some \$8,000,000 less for the combined wheat and wheat flour exported by ECA than would have been the case had all wheat been shipped. The loss conclusion is arrived at by establishing a theoretical figure of some \$14,000,000 as the value of the millfeed by-product retained in the United States from the wheat milled for export flour and concluding that the loss is the difference between the \$8,000,000 reduction in amounts paid out by ECA for wheat and wheat equivalent in the form of flour, on the one hand, as against all wheat, on the other, and the \$14,000,000 value of millfeed retained in the United States.

Disregarding the assumptions indulged in by ECA, which assumptions it would be difficult for anyone to prove, it is clear that the actual cost of wheat and wheat flour shipped was \$6,000,000 less than if the entire quantity had been shipped as wheat grain.

It is erroneous to characterize in any respect the byproduct or millfeed resulting from the production of flour for the ECA countries as a loss. It is retained in the United States and is consumed by our own livestock.

Thus it contributes to our agricultural economy and our own domestic food supply.

It is significant to note in this connection that there is never a carry-over of millfeeds at any time. The entire quantity of millfeeds produced by the flour mills in the United States is consumed each year.

The ECA calculation made no allowance for the value of the bags, which are now recovered in the importing countries, or for dollars which would have to be used for fuel and other supplies if the milling of the grain is done in the importing country.

The victory the United States expects to gain through ECA is partly economic and partly moral. If the ECA fails to strengthen the will of the people to live free lives, it will not in fact succeed. It will fail miserably.

Flour goes to ECA countries with a label on every package clearly and unmistakably identifying it as a product "Made in the United States of America." That label carries a message of real meaning to every storekeeper and to every consumer who uses or sees a package, and to every baker who uses the flour in his bake shop.

Its advertising value, its value in strengthening friendship for the United States, defies calculation. It is food—and it is "Made in the United States of America."

Wheat goes to importing countries in bulk cargoes. It promptly loses its identity. It is mixed and diluted with other wheats from other countries. The resulting flour cannot be identified. There was no "Made in United

States of America" label on wheat or on the flour milled from it in the importing country.

We have exported the wheat. We have helped increase the food supply. But we have lost the all-important opportunity for moral victory which is ours when we ship wheat in the form of flour.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry February 9, 1949, Dr. FitzGerald justified making ECA funds available for procurement of Canadian wheat and wheat flour by the statement that while supplies of United States wheat might be adequate it was not available because of inadequacy of shipping facilities.

In other words, United States grain export facilities were being operated at a maximum and it was not possible to ship additional quantities of wheat to meet current requirements.

It is quite significant that port facilities for the shipment of wheat flour over and above our shipments of wheat are adequate to ship large quantities of flour. Secondary ports are available for the export of flour which are not available for the export of wheat. Therefore, the shipments of wheat flour from the United States can be an effective supplement to the contribution and transportation of food supplies from this country.

In the second report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration for the quarter ended September 30, 1948, there appears in chapter IV, entitled "The ECA Financial Supply Program for Europe," the following:

"Furthermore, an analysis of the imports of the participating countries does not show the nature of the recovery that is expected to be achieved. For example, when the Administration finances imports of part of the food required for a manufacturing country, labor in that country which had been diverted from manufacturing into food production can be released for other and more efficient work. The importation of food under the ECA program thereby results in a net gain in productivity. This gain has a cumulative effect, if manpower so released is used for construction of capital plant and equipment. Under these conditions economic recovery is aided in much the same manner as in the provision of capital equipment. Actually, in such cases, food may at times be more helpful than capital-equipment imports in restoring the internal balance of production."

It requires labor and fuel to convert wheat into human food, namely, flour. Therefore, to the extent that food can be supplied to the ECA countries in the form of flour, thus releasing labor in the recipient country "for other and more efficient work," in ECA's own words and employing its own conclusion, there would result a net gain in productivity in the particular ECA country.

In conclusion, may I summarize:

1. An analysis of claimed increased cost to ECA reveals that participation, according to ECA figures, of 25.17 percent flour actually meant use of some 6,000,000 less of ECA dollars in the wheat program.

2. Byproducts of milling wheat into flour instead of a so-called loss provide a very valuable feed for livestock here, a feed that has never yet accumulated a surplus.

3. Flour has a morale-building factor—an identified processed food.

4. Increased port and shipping facilities where flour is in addition to wheat.

5. It is a fact that Canadian flour is being purchased with ECA dollars.

6. United States flour does have consumer preference in importing countries of this commodity if the consumer is enabled to exercise that preference; and

Finally, we are not asking for any export of flour above the historical participation in such business; we are not asking ECA be di-

rected toward solving the problem of surplus agricultural production in this country; but we do feel most strongly that it is contrary to the basic principles of the American way of life should completely controlled marketing such as ECA be a means of destroying that which we have built up over the years.

It is unthinkable that this market for United States flour should be deliberately destroyed only because of the fact that our own Government has taken our wheat-supply problem and is having to operate it on a government-to-government basis.

That, gentlemen, is the case for the milling industry in connection with the proposed repeal of the 25-percent section in the ECA Act.

We are not asking for a thing that we have not gone out and worked for. We are only asking for protection during this temporary period so that when things again come back to a normal basis we will not have to go out and do it all over again.

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. The overwhelming majority of the committee is opposed to it.

Here is what happened last year. Under pressure from the millers a 25-percent provision was put into the bill; in other words, 25 percent of the wheat and wheat products sent to Europe under the program must be milled and sent there as white flour. Last year there was a great shortage of cattle feed and stock feed in the United States; our farmers needed the byproducts of wheat. That was one of the main reasons that the Eightieth Congress stipulated that 25 percent be sent over there as flour. This year there is no shortage of stock feed in the United States, but there is a shortage in Europe. This thing simply means that the program will cost about \$8,000,000 more because the millers want a subsidy. This is also going to cost the farmers of the United States who raise wheat millions of dollars because so much of the allocation for wheat is going to be consumed by the flour provision. Do not think for 1 minute that this is going to do anything for the American farmer; it is not going to do anything for the American farmer, it will hurt him if he wants to sell his surplus wheat in Europe. The man it will help is the big miller; there is no doubt about that. And do not think for a minute that this thing is going to help Europe because over there they do not want white flour; they need the whole wheat. They use

the byproducts for the feeding of their cattle.

I think this is an unwise proposal. Let me warn you that they will come in next with a similar proposal for corn, to send meal over there when the people of Europe are not accustomed to eat corn bread and grits. Eighty percent of our corn sent to Europe is used for cattle and horse feed; yet it will be proposed here that three-quarters of the amount sent for human consumption be sent in the form of meal or grits. It means that meal and grits will be fed to the cattle and that is pretty expensive cattle feed.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman stated that it would cost \$8,000,000 more if we vote this amendment. Today we are being asked to pour out over \$5,000,000,000 to stabilize the economies of these European countries. In my opinion \$8,000,000 is a mere drop in the bucket when we are trying to protect the economy of this country. If we do not adopt this amendment, it means that these mills here in this country will have to close their doors.

Mr. RICHARDS. We are trying to rebuild Europe. It is in our interest to do so. We cannot do that unless we hew to the line. If we have surplus wheat we want to send it to Europe, but we want to send it in the form that will best promote the program.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. It should be pointed out that the American Farm Bureau Federation opposes the 25 percent milling for flour provision. In addition, it is going to cost \$8,000,000 extra and there are \$14,000,000 lost on stock feed that Europe otherwise would get if we send them the wheat. So we are protecting the farmer on this and we are protecting them against the large millers.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. The gentleman realizes that while we are trying to protect the farmer we are also trying to protect the small-business man, as was evidenced by the vote on the previous amendment. There are a great many millers affected.

Mr. RICHARDS. There are not many small millers affected.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. There are a lot of employees affected.

Mr. RICHARDS. There are a few.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Not a few; 10,000 employees in my district.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. When we passed the small-business amendment we did not increase the cost of this program to do it. That is what this amendment would

do. It would cost the program \$8,000,000 more.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is going to cost the program more and it is going to cost the American farmers more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we ought to protect our smaller business groups and our farmers. We did buy \$354,000,000 worth of wheat in Canada and at a time wheat was in great surplus in the United States. In the matter of cotton we learn from the hearings that Clayton, Anderson & Co. got \$800,000,000 worth for cotton out of ECA funds. I guess maybe they are small business. You will remember Mr. Clayton was the gentleman who helped write some of this program. He seemed to have pulled the wool over the eyes of some of us.

Now, may I refer to the statement that in participating in this program there shall be no serious impairment to the economic stability of the United States.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if you really think this type of legislation does not impair our stability? I wonder if you think we are protecting the small mills and the wheat-growing sections of this country when we try to funnel all of the business through the large concerns? I ask you that question. Ask yourselves that question when you go home tonight. One member of the committee had the honesty and the courage to say, "Yes, we are lowering the standards of the people in this country by this type of legislation."

How much lower shall we go?

We must protect our economy or face destruction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri that provides for the milling of 25 percent of ECA wheat in this country. The amendment should include corn as well as wheat. If this grain is going for food, why not process at least a part of it before it is sent abroad. This amendment was included in the act last year and worked pretty well. I say, if it is being sent for food, then they need our finished product from the standpoint of nutrition as well as palatability.

Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion about helping small business. I am informed there are several thousand small mills in this country that are either shut down or running at less than half capacity. It is rather odd you are unwilling to let the workmen in these mills grind even as much as 25 percent of grain that is being given to foreign people, and paid for by American taxpayers. It is contended by some Members the big mills might get the business. If they do, it is the fault of administrators of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I said this amendment should include corn. I am informed an amendment will be offered to include corn. I therefore, call attention to a statement in the Federal Register of

March 20 and April 1, 1948. Here is what it says, and I quote:

(8) Federal Register.—The House unanimously passed an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Federal Register, March 20 and April 1, 1948). This amendment states:

"The most persuasive argument in behalf of the amendment springs from the fact that in the main, European countries do not have good milling facilities for corn. It must be milled in available mills which are adapted to the grinding of wheat and the net result is that a high-grade quality production of corn meal, corn grits, and corn flour cannot be produced in the mills abroad.

"This means an inferior product from the standpoint of nutritional and caloric value. That is highly important because the very purpose of the food commodities to be sent abroad is to build up the physical capacity of people to reconstruct their own industrial economy and this, of course, requires products where every element of nutrition is carefully preserved."

Mr. Chairman, this is a statement of the administration. What more evidence do you want? The amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to the fact that whether it is 15 percent or 25 percent the goal may not be reached for the reason that if you check over the figures for last year you will find that we purchased in Canada more wheat than we did in the United States under this program.

As to the total of wheat and flour converted from wheat we purchased more in Canada than we did in the United States. The only point that I wish to make is the fact that it makes all the difference in the world where you are going to buy this wheat. If you buy the wheat in Canada, it does not make much difference as far as the mills in the United States are concerned. The difference between 15 percent and 25 percent could easily be taken care of if there was a will on the part of the ECA to have this in mind when they make their purchases.

Commitments¹ and reported shipments of specified commodities to OEEC countries, Apr. 3 to Dec. 31, 1948

Commodity and source	Commitments		Reported shipments	
	Approximate quantities in 1,000 metric tons net weight	Million dollars	Approximate quantities in 1,000 metric tons gross weight	Million dollars
Wheat:				
United States.....	3,583.0	342.6	2,453.6	232.5
Canada.....	2,920.0	201.4	2,762.5	190.8
Total.....	6,503.0	544.0	5,216.1	423.2
Flour—wheat equivalent:				
United States.....	1,378.0	127.2	958.6	83.0
Canada.....	681.0	49.3	678.0	47.4
Total.....	2,059.0	176.5	1,645.6	130.3

¹ Procurement authorizations initiated by Food and Agriculture, ECA, including purchase agreements initiated up to Dec. 31, 1948, for first quarter 1949 delivery.

Commitments¹ and reported shipments of specified commodities to OEEC countries, Apr. 3 to Dec. 31, 1948—Continued

Commodity and source	Commitments		Reported shipments	
	Approximate quantities in 1,000 metric tons net weight	Million dollars	Approximate quantities in 1,000 metric tons gross weight	Million dollars
Total wheat and flour—wheat equivalent:				
United States.....	4,961.0	469.8	3,412.2	315.5
Canada.....	3,601.0	250.8	3,449.5	238.2
Total.....	8,562.0	720.6	6,861.7	553.5
Tobacco:				
United States.....	107.2	98.8	59.0	63.5
Turkey and Greece.....	4.0	3.0		
OWH.....	1.8	1.1		
Total.....	113.0	102.9	59.0	63.5
Cotton:				
United States.....	391.2	302.5	117.0	112.8
Peru.....	.2	.3		
Total.....	391.4	302.8	117.0	112.8
All dairy products, including cheese, product weight:				
United States.....	102.9	61.6	49.0	35.7
Canada.....	14.7	10.0	13.7	10.0
Turkey.....	.3	.3		.1
Total.....	117.9	71.9	63.7	45.8
Cheese:				
United States.....	32.5	21.2	29.9	28.8
Canada.....	14.6	10.0	13.6	10.0
Turkey.....	.3	.3		.1
Total.....	47.4	41.5	43.5	38.8
Soya Beans:				
United States.....	169.1	17.3	(?)	(?)
Brazil.....	4.9	.8	(?)	(?)
Total.....	174.0	18.1	(?)	(?)

¹ Procurement authorizations initiated by Food and Agriculture, ECA, including purchase agreements initiated up to Dec. 31, 1948, for first quarter 1949 delivery.

² Not available.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment to cut the amount, and I am opposed to increasing these figures even by the \$8,000,000. There is one hard thought that we must understand, it seems to me, in this whole program, and it is that it is designed as a recovery program for Europe.

Now, what is the situation so far as the milling industry in Europe is concerned regarding the 25-percent provision.

The provision prejudices the milling industry in the participating countries which have milling capacity adequate or nearly adequate to their needs. These are Austria, Belgium, France, the French zone of occupation in Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, and Norway. The detriment to the local economy is bad, particularly in Austria, Italy, and Greece, where recovery is complicated by unemployment. Section 112 (c) drains away funds which would otherwise be available for assistance to the participating countries. The committee must stand on the premise that this is a European recovery program.

Now, if we adopt this amendment it means that we are going to throw out of

employment men who are engaged today in the milling industry overseas. Again I repeat, I want to see American industry taken care of so far as it is possible, yet under the policy of the law as written we are interested in European recovery. Now that is a hard fact that we must all understand. I want to protect American agriculture and industry but we seem to be bound by our previous action.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Whenever we make this into a relief program for any part of our economy, we cut down on the amount of recovery over there or increase the expense of the whole business; is that not true?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

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

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, coming from the second largest milling city in the United States, Minneapolis, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not at this time, at least, speak up in defense of this amendment. It is true that I was interested during the course of the hearings in the committee in their deliberations on this activity.

But, I come here today speaking for several hundred unemployed milling employees of the city of Minneapolis. What I say about the city of Minneapolis, I presume, is also true of Buffalo, Kansas City, and other large milling centers.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It would also apply to many of our small mills.

Mr. WIER. That is true. There are many small mills throughout the State of Minnesota as well as our large concentrated milling industry, in Minneapolis. Bear in mind, I am not speaking here today for the milling industry; I am speaking for the men who are at present on the unemployment rolls because of the slackness of the milling industry in Minneapolis. I do not attempt here to interfere with the operations of ECA, but I do feel that we have some responsibility, not only in getting the grain to Europe, but there are some parts of that expenditure that we can well keep at home.

I heard the suggestion in committee that there was a surplus of feed in the United States. I also heard that disputed. However, I am not going to attempt to defend the pros or cons on the question of surplus feed, but I am deeply concerned, and I think all of us are deeply concerned, with unemployment in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GORSKI].

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

Mr. GORSKI of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Is it not a fact that today in Buffalo, one of the largest mill-

ing centers in the world, there is a 25 to 50 percent falling-off in work in the mills? If this amendment is not adopted, it may mean the closing down of several of the mills in Buffalo.

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Chairman, the present provision calling for 25 percent of the wheat which is ground into flour for shipment to foreign countries being milled in this country should definitely be retained.

Flour that goes to the importing countries with an American brand indicates it is made in the U. S. A. The baker, the housewife, the jobber, and everyone who handles the flour has visible evidence that it is a product of the U. S. A. that is given to their country. Wheat has no identity and a cargo of wheat might be from Russia, Argentina, or Canada, but no one handling the wheat would know it might be paid for with our American money.

The losses claimed by ECA in shipping flour instead of wheat cannot be proved. The mill feed is retained in this country and it is not a loss to our economy. One country in Europe is now considering the necessity of exporting mill feed because they are oversupplied. Labor is paid for in the manufacture and the handling of flour. This labor income is used to maintain our purchasing power and a share of it goes to pay taxes, including social-security and old-age benefits.

The miller is the largest purchaser of the farmers' wheat and any curtailment of the millers' wheat requirements means lower prices because one buyer—the Government—cannot support the market everywhere every hour of every day.

Flour exports have held up when there was no demand for our wheat. This was particularly in evidence in the 1930's when we had a difficult time exporting our supplies.

Now we are reaching the point where many countries do not want our wheat or flour even as a gift and they take the wheat because it can be fed to livestock and can be disposed of to other countries to better advantage than flour.

Flour can be shipped from any port and space is available and has been available for flour shipments. ECA claims they were justified in furnishing money for Canadian wheat and flour because of lack of ocean space and port facilities in this country. There was no shortage of space for flour and no shortage of port facilities for the shipment of flour. More wheat equivalent can be loaded in a boat in the form of flour than bulk wheat. In other words, the space used for flour is less than the space required for the amount of wheat it would take to make the flour.

Buffalo being the largest flour-milling center in the world, employing approximately 10,000 employees in the grain industry, namely workers in the flour mills, feed mills, and grain elevators, at present are experiencing short-running time. They are working 3 and 4 days a week. It seems strange to me that the Government, instead of being interested in preventing and averting any form of unemployment, if the ECA program goes through, it will be a promoter in putting more and more people out of work. Closing of mills and curtailment of running

time means fewer jobs. This will first affect the mills in the interior and in the small communities where there are no other jobs. The closing of these smaller mills will eliminate the best market the farmer has for his wheat.

Eliminating flour will give the ECA another opportunity to furnish money to buy wheat and flour in other countries because they probably can claim they cannot secure space for shipping bulk wheat from this country.

Where wheat or flour is paid for with our money, we believe we should furnish, first, the product that is best for our own economy and the economy of the American worker. Labor in importing countries can be utilized to better advantage than in the manufacture of flour. Our furnishing all wheat will encourage the building of mills that will be available for grinding local wheat on land that can be better utilized for other purposes or in grinding wheat from countries that can produce wheat at a cost lower than our cost of production. This will reduce our potential market for all time. ECA money should be used to support the economy of each country, but in order to make recovery faster in some other country, this should not be carried to the extreme of damaging our own economy more than the resultant high taxes. Supporting Canadian wheat prices with our money is one example of how far this idealism can be carried.

I heartily favor the stated objectives of ECA to help reconstruct a world which can again trade largely on an individual free-enterprise basis. We also recognize the necessity at this intermediate stage of tolerating some government-to-government trading. However, any arrangement whereby foreign governments can use this temporary period and our own taxpayers' money to destroy the regular channels of trade developed in free competitive markets obviously works against the best interests of the United States and against the objectives of ECA.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

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

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. IRVING. If Members will read the testimony in the hearings they will find it contradicts the statement made here that there is a \$8,000,000 deficit or extra expense. The testimony by experts showed that if all this grain had been milled they would have saved \$6,000,000, not \$8,000,000, on the operation covered by the amendment I propose.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Everybody seems to be alarmed and worried about the cost of \$8,000,000 and more. With \$5,380,000,000 under consideration in this bill, I do not believe we ought to be too concerned with \$8,000,000, when it throws American labor out of work, when it curtails the purchasing power of the men who are put out of work, when it shuts up shop for the small millers and curtails the activities of the large millers. If we are so concerned about saving a paltry \$8,000,000 here

now, I did not hear a single voice raised on the floor of the House when the previous section of the bill was adopted, which required us to use 50 percent American bottoms to ship these things to Europe, which would cost \$8,000,000, too, according to Administrator Hoffman.

This is very serious, and it is very serious in my district. I hope the Committee will vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] will offer an amendment at the end of section 7 which in substance will provide that basic commodities purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation be first exhausted by the ECA before such commodities are purchased elsewhere.

I intend to offer an amendment to the Worley amendment which will incorporate the language of the so-called corn amendment. It was unanimously approved by the House last year when a similar bill was under consideration. The same language used in my amendment was adopted by the Senate on last Friday. My amendment does not require the shipment of corn or any particular amount of corn but it does require that when and if any corn is used by the ECA, not less than 15 percent shall be in the form of corn grits; corn meal, and corn flour. I take this time merely to notify the committee of the substance of my amendment, which will be offered at the proper time.

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

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, section 112 of the Economic Cooperative Act of 1948 was amended in the Senate by adding after the words "any agricultural commodity or product thereof" the following, "or class, type, or specification thereof."

This amendment was highly desirable to include various deciduous fruit crops in the agricultural commodities to be shipped to the countries receiving aid under the provisions of this act.

In the crops which we desire to ship are apples, prunes, pears, peaches, and so forth. Europe at one time imported about 20 percent of our apple crop. Germany and France consumed practically all of the small prunes produced in this country. During the war all imports were halted, and since the war no provision has been made under our assistance programs to include these crops. The American farmer will lose this market for all time unless we reestablish that export market.

Fruit trees, unlike cotton, wheat, potatoes, and so forth, cannot be restricted, as it takes from 10 to 15 years to grow a producing tree. These orchards must be pruned, sprayed, cultivated, and taken care of in the proper manner. To keep this fruit industry solvent, I trust the conference committee will agree to the Senate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, ECA is not a pump primer for pressure groups and surpluses. ECA is not a carousel where every special interest tries to grab the ring for a free ride. If you want to subsidize, do so frankly. Do not hide behind ECA.

I call the attention of the Members of the House who talk about the cost of the program to the following items of special interest that raise the cost of this program \$84,000,000:

Flour, \$8,000,000; shipping, \$25,000,000; surplus agricultural items, \$35,000,000; marine insurance, \$11,000,000; and corn, \$5,000,000.

If you want to subsidize, let us do so frankly, but let us not kid ourselves. You are putting all this extra cost on the shoulders of the American taxpayer.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The statement was made that under the ECA we had made off-shore purchases of grain. I think that is a very important point, which ought to be answered now. We did make those purchases. We did so because when we passed this legislation last year we authorized ECA not to buy any commodity of which we were in short supply. I would like to read Mr. Hoffman's statement on grain, which is as follows:

Speaking generally from July 1 of last year to January 1 of this year, we have shipped every bushel of wheat from America for which we could get an export license. The issuance of export licenses was dictated not only by the supply of wheat, but also by the availability of shipping.

If we have a surplus of bread grains, then naturally the ECA will buy bread grains from the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to contribute to this debate a statement made by the American Farm Bureau Federation before our committee. That statement is as follows:

We urge the elimination of the provision in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 which requires that 25 percent of the wheat supplies under this program must be in the form of flour.

This provision tends to penalize American wheat growers because participating countries, with only a limited supply of dollars available, are likely to buy less wheat if they must use more dollars to buy 25 percent of their requirements in the form of flour.

Testimony before the committee showed that the provision cost the ECA program \$8,000,000 in the first 9 months of the program. There was a saving of \$6,000,000 based on the cost of the flour shipments as against the equivalent human food value in wheat, but this was offset by the extra cost of \$14,000,000 in value of animal-feed byproducts which would have been realized by processing the grain in Europe.

We say that if this is a European recovery program, we ought not to make it a program for the benefit and the aggrandizement of everybody who happens to be in business here in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IRVING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. IRVING) there were—ayes 66, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WORLEY: On page 8, line 3, at the end of section 7, add a new subsection as follows:

"(j) No funds authorized to carry out the purposes of this act shall be made available for the purchase of any basic agricultural commodity or livestock product other than from supplies now or hereafter owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, unless or until such supplies have been exhausted."

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, just a few moments ago we adopted an amendment which will be helpful, I hope, to small business. Small business has a very definite interest in the progress of this bill, but the amendment which I am now offering will not only benefit small business; it will likewise benefit big business; it will benefit the farmer, the rancher, and people in every segment of our economy, because it will help to save the taxpayers' money.

This amendment provides that at any time we have a surplus of any basic agricultural commodity or of livestock or product thereof it shall be mandatory—now, please note the distinction—it shall be mandatory, not permissive, for the Economic Cooperation Administrator to purchase those surpluses before buying such commodities from any other country.

My reasons for offering such an amendment are that at the present time under the price-support program the Government has lent to cotton producers \$670,000,000; that accounts for 4,275,000 bales of cotton. The Government has also lent \$500,000,000 on 245,000,000 bushels of wheat. We have under loan on corn, 140,000,000 bushels to the value of \$193,000,000; on tobacco, 400,000,000 pounds to the total of \$153,000,000; and, in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, before the Committee on Agriculture this morning, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, said it would be but a short time until, under the hog-price-support program, his Department would be buying a great amount of pork. In addition to that, the Commodity Credit Corporation has, under the foot-and-mouth-disease program in Mexico, title to, and is in possession of, some 103,000,000 pounds of good canned beef.

I cannot fully concur in the statements that have been made this afternoon that the entire objective of this program is European recovery. While that is an integral part of the program, at the same time it seems to me consistent with sound judgment and sound business principles that at any time we have a surplus of any commodity which these participating countries need we should first dispose of our own surplus before buying from other countries.

Through December 31, 1948, the ECA had bought 241,000,000 pounds of meat of all kinds, not only from the participating countries but also from nonparticipating countries. Do you know how much of that 241,000,000 pounds was

sold by the United States? Exactly 38,000,000 pounds; this leaves 213,000,000 pounds, including horse meat, that ECA has bought for distribution abroad, and they also brought meat from nonparticipating countries. Australia, for example, is not one of the participating countries. I do not know whether you will agree with me or not—I hope you do—it seems to me the best thing we can do is not to impair the operation of the recovery program but, so far as consistent with sound business practice, to dispose of the surplus commodities we have just as quickly as we can. To me that is just plain common sense.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEVEN to the Worley amendment: Amend the Worley amendment by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The amounts of corn and corn grits, corn meal, and corn flour produced in the United States to be transferred by grant to the participating countries shall be so determined that the total quantity of the United States corn used to produce the corn grits, corn meal, and corn flour procured in the United States for transfer by grant to such countries under this title shall not be less than 15 percent of the aggregate of the unprocessed corn, and corn in the form of corn grits, corn meal, and corn flour procured in the United States for transfer by grant to such countries under this title."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am proposing to the Worley amendment received unanimous approval of the House of Representatives last year when similar legislation was before us. The same amendment in identical language was adopted by the Senate on last Friday. We are all aware of the fact that the country is now entering an era of surpluses and this pertains particularly to corn. The 1948 corn crop consisted of 3,650,000,000 bushels. We had an old crop carry-over of 125,000,000 bushels. This made a total supply of 3,776,000,000 bushels available as of October 1, 1949. The prospects are that we will have about as large a corn crop in 1949 as we had in 1948; therefore the prospective carry-over of corn will exceed perhaps 700,000,000 bushels.

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

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

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I offered a similar amendment in committee. I hope that the gentleman's amendment will be adopted by this Committee.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman. This amendment is simply a step in the direction of trying to meet an emergency, which may confront this country as far as the surplus of corn is concerned. We must take steps to handle these surpluses now and the ECA will afford an outlet.

My amendment does not require the shipment of corn or any particular amount of corn. We are assuming, of course, that the ECA will use some corn.

My amendment simply requires that in the event any corn is shipped or used by the ECA not less than 15 percent shall be in the form of corn grits, corn meal, or corn flour. The purpose of the proposed amendment is also to contribute materially to continued high wages, full employment and to full production, and in establishing markets for the future.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Have they the facilities over there to prepare corn in the form of grits and other edible food for human consumption that we have in this country?

Mr. HOEVEN. No. These foreign countries have unsuccessfully attempted to mill our corn with wheat-milling equipment. That is the only thing they have. They have no corn-milling equipment, as far as I know. They have had very unsatisfactory results. They need our finished products, both from the standpoint of nutrition and palatability as well as the milling mark to shoot at.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman's amendment does not in any way alter, it really strengthens the Worley amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. It strengthens the Worley amendment because the Worley amendment pertains to all basic commodities, of which corn is one. My amendment simply says that whenever they use the basic commodities, of which corn is one, 15 percent shall be shipped in the form of grits, corn meal, and corn flour.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. May I say to the gentleman that I am very much in favor of his amendment and, if adopted, it will contribute to an alleviation of a possible shortage of storage space in the event another bumper crop is harvested this year.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. May I say that in view of the adoption of this amendment by the Senate I do not see why the House cannot take similar action at this time.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman is quite correct. In view of the record on this amendment as it stands today, I am amazed that the committee opposes my amendment.

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

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

Mr. DONDERO. Is there a demand in Europe for processed corn in the form of corn meal?

Mr. HOEVEN. There is. After World War I under the Hoover recovery program large quantities of corn meal and corn flour were shipped to Europe with detailed cooking instructions in the various languages inserted in each sack. The people used the processed corn, the statements of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] to the contrary notwithstanding.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, reserving 5 minutes to the committee.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 7 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I make the point of order that a motion to apply to all amendments to the section is not in order at this time, and further, that it reserves 7 minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] makes a point of order against the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section of the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GRANGER moves that the Committee do now rise and the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important amendment. Certainly, limiting the time of debate is not in the interest of sane legislating nor doing the committee any good, in my judgment. I just wanted to take time enough to inform the House of a situation with which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] and I have been rather closely associated, that is, the matter of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico.

The Republic of Mexico is also a friend of ours, and perhaps is in need of some consideration in this program. As a result of the foot-and-mouth disease there, the President, by executive order, placed an embargo upon all Mexican cattle. There is not a hoof of Mexican

cattle that can enter the United States except in a can. We have appropriated money and built packing plants in Mexico to process the cattle that cannot be moved out of that neighboring country. The taxpayers of this country have \$25,000,000 now invested in canned meat. It is not an inferior product, it is a good one. It is not the inferior cattle but it is all the cattle the Republic of Mexico can sell. This amendment would provide a means of saving the taxpayers some money by making it possible for this meat to be sold and distributed in the countries where it is needed.

I think it is important to the people of Mexico and it is important to the taxpayers of this country because it is different from any other kind of amendment offered, for we already have this meat on hand. It does not belong to stockmen or farmers but is owned by taxpayers of the United States, and we cannot dispose of it locally because it is more than the normal channels of trade can consume. I hope the Worley amendment is agreed to, because it is important to our neighbors and to ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion. Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, this combination meat and corn amendment could well be called a pork amendment.

We must not make this European recovery plan a form of disguised subsidy for American agriculture in any form. It may be that we need a subsidy program, but let us not put it in this bill. The fact is as to meat that the only meat that goes from the United States is horse meat under this program. This meat that is referred to, that the Commodity Corporation has, is about 100,000,000 pounds of canned meat that costs about 50 percent more than the raw meat, which the Europeans like to eat. They do not like canned meat.

The same thing is true on the corn amendment. Eighty percent of the corn goes over there as feed, and if we are going to have corn flakes and corn products made out of corn, we simply add thereby to the cost of the program as a hidden subsidy for American agriculture and the milling industry.

Remember, in this program we are supporting the recovery of enterprises in agriculture and in industry in Europe that may be competitive with us. It is our past experience that in times of peace we have always had the most trade with the most prosperous foreign countries, that at the same time were our best competitors. If we start to gut this program for recovery in Europe by making it into a hidden subsidy program for business or agriculture in this country, we will do one of two things, we will make its cost completely prohibitive or we will cut down the amount of aid.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. Does not the gentleman believe this amendment would mean that

before ECA could purchase any meat for this program in Europe it must purchase the entire 100,000,000 pounds of this canned meat?

Mr. VORYS. That is right, and the gentleman from Texas explained it that way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the preamble to the bill contain this language:

Provided, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

Without these amendments, how will you avoid impairing the economic stability of the United States?

Mr. VORYS. We have handled it without these amendments for the past year, and I do not know that the corn or the cattle industries of the country have been impaired by ECA.

The point is we must not make this program a form of subsidy for American industry or agriculture. There are a thousand different branches of industry and agriculture that can come here asking for special favors. They are not doing it, recognizing the possibility of competition in the future as a result of recovery over there. Let us not pick some favorites here and subsidize them in this indirect way. If there are surpluses that are available for use in the recovery plan under the existing law the Administrator must use those surpluses first. Let us not put through this type of pork-barrel amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to these amendments because you can upset the whole pattern of world trade. We are trying to increase and help world trade, and thereby help western European recovery and world recovery. If we do have a surplus of agricultural products, I would just like to point out in the few seconds that I have what the Secretary of Agriculture says about surplus products. In a letter of April 4 to the gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE, Mr. Brannan says:

The proposal would have the effect of redefining agricultural commodities to include not only those agricultural commodities and products which are determined by me to be in excess of domestic requirements, a definition now in effect, but also in addition to those agricultural commodities selling at less than parity, or comparable price. The proposal is not practicable from the administrative standpoint. I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, after you get your job done, come and see me; meaning I

am opposed to any and all amendments as to the amount to be granted by authority under a bill which only authorizes but does not grant the amount included in the bill as a ceiling.

The bill contemplates some relief or none. When the amount is determined it will primarily be by the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the surplus agricultural commodities in America, I am reminded of the old adage that charity begins at home. I see no reason why any surplus supplies or other commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation should not be purchased therefrom. This is a meritorious amendment and I regret that I do not have more time to discuss it fully from the standpoint of the American farmer.

However, I am familiar with the hearings held by the committee, and I am of the opinion that this amendment should be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be granted to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the statesmen on the Foreign Affairs Committee have found it necessary to railroad this bill through the committee, thereby precluding even a limited debate on its merits. It appears that the members of the committee are primarily interested in taxing the Americans to the tune of billions of dollars to be used as gifts to 19 foreign countries, and making certain that none of the money will be spent in the United States.

To illustrate the policy of the ECA, which has been concurred in by members of the legislative committee, I point out what has occurred since April 3 of last year. The ECA under direction of the Truman administration turned over \$573,000,000 to the 19 Marshall countries to buy grain and food in Canada. This was at the time when we had large surpluses of wheat and other grains in this country, and the CCC was putting up several hundred millions of dollars to support the price of these grains in the United States. There will no doubt be another record wheat crop in this country this year, and with a carry-over of nearly 400,000,000 bushels, it seems to me that the membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee should be more interested in American producers than they are in financing the removal of surplus wheat in Canada. The spokesmen for the committee say, "No," to American producers. I say it is a disgrace.

The committee also takes the position that we must not ship any American-made flour to the Marshall countries under direction of the ECA. They say that the flour must be purchased in other foreign countries. And this comes at a time when the flour mills of the United States are operating on half time. The committee refuses to give American workmen a break when it comes to work in our flour mills. What are we coming to in this Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio inveighs against subsidies for business and for agriculture. I rise in favor of this amendment, because I believe in subsidies for the American taxpayers. We American taxpayers have great investments in meat which we have had to buy because of the aftosa program in Mexico. We have tremendous investments in surpluses which have been incurred because of our agricultural program. I think it is unwise for us to contribute to the assistance of these people overseas when we have surpluses here in this country which they could utilize and utilize well. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, and also in support of the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

In the outset let me say that in my judgment nations, like individuals, act in self-interest. The United States has purchased through the Commodity Credit Corporation, commodities costing several hundred million dollars. It seems but common sense that we should require that a few million dollars of the billions of dollars authorized under this bill be spent to purchase commodities owned by this country and suitable for use in the operations of this program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Texas has pointed out the Commodity Credit Corporation owns something over 100,000,000 pounds of beef that was purchased in that portion of Mexico not infected with the foot-and-mouth disease. This meat was processed and canned under the same standards as the military used in preparing meat for shipment to our armed forces abroad during and since the war. It is high grade in every respect. There is no good reason why this meat should not be used and the Treasury of the United States reimbursed for its investment therein. I may say, also, Mr. Chairman, that the Commodity Credit Corporation still holds a stock pile of some 80,000,000 pounds of wool all of which was purchased at different times over the past 6 years. A good many of the participating countries can use that wool to good advantage. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that any other nation on earth would take the money out of one of its pockets and put it into another if in so doing

they could at the same time achieve the objective and purposes of the program. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GORSKI] is recognized.

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORSKI of New York: On page 7, line 6, strike out "repealed" and insert "amended by striking out '25 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '15 per centum'."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may speak now; his amendment will have to be offered later.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the amendment which would permit the 25-percent milling of flour in this country was defeated. My amendment substitutes 15 percent and is the compromise set by the Senate, the figure that is in the bill that was adopted by the Senate. So I am asking that it be approved because it is going to mean a good deal to the people of Buffalo.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORSKI of New York. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman's amendment should surely be approved. Today we are faced with surplus wheat in this country. This amendment is needed to give American workers jobs, men who are now working part time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, it does give me a lot of surprise as a Member from the city to hear certain Members from the farm States now complaining that they have a lot of surplus wheat. Because you will remember last year two Members, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] said: "Do not put the limitation on the purchase of United States wheat by ECA. You farmers are going to have a surplus and you are going to be here asking for its removal."

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] insisted, however, on a United States minimum retention by law under ECA of 150,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat over United States needs. The ECA nations had to buy abroad. Now he should complain?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. No. The gentleman from Minnesota calls us "the elder statesmen of the Foreign Affairs Committee." I think we at least have the intelligence not within 1 year to change our positions completely, as has just been done, and say, "Now we are for selling as much wheat as we can force ECA to take by law." When last year we heard: "You people do not know what you are talking about when you try to prevent us from

restricting the purchase of United States wheat by ECA."

Ho hum.

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

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, once before when the ECA bill was under consideration I offered a similar amendment, and the amendment offered by me was accepted by the Committee and also by the House; however, when the bill was sent to conference the amendment was not approved by the conference committee.

Mr. Chairman, representing an agricultural district, and having had surpluses of various agricultural products in my district and State, I was one of those of the opinion that not only the agricultural surpluses in my district and State, but also all surplus agricultural products in the United States should be utilized in the program under the ECA. During the last 2 years of the operation of this program, together with others, I made every effort to have the ECA purchase some of these surpluses in the program, but without success.

Even today there exists in almost every State in the Union agricultural surpluses and in my district and State and the States of Texas and Georgia there are tremendous surpluses of canned sugarcane sirup which could easily be purchased and would be of great value to this program as well as assist our own people who pay the taxes for this program.

Mr. Chairman, as has been repeatedly pointed out on this floor, why should the administrators of this program continue to buy the products of other countries for this undertaking when there is available the same foods and products in this country that are just as economical and suitable as those purchased in other countries. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to take further time on this amendment for my position is too well known to every Member of this House on this legislation, and my record on this legislation speaks for itself.

Mr. Chairman, I have not changed my position.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say two things: First of all, I am ready to vote on the bill now, and every other Member of this House is ready to vote on the bill now. Second, I am tired of having Members of this House say to the opposition to this bill, "You have no positive approach; you have a negative approach." A positive approach is one that looks after the interests of the American people.

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

The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, we have got so far afield from the amendment in the argument that I

think it well to touch upon just what it means. First of all, it means the disposal of 100,000,000 pounds of canned meat in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That meat cannot be imported into the United States. In order to cover costs it is priced by CCC in the neighborhood of 30.4 cents per pound.

There are practically no dollar requirements for meat by the participating countries. Whether they should eat it or not is not what we are considering here; they do not like canned meat, and this is not only canned meat, but it is canned meat and gravy. Obviously, no participating country is interested in buying an unfamiliar product which would cost them 15 percent more than they can buy fresh meat for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] is recognized.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, can we not give these Members more than 15 seconds apiece?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment because I believe in carrying out the theory that charity begins at home. I think this amendment will be very helpful to our constituents at home. Do not make any mistake about it, if the folks back home were voting on this amendment it would carry 10 to 1.

We have had certain experiences with the Administrator in the administration of this law. Recently a group of Senators and Congressmen from Louisiana, Texas, Georgia, Florida, and Mississippi, approached the Administrator with reference to the disposition of a commodity held by the Secretary to be in surplus, a wholesome product, sirup produced in those five States. We were told that the participating countries would first have to express a desire to use the sirup. My only objection to the pending amendment is that it does not go far enough.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the members of the distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee, especially the members on my side of the aisle, that last year we adopted an amendment which provided \$65,000,000 for one agricultural product. This happened to be dried skim milk. If we could do that last year I would like to know why any one can offer any objection as a principle or as a program to adopting the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Texas.

Maybe the rest of you gentlemen have millionaires in your districts, but may I say to my colleagues here that so far as my district is concerned the people have lost half of their purchasing power within the last year. I have always supported this legislation and I expect to

support it this time, but I would like to have someone start using a little common sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take one second of the time to say that I am ready to vote on the pending amendment. I would like to yield 49 seconds of my time back to speed up this resolution we are going to vote on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be so little understanding during these last few minutes of the thing we are really doing, including sending canned meat that cannot come into this country because of Mexican hoof-and-mouth disease to Europe, where canned meat is not eaten, apparently to pull the CCC out of a hole. It seems to me it would be much better if we were to get down to earth and do a responsible job on what we set out to do, which is the rehabilitation of Europe. The faster that can happen, the faster the people over there will be able to trade with us in increasing measure as the years come and go.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEEL], and the members of the committee for their fine work in reporting out this legislation. It speaks well for the long hours of hearings held, and for the very few and relatively minor points of difference. It is only after the successful discussion and consideration of legislation of this character that a bill of such magnanimity of purpose and objectivity can be agreed on in such a relatively short time and after full and complete debate on the floor.

We have advanced a great step forward away from isolationism. Some people would try to make out that questioning of funds for foreign aid, both ECA and arms for Europe, means a new wave of isolationism. It is a healthy sign rather than a pessimistic one, because there is a real regard for caution and a raising of the question as to how much we really can afford to spend.

We as Members of Congress should awaken to the idea and to the hard economic facts that this Nation's resources are not without limit. It is about time that we give careful consideration to this point of view.

It is about time that we give serious thought to our present economic plight. We seem to be seeking a new level of normal activity. It is to the interest of all concerned that we remain a prosperous, continuing Nation of high-level production and consumption. We must not fail in this. Too much is at stake.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, instead of this measure being designed for European recovery, it appears that we are going to use it for the purpose of subsidizing surpluses. If that be so, I would like to see it used as a subsidy to give employment to the many mills in this country that are running short.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this is not a relief program for the nations of Europe. We decided that last year. It should not be made a relief program for the farmers of the United States who have enjoyed the greatest income that they have had in many years. I hazard the guess that the great bulk of the farmers of the United States know that their best interest lies in a prosperous America, a prosperous Europe, and not in these rather small maneuvers for a few million dollars of special returns to be inserted in this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Ohio said this meat that is owned in Mexico is contaminated with the foot-and-mouth disease. This is 350 miles from the infected zone in Mexico; is that correct?

Mr. GRANGER. That is correct. This is not any foot-and-mouth-diseased meat at all. It is good canned meat.

Mr. WORLEY. These beef cattle have been on grass up until this time. Ordinarily they would come into this country, until we slapped a quarantine on them, at the rate of 500,000 a year.

Mr. GRANGER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoeven amendment. The farmers in my district and in fact, the farmers all over the Corn Belt face a serious corn surplus. Here is a chance to help the farmers. Here is a chance to really do something about the farm-surplus problem. It is a big problem—a serious problem. I am surprised to hear opponents say the farmer is so well off. They claim he is making too much money. They should realize the farmer does not receive the money the consumers pay. There is a wide spread so far as what the farmer gets for what he produces and what the consumer pays.

So far as the Mexican canned meat is concerned I can say from official information that the meat in question does not come from animals affected by foot and mouth disease.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, it is well to remember that about 50 percent of the funds in the ECA program are spent for the purchase of food and agricultural products and 50 percent for industrial commodities. I think it is also

wise to remember that Europe puts up dollar for dollar in their currencies the same amount of money that we do. They have mapped out a program which must be followed if rehabilitation is to be achieved by 1952. If we throw this program out of line by forcing the use of money to buy certain goods they do not want to buy and do not need to buy, it will seriously affect the whole program and will set back recovery. If we make it impossible for western Europe to buy the agricultural products they must have, their standard of living cannot be maintained at a safe level. That is what these agricultural amendments that are offered will do.

Western Europe buys a limited amount of canned meat and these products are now being purchased from the Commodity Credit Corporation's supply of canned goods from Mexico. The only other meat they buy from us is a limited supply of horse meat.

It is very short-sighted to ask now for special subsidies for, in the long run, they will benefit no one.

The program as it is now working is equitably distributed in the demands that it makes on our economy. Our entire economy benefits from our exports to the ECA countries. If we pull the whole program out of line by the adoption of the proposed amendments, the European countries will not be self-sustaining by 1952 and then, indeed, we will have wasted the taxpayers' money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. In the interest of getting through with the bill and coming to a vote, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that even those who favor this amendment should read it a little more carefully in order to see that they are properly protected. It reads, in substance, that no fund will be made available for any basic agricultural commodity or livestock product other than from supplies now or hereafter owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. There are literally hundreds of products that do not come under the Commodity Credit Corporation, which would mean just simply this, if this amendment were adopted, that the citrus people of Florida, the fruit people of California, and half of the other people in the agricultural business would not be able to participate under this Marshall-aid program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to inquire, if this amendment does not pass, in spite of the fact that I am in favor of it, will \$100,000,000 worth of canned meat be served to the United States Army?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman understands that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

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

There was no objection.

(The Hoeven amendment was again read.)

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOEVEN) there were—ayes 89, noes 129.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KEE and Mr. HOEVEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 78, noes 131.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, under the Worley amendment, which now remains to be voted upon, would it not be possible for funds appropriated under the authority of this act to be expended for products after the surplus property of the Commodity Credit Corporation had been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. My good friend from South Dakota realizes that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas be again reported.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Worley amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WORLEY) there were—ayes 87, noes 112.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WORLEY and Mr. KEE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 97, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GORSKI] has an amendment at the desk.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise; that is a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORSKI of New York: Page 7, line 6, strike out the word "repealed" and insert: "Amended by striking out '25 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '15 per centum'."

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORSKI of New York) there were—ayes 25, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. To this section?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin: On page 8, line 3, after the word "payment", add "Subsection (j)" and insert subsection (j) reading as follows:

"(j) That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to permit the export of tobacco seeds to countries receiving aid under the European Recovery Act."

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, since the ending of the war in 1945, we have had presented to us for our consideration the same type of legislation that is now before us—namely, aid to Europe. Just how much we have actually given to the European nations seems to be very much of a question. However, we are certain it is in excess of \$28,000,000,000 since the end of the war. We were told at the start the program would last 2 or 3 years at the outside. Today I listened to statements that it will take 2 or 3 years more. I am wondering now, Mr. Chairman, just when it is going to stop and how long can we afford to continue a policy of "give" which means to the taxpayers of America "spend and spend and tax and tax."

We are told that this money is being used to prevent the spread of communism. I would like to ask the question, Is that what it is being used for, to stop the spread of communism and promote individual initiative and freedom for all peoples? If such is the case, why do we find money and aid going to satellite nations of Russia and, yes, to Russia itself. May I call to your attention a United Press release of just last Saturday, April 9, 1949, and this release has not been disputed on the floor during this debate. It is datelined London, April 9, and I quote from the release, Mr. Chairman:

Britain and Russia will begin new discussions on a 1-year trade agreement within

a few days. Board of Trade officials announced today. Negotiations for a long-term Anglo-Soviet treaty failed in Moscow last January, but Britain suggested renewed talks a month ago, after a series of Moscow propaganda broadcasts advised Britain to solve her export problems by trading with eastern Europe. British officials said today Russia had "agreed in principle" that the two nations should try to work out a short-term pact. The announcement coincided with reports that a 5-year trade pact between Britain and Yugoslavia will probably be concluded within 3 weeks.

If this statement is true and I repeat, it has not been denied, why are we giving Britain any money when it is charged and not refuted that she is negotiating with Soviet Russia as well as the satellite nations of Russia? It has been charged and not denied that countries to which we are giving aid under the European recovery program have been shipping copper to Poland, which is under Russian control, and, yes, Mr. Chairman, shipping steel rails and locomotives direct to Russia. The records will show that we are furnishing to European nations materials which are critical in this country and which are badly needed for the establishment of our own defense program. Communism, Mr. Chairman, starts when people are discouraged and under a burden of high taxes. Many of the nations that we are giving aid to under the recovery program have a tax per person of less than one-half of ours. Their indebtedness per person is less than one-half of ours.

I am raising the question, Are we not making these United States vulnerable to a spread of ideology different from our own by the extension of a program whereby we are asking our people to continue to pay high taxes and high living costs? Is it not time that the people of Europe do something to help themselves? I am certain that my people would be perfectly willing to pay this amount and even more if it would assure peace, and I would be willing to vote to continue this burden upon them if I felt certain the program would definitely stop the spread of communism. The records will show, and it has not been disputed, that some of the money we are sending to foreign countries is not getting to the people who actually need the aid. More depends upon the administration of a loan or the administration of a government, than the amount of dollars and cents. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are sending money to governments whose officials just a few weeks ago stated and I quote, "Britain's recovery is now virtually complete." This statement was made, Mr. Chairman, by a member of the British Cabinet, and it was concurred in by the Right Honorable Harry Wilson, a member of the Cabinet in Britain during a debate in the House of Commons.

Mr. Chairman, our economic condition can stand only a certain amount of indebtedness. Our military position needs a tremendous expenditure in order to protect ourselves. I am asking you, are we going to continue a policy of weakening our economic structure and weakening our military position? I am

of the firm conviction that it is time for us to give recognition to our own needs. We have many, many people who are more poorly housed, have less clothes, and less food than many of the people of the countries to which we are giving aid. Nearly every day our mail shows us that many of our people need immediate assistance, yet we are told by some of the leaders, and some who are so insistent on the passage of this legislation, that we cannot afford to give such aid.

I have listened to many speeches in the last few days of individuals whose records show that they have refused to give assistance to the veterans, including the construction of veterans' hospitals, to the laboring man, to the farmers, and to practically all of the people of our country—yet they are calling upon us today to vote to give aid to peoples of other countries.

From personal experiences in the last few hours it has been proved that those who are in control of this legislation are accepting no amendments whatsoever. In other words, the distribution of this \$5,000,000,000 is going to follow the same channel as it has in the past; even in the face of a record of wastefulness; yes, even part of it going to countries under communistic domination.

Let us be fair with the American people—recognizing their need, recognizing the weakness of our own country—put our own house in order. We have been lenient with other countries, certainly it is time for them to show some desire to help themselves. I am of the firm conviction that this raid on the American people will ultimately mean an increase in taxes and a continuation of the program of spend and spend and tax and tax, which certainly we must recognize is weakening our own national structure. It is time we recognize that in order to be strong, we must have a government that is stable and one which gives relief to its own people, so that when an emergency does arise, we will have the strength both economically and financially to assume our responsibility. Mr. Chairman, this cannot be done if we continue the policy of aiding the world without asking them to do something to help themselves.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) Section 114 (c) of such act is amended in the following particulars:

(1) By striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided further, That, in addition to the amount above authorized to be appropriated, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions and accomplishing the purposes of this title not to exceed \$1,100,000,000 for the period April 3, 1949, through June 30, 1949, and not to exceed \$4,280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950: Provided further, That, in addition to the foregoing, any balance, unobligated as of June 30, 1949, or subsequently released from obligation, of funds appropriated for carrying out and accomplishing the purposes of this title for any period ending on or prior to that date is hereby authorized to be made available for obligation through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and to be transferred to and consolidated with any appropriations for carrying out and accomplishing

the purposes of this title for said fiscal year."

(2) By amending the last sentence of such section 114 (c) to read as follows: "The authorizations in this title are limited to the period ending June 30, 1950, in order that the Congress may pass on any subsequent authorizations."

(b) Section 114 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, until such time as an appropriation additional to that made by title I of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949 (Public Law 793, 80th Cong.), shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,000,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the Administrator shall request, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest for advances made by it hereunder, from funds made available for the purposes of this title."

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I hope and trust this House will pass the appropriation measure it has before it to provide for the extension of the European recovery program during the second period of its existence. Nobody can guarantee that it will prevent another war. Nobody can guarantee that the North Atlantic Pact will be successful. We are unable to look into the future but we can judge the present and evaluate the future in the light of the past. It has been said on the floor of this House that the European recovery plan will bankrupt this Nation and it has been proposed that the funds be cut here and sliced there. Let us not go to this task with too little and get there with that too late. You, who are students of history, take a journey back along the steep and tortuous path that man has followed, go back until the trail is lost in the wind-blown dust of antiquity and you will find the path littered with the stark and naked skeletons of nations and empires that have been destroyed by selfishness, cupidity, avarice, and greed. However, I look in vain for any nation that has been destroyed by mercy, charity, or generosity. Our expenditures for war are staggering. Billions of dollars are spent every year to pay for wars of the past and prepare for wars yet to come. The European recovery plan is the first plan in the history of the human race on which any nation has ever proposed to spend a vast sum of money in the hope that it will bring peace. We are providing this money for the European recovery program in order that people living in other lands may have jobs and wages and homes and children and schools and a future. We are providing this money in order that people in other democracies may have churches, Sunday schools in order that they may have the privilege to worship God without being molested. The same God in whom we profess to have faith. Christ could have preached the fatherhood of God for 10,000 years and no one would have molested him but He chose to have compassion on the poor, the sick, the lame, and the blind. He

scourged the money changers out of the temple, telling them, "My Father's house is a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves." He told the scribes and pharisees they could not devour widow's houses and then atone for their misdeeds by making long prayers on street corners. He taught the people mercy, charity, and generosity, and the aristocracy of Judea nailed him to a cross. It was not popular to relieve hunger, want, and misery in those days, and it is not popular in certain places today, but my faith in the wisdom, courage, patriotism, and sincerity of the Members of this House is unshaken. I believe they will pass this measure without crippling amendments. How would we dare on our knees ask God to bless our home, our children and our country, if we failed to thus prove that we loved our neighbor as ourself.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3748) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter received from Prof. Charles C. Price.

Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters from employees who earn their livelihood in the west coast canneries and fields.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article which appeared in the China Monthly of March 1949. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$318, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, and notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain data.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

REPORT ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] may have until 8 o'clock tonight to file a report from the Committee on Appropriations on the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1950.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on that bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE LATE JAMES WOLFENDEN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the death of the late James Wolfenden.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have read with deep regret of the death of my valued friend, and our former colleague, James Wolfenden, of Pennsylvania.

For many years Jim Wolfenden served his people and his country in this body with ability, fidelity, and with courage. His type of service was quiet, but was very efficient.

As a result of his great ability, his knowledge of legislative and public questions, his convincing personality, and the confidence and the respect his colleagues had for him, Jim Wolfenden exerted a most unusual influence on his colleagues. For years prior to his retirement from the House, he was recognized as one of the leaders of this body. In his own political party he was for years a recognized leader.

I regret very much his death. In his passing on, I have lost a personal friend.

The loved ones he left behind, Mrs. Wolfenden and her son and daughter, can derive great consolation in the knowledge that his life was a constructive and a fruitful one; that his friends were many in all parts of the country, and that he served his district, his State, and his country in an outstanding manner. To the loved ones he left behind, I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 12, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

518. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize the appointment of Col. Kenneth D. Nichols, O-17498, professor of the United States Military Academy, in the permanent grade of colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

519. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 28, 1906, relating to the Osage Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

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. WILLIAMS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 91. A bill to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3436. A bill to amend section 3 of the Lucas Act with respect to redefinition of request for relief; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3196. A bill to authorize appropriations for roads, trails, and other aids to transportation serving lands and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3111. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and section 118 thereof, and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; with amendments (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4177. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 4166. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Catlettsburg, Ky.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BREEN:

H. R. 4167. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 4168. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4169. A bill to establish a standard schedule of rates of basic compensation for certain employees of the Federal Government; to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of basic compensation of individual employees; to repeal the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 4170. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 4171. A bill to provide authorization for additional funds for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4172. A bill to provide for the construction of a post-office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4173. A bill to provide for the construction of a new post-office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 4174. A bill to provide additional options with respect to Government life-insurance policies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 4175. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 4176. A bill to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 4177. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4178. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 with reference to claims arising out of the death of members of the armed forces of the United States as the result of enemy action after cessation of hostilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 4179. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to permit individual sellers to absorb actual freight costs if such absorption is in good

faith and does not result in injury to competition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 4180. A bill to repeal so much of the Hatch Act as prohibits certain officers and employees of the Federal and State Governments from taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 4181. A bill to provide an allowance for uniforms for certain postal and other employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4182. A bill to promote the national defense and security by providing for a National Inventors Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 4183. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to extend the time within which applications may be filed for lump-sum payments payable with respect to World War II veterans who died before August 10, 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp to commemorate the anniversary of the birth of Rex McDonald; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. J. Res. 220. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; 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 Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide assistance to unemployables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to return to the State of New Jersey sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the State of New Jersey for the administration of unemployment compensation to provide adequately for administration of the law in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging support for an appropriation to carry out the sea-wall and harbor-improvement project at Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that the Government construction programs in Alaska allow the fullest participation of resident Alaskan firms and labor; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that the Secretary of the Interior be authorized to investigate the advisability and feasibility of erecting a custom smelter in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make available such facilities to the Territory of Hawaii needed for the construction of wharfage and harbor facilities in the vicinity of Kaneohe, Oahu; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging that surveys necessary to establishment of a road between Nenana and Fairbanks be instituted next

summer with a view to construction as soon as possible; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging the construction of a road between Livengood and Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4184. A bill for the relief of Michael Zarechnak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4185. A bill for the relief of Edward W. Delmater; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 4186. A bill for the relief of Jan Liga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 4187. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada Svejkovsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 4188. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ferdinando Schiappa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 4189. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Crook and B. L. Fielder; 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:

547. By Mr. ASPINALL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact pending legislation for the amendment of the Social Security Act to provide assistance to unemployables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

548. Also, resolution of the senate of the State of Colorado, petitioning the President of the United States to prohibit the importation of furs from Russia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

549. By Mr. BARING: Senate Joint Resolution 10, approved by Governor Pittman on March 29, 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

550. By Mr. CARROLL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature, urging passage of the Local Public Health Services Act of 1949 and that the appropriation of \$10,808,000, "Assistance to States, general public health," which was deleted from the appropriation bill H. R. 3333 for the Public Health Service, passed March 9, 1949, by the House of Representatives, be restored so that adequate financial assistance will be available; to the Committee on Appropriations.

551. Also, memorial of the State Legislature of Colorado, urging the Congress to approve proposed legislation providing for amendments to the Social Security Act in order to provide for assistance to the chronically ill, physically or mentally handicapped, or otherwise unemployable persons between the ages of 18 and 65, who have been determined by clinical and laboratory tests or otherwise to have a chronic or prolonged disability which causes them to be unable or unavailable for gainful employments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

552. By Mr. HALE: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, asking that the Congress of the United States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution give serious consideration to the calling of a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution

which are appropriate to authorize the United States to negotiate with other nations, subject to later ratification, a constitution of a world federal government, open to all nations, with limited powers adequate to assure peace, or amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to ratify any world constitution which is presented to the United States by the United Nations, by a world constitutional convention, or otherwise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

553. By Mr. HESELTON: Petition of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Holyoke, Mass., regarding the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

554. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Robert R. Dalziel, druggist, and other citizens of What Cheer, Iowa, urging repeal of the 20 percent excise tax on all toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

555. By Mr. SADLAK: Resolution of the Court of Common Council of the City of Meriden, Conn., memorializing the Congress to pass and the President to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

556. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Gulf Ports Association, Inc., Galveston, Tex., stating approval of the wording of the bill H. R. 1340; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

557. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

558. Also, petition of Mrs. Robert L. Rice and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

559. Also, petition of Mrs. Ruth Childers and others, Avon Park, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

560. Also, petition of Arthur C. Almy and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

561. Also, petition of Mrs. Anna Pinckard and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

562. Also, petition of J. M. Villa and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

563. Also, petition of I. C. Ellis and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

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

His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, of New York City, offered the following prayer:

O God of our Fathers! In this solemn hour we call upon Thy name. We are Thy people. Thou art our God, our watching, mighty God. Thou hast carved us a nation out of the wilderness, sealing us with high destiny, to be light to peoples in darkness, to bring freedom to nations in chains. Thou didst breathe Thy breath into the face of our sires, Thy breath of freedom, of justice, of

peace. Breathe we Thy breath, our Nation shall not die. O God, preserve us, Thy Nation, a union of States, one and indivisible.

Grim are the signs we sight as rolling wrecks drift by, nations with decks awash, nations in frantic fear. Death riding at the masthead, with mutiny aboard, against Thy holy will, O God, our captain! Preserve us Thy Nation, a union of States, one and indivisible.

When a nation drops God as a pilot, God abandons the ship of state to gales of pernicious doctrines, to cross-currents of greed, to the lash of pirates, to the lot of slaves, to the doom of drowning. O God, our captain! Preserve us Thy Nation, a union of States, one and indivisible.

O Father of the nations! Great is Thy trust in us, sacred our hope in Thee. In Thee, we pledge our faith with the blood and tears of our bravest! Beside us lie the tasks of the hour. Before us shine the goals to be won. Bless us, O God, with unity; unity of heads, sharing common counsels; unity of hands, sharing common toil; unity of hearts, sharing common hopes. Our unity revealing Thy strength and our will.

O God, our Father! Preserve us Thy Nation, a union of States, one and indivisible.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 11, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3932) to exempt artificial limbs from duty if imported for personal use and not for sale, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] retained the floor under a unanimous-consent agreement last evening?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was no express agreement, but he had offered an amendment and was on his feet yesterday at the time the Senate took a recess.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present routine business and matters for the RECORD without jeopard-