

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a committee was submitted:

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

Executive A, Eighty-first Congress, first session, the Charter of the Organization of American States, formulated at the Ninth International Conference of American States, and signed at Bogotá, Colombia, in the English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish languages on April 30, 1948, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and other American Republics; with a reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 15).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, by agreement, the nomination on the calendar ahead of the new report is to be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

The new report on the executive calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert W. Gatov, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, August 25, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 24 (legislative day, July 20), 1950:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be Representatives of the United States of America to the Fifth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont.
Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.
JOHN J. SPARKMAN, United States Senator from the State of Alabama.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., United States Senator from the State of Massachusetts.
John Foster Dulles, of New York.

The following-named persons to be Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the Fifth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Benjamin V. Cohen, of New York.
John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky.
Ernest A. Gross, of New York.
Edith S. Sampson, of Illinois.
John C. Ross, of New York.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter J. Donnelly, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Venezuela, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria, and to be also United States High Commissioner for Austria.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Ernest E. Killen of Harrington, Del., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware, in place of Norman Collison.

Howard H. MacGowan of Seattle, Wash., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 30, with headquarters at Seattle, Wash. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance
Donald D. Gold

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance
Harold W. Wolf
Frederick A. Flohrschutz
Raymond E. Matthews

To be senior assistant scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance
Robert K. Ness

To be senior assistant sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance
Leo Kartman

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Alma Marlin Lillian S. Dick
Marion E. Becker Catherine N. McDuffie
Faye G. Abdellah Helen L. Roberts

To be assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance
Nina A. Ramacciotti

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Paul A. Lindquist Robert A. Hingson
George K. Massengill Kenneth W. Chapman
Michael B. Shimkin Benno K. Millmore
Lloyd S. Rolufs James K. Shafer
Joseph C. Sturgell

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Richard S. Yocum Keith F. Farr
Ardell B. Colyar Robert E. Staff
Andrew W. Para John W. Smillie
Gerald R. Clark Sidney Krohn
Warfield Garson Leo J. Gehrig
William P. Ramey Robert Leslie Smith

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

John J. Walsh
Joseph A. Gallagher

Dental surgeons to be senior dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Clovis E. Martin
James O. Blythe, Jr.

Senior assistant sanitary engineer to be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Joseph H. Coffey

Junior assistant pharmacist to be assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant):

Paul H. Honda

Assistant nurse officers to be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Alice M. Driscoll
Phyllis B. Kyte

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate August 24 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Albert W. Gatov, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for a term expiring June 30, 1953.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 24, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D. offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, we are again humbly uniting our hearts in the fellowship of prayer to adore Thy great and holy name, to confess our sins, to render unto Thee our gratitude, and to seek Thy blessings and Thy benediction for ourselves and all mankind.

Thou alone knowest what our greatest needs are in these days of strife and confusion. Give us a reassuring sense of Thyself, for when we have Thee we have everything, a presence to strengthen and inspire, a light to guide and cheer, a sympathy to comfort and encourage, and a love which will not let us down and never let us go.

Grant that during this day we may sense the sanctity of all our tasks and responsibilities. May that day of blessed prediction soon come when there shall be peace on this earth and good will among men.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1585. An act for the relief of Lellah begum Alaoui Mullin;

H. R. 1611. An act for the relief of Walter E. Miller;

H. R. 1616. An act for the relief of S. L. Ayres & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sergio and Mara Lambertini;

H. R. 3278. An act to amend section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to involuntary liquidation and replacement of inventory;

H. R. 3304. An act for the relief of José Cotto Santiago;

H. R. 3921. An act for the relief of Nicholas C. Hadjipateras, Piptsa N. Hadjipateras, and Costas N. Hadjipateras;

H. R. 4014. An act for the relief of Maria Hoffman;

H. R. 4142. An act for the relief of Ralph D. Kinney;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of J. R. Fleming & Co.;

H. R. 4775. An act for the relief of Harold L. Corzett, commander, United States Naval Reserve;

H. R. 4954. An act for the relief of Jacob F. Hutt and Anderson E. Humphrey;

H. R. 5523. An act for the relief of Fred I. Massengill;

H. R. 5984. An act to approve Joint Resolution 12, enacted by the Legislature of the

Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1949, relating to the granting of land patents in fee simple to certain lessees under homestead leases;

H. R. 6052. An act for the relief of John M. Vick;

H. R. 6217. An act to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6221. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the This-Side-of-Heaven Children's Home for use as a children's home;

H. R. 6223. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of James Ermini;

H. R. 6312. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Joseph Lundborg and others against the United States;

H. R. 6386. An act for the relief of Amos Chen, a native of Jamaica, British West Indies;

H. R. 6417. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frieda Gray (formerly Frieda Putman);

H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Mrs. Martha Reid;

H. R. 6449. An act for the relief of Mrs. L. M. Cox and Mrs. M. R. Nickle;

H. R. 6463. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shikaju Nakashima;

H. R. 6578. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gunnborg Janzon Hamilton;

H. R. 6586. An act for the relief of Stamatie Amerzonis;

H. R. 6707. An act for the relief of Sirius Proestopoulos;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Anna Ellero and Clara Ellero;

H. R. 7146. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States," so as to provide that moneys received from the disposal of material from reserved school section lands in Alaska shall be credited to the Territory;

H. R. 7282. An act for the relief of Cornelius VerSluis;

H. R. 7297. An act for the relief of Ignas Malcius;

H. R. 7370. An act for the relief of Kiyoko S. Barr and Harue Barr;

H. R. 7613. An act for the relief of Mrs. Miyako Horikoshi Spaulding and Mabel Miya Spaulding;

H. R. 7641. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in the District of Columbia to the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church;

H. R. 7677. An act to provide for perfecting the title of the State of Nebraska to certain property heretofore known as the Genoa Indian School;

H. R. 7814. An act for the relief of Stella Matutina Kazuko Yamazaki;

H. R. 7840. An act to provide for the refund of certain estate taxes;

H. R. 7919. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yukiko Yoshii French and her son;

H. R. 7921. An act for the relief of Eva T. Ross;

H. R. 8009. An act for the relief of Enrica Gianoli;

H. R. 8061. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yuki Sugimoto Murphy and David Murphy;

H. R. 8069. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Kohga Brooks;

H. R. 8073. An act for the relief of Kimiko Iso and her minor daughter, Midori;

H. R. 8134. An act for the relief of Elona Schwietza and her son;

H. R. 8153. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Akashi;

H. R. 8315. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Gallagher;

H. R. 8417. An act to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to

the regulation of motor carriers engaged in commerce to and from the Territories and possessions of the United States;

H. R. 8423. An act for the relief of Yuriko Mizumoto;

H. R. 8473. An act for the relief of Kimiko Tomita;

H. R. 8477. An act for the relief of Marcel Rene de Romanett;

H. R. 8558. An act for the relief of Kimiko Yamaguchi;

H. R. 8584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tokio Sato Keating, Terry Yoichi Keating, and Betty Jean Keating;

H. R. 8619. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, to provide for the appointment of dental specialists, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8634. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yumiko Kawai Misanin and her daughter, Maria Mari Misanin;

H. R. 8740. An act for the relief of Erika Kuhn;

H. R. 8741. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Yonashiro Martin and Gerald Philip Martin;

H. R. 8742. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tokiko Amano Roloson;

H. R. 8751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoshiko Ogiso Peterson;

H. R. 8772. An act for the relief of Ah-Kim Wong;

H. R. 8794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elko Yoshizawa Lendrum and Charles Robert Lendrum, Jr.;

H. R. 8795. An act for the relief of Benjamin Paglinaman;

H. R. 8824. An act for the relief of Tokuko Murayama;

H. R. 8826. An act for the relief of Yaeko Nakajima;

H. R. 8918. An act for the relief of Mary Rynik Baran;

H. R. 8935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jaye Kurusu Maddox;

H. R. 8956. An act for the relief of Mrs. Claude Morita and Rodney Morita;

H. J. Res. 497. Joint resolution extending from gross estate of a nonresident alien works of art on loan to the trustees of the National Gallery of Art;

H. J. Res. 510. Joint resolution to exempt certain counsel employed by committee from certain Federal laws under Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures, 1950; and

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1586. An act for the relief of Harold E. Trautwein;

H. R. 1874. An act for the relief of John W. Mahoney, Charles Sorenson, Charles A. Stewart, and Stanley Thiffault;

H. R. 3919. An act for the relief of John S. Steber;

H. R. 4221. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Patricia Joyce Dunn, a minor;

H. R. 4903. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers;

H. R. 6095. An act for the relief of Universal Corp., James Stewart Corp., and James Stewart & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 6209. An act to authorize the commutation of the annual appropriation for fulfilling various treaties with the Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6339. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and investigation to determine the feasibility and advisability of constructing a multipurpose tunnel through

the Laguna Mountains in San Diego County, Calif.;

H. R. 6343. An act relating to customs duties on articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 6804. An act for the relief of certain Italian aliens;

H. R. 6832. An act for the relief of Choko Nishida;

H. R. 7447. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to sound-recording materials for use in connection with moving-picture exhibits and news reels;

H. R. 7454. An act for the relief of Robert C. Watters, Mrs. Martha L. Watters, C. E. Nivens, E. O. Nivens, and the estate of J. W. Gillum, deceased;

H. R. 7824. An act to provide for the administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8028. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the remaining Government lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla.;

H. R. 8219. An act for the relief of Tadeusz Herka;

H. R. 8726. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to exempt from duty sound recordings for news broadcasts;

H. R. 8992. An act to eliminate the additional internal-revenue taxes on coconut oil coming from the trust territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9134. An act to amend title 46, United States Code, section 251.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1192. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 2324. An act for the relief of Maria Balsam;

S. 2648. An act for the relief of Carlo Fava;

S. 2922. An act for the relief of Chieko Murata;

S. 3018. An act for the relief of W. F. Stelner;

S. 3037. An act for the relief of Nicholas Yialouris (also known as Nicholas Gialouris or Nicolaos Gialouris or Nick Yialouris);

S. 3121. An act for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Planetto;

S. 3136. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the town of Mills, Wyo., a sewage system located in such town;

S. 3250. An act for the relief of Marne Post No. 28, American Legion, New Martinsville, W. Va.;

S. 3254. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Buffalo, N. Y., as the Buffalo Veterans' Memorial Hospital;

S. 3321. An act for the relief of Zena (Zenobia) Symeonides;

S. 3434. An act for the relief of Mikiko Anzal;

S. 3546. An act to extend the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes;

S. 3672. An act to amend section 3 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make the exclusion from such act of temporary employees of the Senate and House of Representatives inapplicable to such employees with one or more years of service;

S. 3768. An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes;

S. 3807. An act to authorize the President to appoint Col. Henry A. Byroade as Director of the Bureau of German Affairs, Department of State, without affecting his military status and perquisites;

S. 3910. An act relating to the assignment of surplus clerks in the Postal Transportation Service;

S. 3917. An act for the relief of Basilio Gorgone;

S. 3965. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.;

S. 3966. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.;

S. 3967. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust;

S. 3933. An act to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations;

S. 3995. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Secretary of Commerce to undertake security measures relative to the regulation and control of air commerce, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to provide that the housing developments known as Westview and Southview in the village of Springfield, Vt., shall for the purposes of the seventeenth decennial census be treated as a part of the village of Springfield, Vt.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2423. An act to amend section 7 of the act of February 27, 1925 (43 Stat. 1003), relating to the Osage Indians of Oklahoma; and

S. 2633. An act to give effect to the Convention for the Establishment of an International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna, signed at Mexico City January 25, 1949, by the United States of America and the United Mexican States and the Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, signed at Washington, May 31, 1949, by the United States of America and the Republic of Costa Rica, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4900. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. THYE, and Mr. KEM to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1056) entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the

House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2317) entitled "An act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their need for elementary and secondary school facilities and for planning State-wide programs of school construction; and to authorize grants for emergency school construction to school districts overburdened with enrollments resulting from defense and other Federal activities, and for other purposes;" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HILL, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. MORSE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair prefers not to recognize Members to address the House for 1 minute, but will recognize Members to extend their remarks.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THIRD DIVISION OF DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill (H. R. 3775) to provide for an additional district judge for the third division of the District Court for the District of Alaska.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 147, answered "present" 2, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

YEAS—196

Abbitt	Breen	Chesney
Addonizio	Brown, Ga.	Clemente
Albert	Bryson	Combs
Allen, La.	Buchanan	Cooley
Andrews	Buckley, Ill.	Cooper
Angell	Buckley, N. Y.	Crook
Aspinall	Burdick	Crosser
Barden	Burke	Davenport
Baring	Burnside	DeGraffenried
Barrett, Pa.	Burton	Delaney
Beckworth	Byrne, N. Y.	Denton
Bentsen	Camp	Dollinger
Blatnik	Cannon	Donohue
Boggs, Del.	Carlyle	Doughton
Bolling	Carnahan	Douglas
Bolton, Md.	Cavalcanti	Doyle
Bosone	Chatham	Durham
Boykin	Chief	Eberharter

Elliott	Keogh	Priest
Engle, Calif.	Kerr	Rabaut
Evins	Kilday	Rains
Fallon	King	Ramsay
Feighan	Kruse	Rankin
Fernandez	Lane	Redden
Fisher	Lanham	Rhodes
Flood	Larcade	Richards
Fogarty	Lind	Robeson
Forand	Linehan	Rodino
Frazier	Lucas	Rogers, Fla.
Fugate	Lyle	Rooney
Furcolo	Lynch	Roosevelt
Garmatz	McCarthy	Sasser
Gary	McCormack	Sikes
Gathings	McGrath	Sims
Gilmer	McGuire	Smathers
Gordon	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Va.
Gorski	McSweeney	Spence
Gossett	Mack, Ill.	Stanley
Granahan	Madden	Steed
Granger	Magee	Stigler
Grant	Mahon	Sullivan
Green	Mansfield	Tackett
Hardy	Marsalis	Tauriello
Harrison	Marshall	Teague
Hart	Mills	Thompson
Havenner	Mitchell	Thornberry
Hays, Ark.	Monroney	Trimble
Hays, Ohio	Morgan	Underwood
Hedrick	Morris	Vinson
Heffernan	Moulder	Wagner
Heller	Multer	Walsh
Herlong	Murdock	Walter
Hobbs	Noland	Welch
Holmes	O'Brien, Ill.	White, Calif.
Horan	O'Brien, Mich.	Whitten
Irving	O'Hara, Ill.	Whittington
Jackson, Wash.	O'Sullivan	Wickersham
Jones, Ala.	O'Toole	Wier
Jones, Mo.	Pace	Willis
Jones, N. C.	Patman	Wilson, Okla.
Karst	Perkins	Wood
Karsten	Peterson	Woodhouse
Kee	Philbin	Yates
Kelley, Pa.	Pickett	Zablocki
Kelly, N. Y.	Preston	
Kennedy	Price	

NAYS—147

Abernethy	Goodwin	Nixon
Allen, Calif.	Graham	Norrell
Allen, Ill.	Gross	O'Hara, Minn.
Andersen,	Gull	Passman
H. Carl	Gwinn	Patten
Anderson, Calif.	Hale	Phillips, Calif.
Andresen,	Harden	Phillips, Tenn.
August H.	Hare	Piumley
Arends	Harris	Poage
Auchincloss	Harvey	Polk
Bates, Ky.	Herter	Potter
Bates, Mass.	Heseltin	Poulson
Battle	Hill	Reed, Ill.
Beall	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rees
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Ribicoff
Bishop	Hope	Rich
Bolton, Ohio	Hull	Riehlman
Bonner	James	Rogers, Mass.
Bramblett	Javits	Sadiak
Brooks	Jenison	Sanborn
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Saylor
Burleson	Jennings	Scrivner
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Scudder
Canfield	Jonas	Secret
Case, N. J.	Judd	Shafer
Case, S. Dak.	Kean	Short
Chipperfield	Kearns	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Keating	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Cole, N. Y.	Kunkel	Stefan
Corbett	LeCompte	Stockman
Cotton	LeFevre	Taber
Coudert	Lichtenwalter	Talle
Cox	Lovre	Towe
Cunningham	McConnell	Van Zandt
Curtis	McCulloch	Velde
Dague	McDonough	Vorys
Davis, Ga.	McGregor	Wadsworth
Davis, Wis.	Mack, Wash.	Weichel
Deane	Martin, Mass.	Wheeler
D'Ewart	Morrow	Widnall
Dolliver	Meyer	Wigglesworth
Ellsworth	Michener	Wilson, Ind.
Elston	Miller, Md.	Withrow
Fenton	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Ford	Morton	Wolverton
Fulton	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff
Gavin	Nelson	Young
Golden	Nicholson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Huber	Thomas
-------	--------

NOT VOTING—85

Bailey.	Halleck	Patterson
Barrett, Wyo.	Hand	Pfeifer,
Biemiller	Hébert	Joseph L.
Blackney	Hinshaw	Pfeiffer,
Boggs, La.	Hollifield	William L.
Brehm	Howell	Powell
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Calif.	Quinn
Carroll	Jacobs	Regan
Celler	Johnson	Rivers
Christopher	Kearney	Sabath
Chudoff	Keefe	Sadowski
Colmer	Kirwan	St. George
Crawford	Klein	Scott, Hardie
Davies, N. Y.	Latham	Scott,
Davis, Tenn.	Lodge	Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson	McKinnon	Shelley
Dingell	McMillen, Ill.	Sheppard
Dondero	Macy	Smith, Kans.
Eaton	Marcantonio	Smith, Ohio
Engel, Mich.	Martin, Iowa	Staggers
Fellows	Mason	Sutton
Gamble	Miles	Taylor
Gillette	Miller, Calif.	Tollefson
Gore	Morrison	Vursell
Gregory	Murphy	Werdel
Hagen	Murray, Wis.	Whitaker
Hall,	Norblad	White, Idaho
Edwin Arthur	Norton	Williams
Hall,	O'Konski	Wilson, Tex.
Leonard W.	O'Neill	Winstead

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chudoff for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.

Mr. Carroll for, with Mr. Hand against.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mr. Murphy for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Jacobs for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Gillette against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Lodge against.

Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Crawford against.

Mr. Biemiller for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall, against.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Blackney against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Patterson against.

Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Thomas against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Huber against.

Mrs. Norton for, and Mr. Hardie Scott against.

Mr. Davies of New York for, with Mr. Norblad against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Brehm against.

Mr. McKinnon for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall, against.

Mr. Miles for, with Mr. Hinshaw against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer against.

Mr. Regan for, with Mr. Engel of Michigan against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming against.

Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. McMillen of Illinois against.

Mr. Wilson of Texas for, with Mr. Johnson against.

Mr. Christopher for, with Mr. Werdel against.

Mr. Marcantonio for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Gore with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. VINSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL. If he were present he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan Mr. SADOWSKI, who is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and answer "present." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Empire State Petroleum Association magazine.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURLESON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BARING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9477) to provide allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services, to suspend certain provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9477) providing allowances for dependents of enlisted personnel, with Mr. STIGLER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from Louisi-

ana [Mr. BROOKS] is entitled to recognition for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] to 1 hour.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill regarding which there has been a great deal of interest.

Before I proceed with what I have to say with reference to the bill, let me state that this morning the full Committee on Armed Services met and agreed to one change in the bill. We have rewritten section 13 so as to give the Comptroller General the authority which in the original bill we gave to the heads of the different services. This conforms to the recommendation of the Comptroller General.

In other respects the bill is the same as reported out. At the proper time, I shall present the amendment we have agreed upon to rewrite section 13.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to discuss with the members of the Whole Committee the purposes and objectives of the bill, H. R. 9477.

We have worked hard and, we believe, diligently to prepare a reasonable, equitable and practical bill which will provide benefits for the enlisted members of our armed services who have dependents.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services recognized at the outset that we could not discriminate between Regular service personnel and those ordered to active duty involuntarily or inducted through selective service. The benefits had to be the same for all persons. Nevertheless, we did take into consideration the fact that the people who are being maladjusted at this time are those who have been ordered to active duty involuntarily.

We are not in total mobilization.

Now, before anyone objects to that statement, let me say that I fully appreciate the fact that to a guardsman or reservist or inductee there is no difference between total and partial mobilization. And the benefits provided in the bill before the House today are not predicated on the theory that they can be less because of a partial mobilization than they would be under a total mobilization. In fact, the bill before you today provides adequate benefits for all enlisted personnel with dependents, and provides greater benefits than did the 1942 Family Allowance Act.

When I say that we are presenting a practical bill, I mean that we are considering those persons who need help the most; that is, the wives and the children and the truly dependent mother and father. For the men in the lower three pay grades with one dependent, we have provided a quarters allowance of \$45 a month. For a man with a wife and one child, or a man with a dependent mother and wife, we have provided a quarters allowance of \$70 per month. For a man with a wife and two children, or a man with a dependent mother and a wife and child, we have provided a quarters allowance of \$85 per month. In order to qualify for those amounts, however, enlisted men in the lower three pay grades must allot \$40 of their own basic pay,

which will be added to the quarters allowance to be provided to the dependent. That means that a wife alone would receive an allotment of \$85 a month. Now, let us compare that with the 1942 law.

During World War II, an enlisted man with a dependent wife contributed \$22 of his pay and the Government contributed \$28, to give that wife a total of \$50. We have allowed that wife or that dependent mother or that dependent child a total of \$85.

During World War II, a wife and child received from the Government a total of \$80 a month, including the \$22 contribution by the man. Under our proposal, the dependent wife and child will receive a total of \$110 per month.

During World War II, the mother with two children received a total contribution from the Government of \$100 per month, including the man's contribution. Under our proposal, that mother with two children will receive \$125 per month. Thus, we have taken into consideration the increased cost of living since World War II, but, in so doing, we have also taken into consideration the pay increases that have been granted to all service personnel since 1945.

The Members of the House will recall that a substantial pay increase was voted to enlisted personnel in 1946 and again in 1949. We took this into consideration in writing this bill, and we felt that we were justified in asking the enlisted man who is now receiving more money to contribute more money to his dependents. We believe that is reasonable, and we do not believe anyone will find any quarrel with it.

We have not required the noncommissioned officers to contribute any portion of their pay in order to qualify for the new allowance benefits because, under existing law, they get a quarters allowance for dependents without contributing any portion of their pay. We merely continue to recognize the old law in this respect, and, at the same time, recognize the fact that these noncommissioned officers are men with responsibilities who will be expected to support their families properly. If they do not, of course, they can be disciplined.

We have made the proposed law retroactive to August 1, because it was after that date that most of our units were ordered to active duty. If it is made retroactive to a date prior to that, it will, of course, accrue largely to the benefit of the persons in the Regular services who have heretofore planned their careers on the basis of the pay they were receiving at that time.

This is the way the new law will operate.

An enlisted man who is inducted or ordered to active duty in pay grade E-1, with 4 months' service, receives a base pay of \$80 per month. Let us assume that he has a wife and one child. His wife will be entitled to a quarters allowance of \$70 a month, provided that he allots \$40 of his \$80 per month. This will give his wife \$110 per month and will give the enlisted man \$40 per month for his own. If he desires to allot more than the \$40, he will be encouraged to do so, but not required.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am somewhat disturbed about these benefits or payments, because a good many men who are called into the service, and who have families, have acquired homes. They are paying from \$50 to \$75 a month on their homes, and certainly we must recognize that the cost of living is at least twice as high now as it was at the beginning of the other war. It may be that the committee feels that it has been extremely liberal, but I do not see how these men with dependents are going to meet their obligations and support their families on \$110 a month, with \$40 coming out of a man's pay.

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will let me complete my statement, perhaps some of the questions in the gentleman's mind will be cleared up, and if not, I will be very glad to yield for questions.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman also cover what payments, if any, will accrue to the father or mother of an enlistee who is not married?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another suggestion?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman cover the question as to whether those inductees who are not in the combat zone will get the benefit of this legislation?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. It applies to everybody, whether he is in the combat zone or otherwise. This is based on the theory that we must take care of the needs of the dependents within the ability of the Government to do so.

If the man has a wife and two children, his wife will receive \$125 per month. He will not be required to make an allotment in the first month that he enters on active duty because, obviously, if he enters in the latter part of the month he could not earn the \$40 that would be necessary for him to allot in order to otherwise qualify for that portion of the quarters allowance.

There are provisions in the bill for requiring a recalcitrant member to support his family. There are also provisions in the bill that will allow the Secretary of the Department concerned to establish allotments for those now in Korea or prisoners of war, and there are provisions which will allow those allotments to be modified for additional amounts for persons who are not in a position to file the new applications themselves. There are other technical details involved in the bill, all of which are intended to permit a liberal interpretation. For example, the family of the man who is absent without leave will not suffer for reasonable periods of time because of the man's failure to be in a pay status during that period of time.

There is another section in the bill, section 13, which might be misconstrued by some Members of the House because it involves a technical question. This sec-

tion provides that the secretaries of the departments may waive indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments of allowances paid under the authority of the Servicemen's Dependents' Allowance Act of 1942, and not acted upon prior to October 1, 1949, the date of repeal of the family allowance law. I intend to offer an amendment which will place that authority in the hands of the Comptroller General, rather than the Secretaries.

But, whether the authority is placed in the hands of the Secretaries or the Comptroller General, the section does not mean that all indebtedness or overpayments which have occurred in any of the services prior to or since October 1, 1949, may automatically be waived. What it does mean is that overpayments which were discovered after October 1, 1949, or which were being processed up to October 1, 1949, may continue to be waived as were the overpayments prior to that time. I would like to use this illustration.

Let us assume a man was discharged from the service in 1947. Through an error, either on his part or on the part of the finance center or the disbursing officer, his wife received a family allowance check for two additional months. She was not entitled to those checks but cashed them nevertheless. The overpayment was discovered in September of 1949 or perhaps sooner. A request for repayment was made by the finance center and she acknowledged the indebtedness, but stated that her husband was dead and that she was trying to support three children on an income of \$15 per week. Under the Family Allowance Act of 1942, the services were authorized to waive that type of indebtedness. Had that same woman not advised the finance center of that indebtedness until October of 1949, that amount could not have been waived even though it was contrary to equity and good conscience to attempt to collect the overpayment, because the authority under which that waiver board had been established, and under which it operated, ceased to function when the Family Allowance Act of 1942 was repealed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, effective on October 1, 1949.

In other words, section 13 will merely permit the services or, if the amendment is adopted, the Comptroller General, to do equity in those cases that require equity. It removes the penalty that heretofore was imposed upon those unfortunate individuals who were not notified of their overpayment or who did not indicate an inability to pay until after October 1, 1949.

Another very important point in this matter of allowances and partial mobilization is the question of why we have not provided benefits for men who have more than three dependents. I will answer that by pointing to section 14 of the bill, which provides that "the secretary of the department concerned shall take cognizance of the provisions of this act and shall establish policies under which enlisted members with dependents may be discharged for hardship." In other words, we do not feel that in this partial mobilization stage it is necessary for

the services to use men, particularly those in the lower pay grades, who have more than three dependents.

We did not specify automatic discharge for those with a stated number of dependents because there would be many persons with more than three dependents who would prefer to remain in the service even though benefits do not increase after three dependents. Likewise, some men with more than three dependents may not be suffering any financial hardship. We do feel, however, that, in general, a man in the lower pay grades with more than three dependents should not be inducted or ordered to active duty.

In the higher noncommissioned officer grades, however, the man is receiving reasonably adequate remuneration for his services and, of course, received a considerable pay increase under the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

And, speaking of those higher noncommissioned officers, you will note that today they receive \$67.50 per month for a quarters allowance; under this bill they will receive \$70 per month if they have one or two dependents, and \$85 per month if they have three or more dependents. We have given them increases, but since this bill is based upon the needs of the dependents, rather than the rank of the enlisted man, we have made the rates for the higher noncommissioned officers substantially the same as those for the lower enlisted grades.

The proposed legislation will not maintain families in the status quo, obviously, but it is more than was provided in the 1942 act in the great majority of cases, and it will prevent hardship. We did not feel that we could go beyond that. We could not maintain a man in the financial condition he was in prior to entering the service, because it would be manifestly impossible to do so. But we have provided what we think will do the job fairly and equitably.

The bill will cost \$242,000,000 for the remainder of this year. It will cost \$360,000,000 in fiscal 1952, based on an estimated armed force of 2,500,000 men at that time.

We have brought a bill on the floor of the House that is liberal in its terms. We hope the House will accept our judgment in this respect. You are aware, I am sure, of the urgency of this legislation, and I strongly recommend its immediate passage.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. FORD. If a man has a wife and two children he gets the benefits of the family allowance, is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is right.

Mr. FORD. But if he has a wife and three children, he only gets the allowance for two children and the wife?

Mr. BROOKS. If he has more than two children, he will get \$85 a month from the Government, to which he contributes \$40, which would make \$125, which his family will get as a family allowance each month.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. There is a provision in the bill giving discretion in cases of hardship to allow the man to be let out of the service. So in all probability that discretion would be exercised if he had more than three dependents.

Mr. BROOKS. Adding to what my distinguished chairman has said, the committee was strongly of the opinion that in cases where there were a large number of dependents the services should not impose a hardship upon that family by inducting the breadwinner into the service, and if the breadwinner of the family was in the service, they should screen that man before a board with the idea of discharging him from the service and thereby relieving the hardship.

Mr. FORD. Are the selective-service boards throughout the country going to coordinate their activities with this provision 14?

Mr. BROOKS. General Hershey, may I say to the gentleman, has already said that his policy is not to induct men with a large number of dependents. So that will dispose of the selective service. They will, in fact, be working together.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I compliment the gentleman and his subcommittee for the work they have done in connection with this bill. There is one thing that troubles me. Why should not this legislation be made retroactive to the date when the various reservists and draftees were called to active duty?

Mr. BROOKS. We went back to August 1, rather than any prior date, because on August 1, for since August 1 most of the inductions of Reservists and National Guard men were made. Had we gone back further, it would have been largely to take care of the Regular Establishment personnel who are already in service with dependents.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. What I had in mind is, suppose it was made retroactive to the time when they came in, which would be subsequent to June 25, the outbreak of the Korean hostilities? I did not have in mind making it retroactive prior to June 25, but June 25 and subsequent thereto.

Mr. VINSON. As a matter of fact no reservists were called in until the latter part of July. The other body does make it retroactive to July 1. We make it retroactive to August 1, because in August, approximately the end of July, they began to come into the service.

Mr. BROOKS. That takes care of most cases.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. You did not cover the boy who does not have a wife, but has a mother and father at home who depend on him.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, he has one dependent; and he is entitled to the same benefits as any other man with one dependent.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. One dependent?

Mr. BROOKS. If the mother or father are truly dependent upon him.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Would the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana describe the procedure a serviceman must follow in establishing eligibility for a dependency allowance?

Mr. BROOKS. He is required, naturally, to file an application; but he does, as a matter of fact, file the application which is to be supported by competent proof, and after they pass judgment on it and find actually that they are dependent upon him, then the allowance is allotted.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the dependent of the serviceman will have to furnish an affidavit to support the serviceman's application?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. They might be called upon to furnish further proof than that, and this is to prevent abuses.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the allotment to the wife out of the soldier's pay is not compulsory?

Mr. BROOKS. No; I did not intend to say that. I said if a man was fighting in Korea, the services are not going to bring him back from the front line and say, "Here, you must file this application for an allotment for your wife."

The Secretary may take cognizance of the fact that he does have a wife and may act for him so as to take care of the dependents.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, war is the most expensive activity on earth. Sherman called it hell, and I think he put it mildly. If carried on any length of time today with the tremendous costs involved it would bankrupt and ruin any country on earth. That is the reason we all should work and pray for peace.

The gentleman from Louisiana has told you that it is next to impossible to tell just what this legislation is going to cost the American people, because there are too many imponderables to consider. It will largely depend upon whether or not we will be able to contain the present conflict in Korea; upon that will depend how much we shall have to expand the different branches of our armed services; but the best estimate that we can arrive at is that for the next 11 months in the fiscal year of 1951 it is going to cost the taxpayers of this country \$242,000,000, and in fiscal 1952 it will cost us at least \$360,000,000. Of course, we all know that war pulls a nation and a people up by the roots and hurls them out into space, dislocates seriously our whole economy. Naturally we would like to relieve all the hardships that one must suffer in time of war. That, of course, is utterly impossible.

Your committee has been not only considerate but we have leaned over backwards and have been liberal and generous if anything to a fault, although we know we can never pay any man who

goes out and faces the fire of musketry and cannon and who risks his life, we cannot pay him enough money for the services he renders his country.

But bear in mind that in the first world war we paid a buck private \$21. We raised it to \$30 a month. In the second global conflict we hiked the base pay to \$50 a month and then we increased it to \$75 a month for an enlisted private. After serving 4 months he is raised to \$80 a month basic pay.

As these men are called up from the National Guard and the Organized Reserves with families and dependents at home or as they are inducted under the Selective Service Act, naturally we want to see that their dependents are sufficiently taken care of, at least to furnish them groceries. I think the committee is very wise in limiting the number of dependents to three.

The private who goes in will, of course, have to pay half of his month's wages, \$40 a month, but the Government will match it \$45 to give his dependent back home \$85 a month. If he has a wife and one child they get \$110 a month; with a wife and two children, or with three dependents, the father and mother, if a substantial contribution is made by the inductee, they receive \$125 a month.

You will recall that we made many mistakes during this last war. We read of many cases, and I happen to know of one—some of them had 6, 8, and even 10 children. There was one buck private from a southern State who enlisted. He had 10 dependents. That private received as much as the pay of a colonel. We want to avoid those cases; soldiers simply cannot be that expensive. Our purpose in writing this legislation is to see that a man with a brood of youngsters is really not inducted; he is not even taken in. Those who are already in the service with many dependents can be discharged because of hardship; otherwise it would make the cost almost prohibitive.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is talking about inductees. The problem right now, it seems to me, has to do with national guardsmen and reservists. They are, generally speaking, older than your inductee, and are the ones who are likely to have more than two dependents. But the guardsmen are called up under the National Guard adjutants in the various States, and the Federal Government does not have anything to say about who comes in until they are actually mustered into the Federal service. What do you do to provide that they may be discharged for hardship?

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman well knows, of course, that any man who is in the National Guard or in the Organized Reserves has voluntarily gone into it and he knows that in case of emergency he is going to be called out. He does not put a dollar sign on the American flag; he is serving his country chiefly and primarily out of sheer patriotism.

The committee, of course, is going along to give members of the National Guard and the Reserves, just as induc-

tees, protection for their dependents to the extent of \$125 a month.

I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] and I agree with what I think the gentleman from South Dakota is thinking: It is next to impossible, of course, for any family, I do not care how small it is, to get along on \$125 a month, although many of them do in this country.

I should like to ask the gentleman: What are you going to do when you go out and take a fine young physician who has a practice of \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year? Uncle Sam cannot pay him a comparable sum. Of course, he has got to suffer, but we all suffer in time of war. War is hell.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; a young physician who has been getting \$35,000 or \$40,000 a year has got something with which to take care of his family. I would rather draft him than I would to draft a member of the National Guard who has four or five children and family obligations for whom no provision is made.

Mr. SHORT. There is, of course, simply a limit to where you can go. I am rather surprised that the gentleman from South Dakota, one of the hardest-working members of the Appropriations Committee, who has always consistently stood for economy, would even suggest that our Committee on the Armed Services would dare boost these enormous increases that have already been given. They have been increased from 50 to 62.9 percent. We cannot go further. You know that.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from South Dakota to the fact that there is a bill pending on that; but in the event there is a hardship case, any member of the National Guard or Reserve may immediately appeal to his superior, and consideration will be given to the hardship feature.

Mr. SHORT. Yes. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GAVIN. That is a regular routine and the procedure that is followed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not so sure that policy is being followed. I trust the gentleman will yield me a little time later.

Mr. SHORT. I am always glad to yield time to the gentleman. I want to have a friend over in the Senate next year.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any more time on this bill. I think the Members understand it. If you will read the report, it is all clearly set forth, and may I say that this is a very excellent report. I want to express appreciation to our staff member, Mr. Russell Blandford, who worked with the chairman of the subcommittee in the writing of this report. It is very clear and understandable even to a wayfaring man.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to express my appreciation for the fine work that the subcommittee and the entire committee have performed in bringing this bill to the House. I want to ask something further about the compulsory provision with reference to a person who is in the service, regardless of where he might be, and he refuses to make an allotment to his wife or dependent. Is there any provision that would make that a requirement for such a person?

Mr. SHORT. There is.

Mr. HARRIS. What is the procedure for the wife where such an incident occurs?

Mr. SHORT. From my observation, in the last war there were a lot of wives who got much more than they deserved when their husbands were fighting and dying on foreign fields. Of course, I am not against the wives.

Mr. HARRIS. I am not talking about them. I am talking about one who is entitled to it.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman from Arkansas will read section 6 he will see that the Secretary has authority to make the allotment notwithstanding the fact that the husband will not do so.

Mr. HARRIS. That is on application of the wife?

Mr. VINSON. Absolutely.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Which, of course, is an excellent provision and I am glad the gentleman from Arkansas brought that up because we do not want these scallwags to run away and leave their wives and children unsupported.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the gentleman's position.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. This is legislation that should be expedited because of the fact that there is hardship right now due to the fact that these allotments are not being paid to the wives and dependents. I understand a similar bill has already passed the Senate?

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is correct. The Senate has already passed a similar bill. There is very little difference between them. I think the Senate made it retroactive to July 1, ours goes back to the 1st of August, but we can iron out that difference in conference. I think we should pass this bill unanimously and I believe it will pass unanimously. I want a roll call vote on this bill. I know all of you are for it. May I thank you for the support and cooperation you always have given to the Committee on Armed Services. Thanks to our one and only CARL VINSON.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I think everyone is in agreement that this legislation is clear, it is sound, and it has been carefully written. It is in keeping with the work that we are accustomed to have from a great chairman of a great

committee, and when I speak of CARL VINSON I talk of a man whose monumental work for this Nation will ever loom large on the horizon of American achievement. Of course, I pay tribute also to the very fine service of the chairman of the subcommittee, OVERTON BROOKS, whose tireless work has been represented year in and year out by legislation of much importance to the defense of the United States. I likewise pay tribute to the services of a great and able Member of the minority, DEWEY SHORT, probably the best speaker in this Congress and certainly one of its beloved and valued Members.

The thing I like about this legislation is the fact that it helps the people who need it and need it most. It is the men in Korea or the men who are in process of being shipped to Korea who need the provisions of this measure. They and their families are the only ones who really have had to sacrifice as the result of the conflict in which we are now engaged. They are the only ones who are getting hurt, and their families are the only ones who are feeling the pinch of personal sacrifice, or the pain of war, with everybody else so far it is business as usual and profits as usual.

The only thing that I think might be changed to advantage would be to make the retroactive feature effective to June 25, on which date the Korean aggression began. Shortly after that time we began to move men to the front and to disrupt their homes. If I might take a half moment I want to show how those disruptions can work. I personally know a boy who is enlisted among the lower four grades and who had no allowances. He was sent to Korea immediately after trouble started, giving up his little home on a military reservation in the South. His wife went back home to her people, and within a week she went to the hospital to have her baby. If he had not been shipped out, she could have gone to the station hospital. That soldier now is trying desperately to find enough money to pay his hospital bill for his wife and baby. He is going to benefit by what the Congress proposes to do today. The amount he will receive is not large but it is important to him and his family far out of proportion to actual money involved.

This is good legislation. It will be one of the greatest morale builders we can possibly provide.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to pay tribute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for the very valuable assistance he has given our committee and the Armed Forces of the Nation. As I have said before, he was a member of our committee; but we lost him to the Committee on Appropriations. He still retains an outstanding interest in military affairs and in the safety and integrity of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield just a bit further, I want to pay tribute to every member of the subcommittee who joined with me in writing this legislation. The committee

did not only meet, Mr. Chairman, in the morning; we met in the afternoon and we met at night. We spent long hours in this work. The Members on both sides of the aisle actively participated in building up this legislation. I want to pay tribute to the legislative staff member, Mr. Russ Blanford, who worked diligently with us and did a grand job. And, I want to pay an outstanding tribute to a great friend and eloquent speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] for his outstanding contribution in the work of the subcommittee. Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in behalf of my colleague and Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. My work on this committee becomes more interesting and more pleasant every day in association with a truly great American and great chairman, CARL VINSON.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, this legislation of course, is of a character that will have a unanimous support of this House, as it should. I join in the compliments that have been paid to the gentlemen who have been mentioned. They are entitled to the praise that has been given to them. In fact, the whole Committee on Armed Services is entitled to similar praise for the expeditious and efficient manner in which this important and necessary legislation has been brought to the House for action.

The report of the committee to the House shows a logical and sympathetic consideration of the problem.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services.

This Nation is now engaged in a large expansion of its armed forces. National Guard men and reservists are being or have been ordered to active duty without their consent; thousands of men are being mobilized under the provisions of the Selective Service Act.

Many of the enlisted personnel now being ordered to active duty have families; likewise, it is anticipated that Selective Service may find it necessary to draft men with dependents.

This type of mobilization creates hardship. Reservists and inductees must, in many cases, make drastic adjustments in their living standards and cannot support their immediate dependents on the basis of pay alone for the reason that their way of life is based not only on monetary income but items of credit living and other commitments not permitted by the very nature of military life. It is therefore urgent that the Congress provide benefits which will aid the families of enlisted personnel and prevent hardship.

The bill provides for an allowance for all enlisted men with two dependents of \$70 per month, and for all enlisted men with three or more dependents, \$85 per month. The proposed bill would entitle enlisted men of the lower grades to a quarters allowance of \$45 per month if they have one dependent.

The provisions of this bill, therefore, represent a total increase for members

in the lower grades of \$45 per month for those men with only one dependent, a total increase of \$70 per month for those with two dependents, and a total increase of \$85 per month for those with over two dependents.

The rates provided in the bill represent a needed allowance to supplement the present pay of enlisted men for the support of their dependents. It should be noted that the allowances provided in the bill are in addition to the pay of the enlisted men.

The benefits provided in this bill grant to the enlisted men a more equitable allowance for the support of their dependents than those provided by the Servicemen's Dependent's Allowance Act of 1942.

Under that act, now repealed, a wife received only \$28 per month as the Government's share for her support; under the proposed bill, she would receive \$45; under the old law, a wife and one child received \$58 a month as the Government's share; under the proposed law, she would receive \$70; under the old law, a wife and two children received \$78 per month; under the proposed law, she would receive \$85 per month.

In addition to these amounts, however, the bill requires an enlisted man in the lower-pay grades to allot from his pay, the sum of \$40 per month in order to be entitled to the allowance for dependents provided by the Government.

In brief, under the provisions of this bill the wife of an enlisted man without a child would receive a total of \$85 per month; a wife and one child would receive \$110 per month, and a wife with two children would receive a total of \$125 per month.

It is gratifying to realize that the Committee on Armed Services has acted so expeditiously and with such a realistic understanding of the need that exists. The dislocation that exists in the home life of an enlisted man as he undertakes military service cannot be overestimated. Added to the concern and fear that exists on the part of members of the family as a result of the hazardous nature of military service, there is also serious concern as to how the family can exist on the limited pay of an enlisted man. This concern can be in some measure alleviated by Congress passing legislation that will supplement the pay of the soldier by an additional allowance for the support of his family. This is what the proposed legislation seeks to do. It is right and just that Congress should do so. Congress would be remiss in the obligation it owes to the serviceman and his family if it did not do so. In giving my support to this legislation I am aware of the fact that without doubt the entire membership of the House feels the same sense of duty and obligation as I do, and, will consequently give their support to the legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this indeed is needed legislation. I have previously urged its consideration and I am glad to see the committee come out with such a comprehensive bill.

I am somewhat concerned, however, with the case of National Guard men and Reservists who have over two or three dependents. Certainly, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations or as a Member of the Congress, I am concerned with how much money we spend, and those of you who are familiar with the interest I took in the renegotiation of contracts during World War II and the reinstitution of that program when we set up the supplemental aircraft procurement in the Eightieth Congress, in 1948, know that I have tried to hold down expenditures and to recover excessive war profits. But, I am here to say that if we can afford to have a war, we can afford to see to it that the dependents of the soldiers we take from their families are properly cared for.

When reservists and guardsmen are called into active duty today, many of them are having their careers interrupted for the second time; they are being taken away from their families for the second time in a few short years. When we ask the National Guard men to come forward now, we are saying "We need you because of the training you have had." They volunteered for guard duty; we now ask them to go into the Federal service. We have encouraged them to buy homes; we have encouraged them to buy automobiles and refrigerators and take on a lot of other installment buying. They have those obligations. They are not going to be the best soldiers that they could be if we do not take proper care of their families while they are away. The guard units are being mobilized as State units. They do not come under the Secretary of Defense until after they are sent to camp. Each State has its own policy in deferment and discharge.

I note that in this bill you are proposing language in section 14, to have the Secretary of the Department take cognizance of the provisions of this act under which enlisted members with dependents may be discharged for hardship.

That strikes me as being a good idea. It is saying, I take it, that you indicate a policy of not taking men with a large number of dependents. But if you do take them, then I think provision should be made for taking care of them on the basis of the number of dependents they have. If we can afford to have wars that call upon us for taking fathers away from their families and children, we can afford to say to those soldiers, "You do not need to worry about your families while you are away fighting."

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, I think all of us sympathize with the statement expressed by the gentleman from South Dakota. War is expensive, and we should make the people pay for it, and when they become conscious of the cost, perhaps then we will have fewer wars.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is right. We should try to adopt policies at home and abroad which would get us away from some of these wars.

Mr. SHORT. But the first line of defense of any country is its financial solvency and a sound economy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, I know, but we should have a consistent policy in handling this dependency problem.

Mr. SHORT. And we have to have a ceiling.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If we have to take the fathers with several dependents and keep them in the service, then we ought to take care of those dependents. The fathers will be better soldiers, if we do.

Mr. SHORT. I am sure any man in the service who can prove hardship knows that he will be released from the service.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman. I had hoped the gentleman would say that when I interrupted him before.

Mr. SHORT. I think he will be, and I do not think it will be the policy of selective service, or even of the Department of Defense, any of the branches, to call men into the service who have a flock of youngsters back home.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have the gentleman say that.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I invite the attention of the gentleman from South Dakota to the phraseology of section 14, and it was purposely written with that in mind:

The Secretary of the Department concerned shall take cognizance of the provisions of this act and shall establish policies, under which enlisted members with dependents may be discharged for hardship.

Now, that is an unusual expression to put in. The table here shows that we are only dealing with two dependents. It might be you do not want to put the number of dependents in, but that is the intent that runs through the table, so we use the expression "shall take cognizance of the provisions of this act."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I mentioned section 14 earlier and I am very glad the committee has that in there, and I wanted to have the expression of the chairman of the committee on this point. That will probably be effective as to inductions under selective service but I would like to have the chairman make some expression on section 14 with reference to the National Guard men after they are federalized.

Mr. VINSON. We can only deal with them after they are federalized. We cannot deal with them until they come into the service.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is the intent of the committee then that the Secretary of Defense shall take cognizance of this provision?

Mr. VINSON. Absolutely.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is, as to the guardsmen, when they are federalized.

Mr. VINSON. Yes. Now I will say this: The Adjutant General has set up a hardship board to comb out men like that. We have no control over the National Guard until it is federalized; but

when it is federalized, then we purposely put that in there so that hardship cases can be dealt with by the respective Secretaries of the three Departments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is an important statement to have, and I want the RECORD clear that the statement was made on the specific problem as part of the legislative history of this bill.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Carrying that point one step further, would it not be possible, Mr. Chairman, to call attention of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to this proposed plan so that these men can be relieved from service before their homes are broken up and before they are called into the Federal service?

Mr. VINSON. I do not think it would be proper for the Department of Defense to call upon the Governors of the States to tell them how they will run the National Guard.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course, I did not intend that. My thought was if the suggestion is made to them that this will be the policy after these men once come into the Federal Service, then you can avoid the breaking up of the homes and send them back again.

Mr. VINSON. As soon as this law is passed, no doubt The Adjutant General, from this debate, will understand that, and he will see that the hardship cases are discharged.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I, for one, intend to send the pages of the RECORD carrying this debate to the adjutant general of my State, as well as to the Governor. It certainly would not make sense, either as policy or economy, to mobilize guardsmen with a large number of dependents if it is known they are going to be discharged after they have been federalized. And I say that realizing that in some cases it may be necessary to keep some of these men in order to have certain skills. If it should develop that this need is extensive, then I believe we should give further consideration to this problem and provide dependency allowances commensurate with the number of dependents. After all, some of these families may increase in size.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, and that my remarks may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the Committee. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay the Committee long on this measure, because I think it has been well thought out and it is a sound measure.

In regard to the question concerning the National Guard raised by the gentleman from South Dakota, I do not think he has so much to worry about. We have extended the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act, which, of course, applies to them as well.

There is some concern at the present time as to the quota of the States, in view of the fact that National Guard units will come from the States, and the application of the draft quotas. Some States will probably have more than other States. Regulations are being promulgated so as to work this out in an equitable manner to all States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say that I raised that question directly with General Hershey. He has told me that the States will be credited on their induction allotment by the number who are taken in, either from the guard or the Reserves; but that there will be some delay perhaps in accrediting the States on the quotas.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes, that is the question; because there will be some delay, and I just wanted the House to know, as the Members probably do know, that it would be hard, definitely, to try to work it out now.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Our subcommittee, worked very carefully on this matter. I think one of the things we were most concerned with was the question which the gentleman from South Dakota has raised. We found, as a matter of fact, that most of the hardship cases will probably be in the higher enlisted grades. The grades of E-1, 2, and 3, which are taken care of, will not have a great many hardship cases. Therefore, there is no reason why screening boards cannot go through these grades and do the job without crippling the services. These men are not skilled specialists. They do not have special training, and the screening boards can screen out the hardship cases and do justice and not burden the services with a great number of hardship cases. I think that has been covered quite well.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the gentleman examined the regulations as put out by the adjutant generals of the various States?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; and we also examine minutely into the percentage of dependency in National Guard units where those figures were available.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There would be discharges only in cases of extreme compassion.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman will realize, of course, that those regulations were put out prior to the consideration of this measure. Our regulations should be very much more liberal.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is now talking about selective service.

Mr. BROOKS. No; I am talking about guardsmen who are inducted. This problem primarily arises out of the Reserves and the Guard. The Selective

Service is not inducting men with large numbers of dependents.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman spoke of regulations. Those are going to be Federal.

Mr. BROOKS. The regulations of the States, of course, cannot be changed by the United States, but when those men are federalized, then the screening boards of the Services can eliminate the genuine hardship cases.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. We must realize that enlistment in the National Guard is voluntary. You cannot say that a man may not enlist voluntarily if he has more than three children.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; I recognize that that is true; but surely the gentleman knows that there are many men in the National Guard who enlisted during the past 2 years, not expecting that within 3 or 5 years time they would face any such situation as now faces them.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. That is the question. I think the gentleman from South Dakota has raised a question that brings to mind a similar situation in the Second World War when we called out the National Guard. The gentleman will recall the situation in Mexico where they were called out. The guardsman suffered untold losses in comparison to other people of the country. The National Guards are filled up in small communities where it has taken all the men in some cases to fill the ranks of the National Guard, and the first time in some of my communities that they want to draft men they had to drop down and take men 23 years old. It seems to me that it is an unfair distribution of the burden.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Practically every county seat in my State has a National Guard unit, and they are being taken.

Mr. DURHAM. In conclusion I want to compliment the subcommittee and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], for the fine work he has done on this measure and to express the hope that the House will pass it unanimously.

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

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Take a specific case, the case of a veteran who served during the last war, came back home and went into business, or farming, or got a good job, married, had one child, and then a year or so ago joined the Reserves. Just what status under this bill would the gentleman say that such a person would have? Would he be exempted from serving?

Mr. BROOKS. No; I may say to the gentleman that if he voluntarily joined the Reserves he is just like a man who voluntarily joins the Marine Corps. He goes in voluntarily; he has considered all those situations.

The only thing we do is this: Because of the emergency and because of the fact that they do have dependents, we add to the pay which the man would have otherwise received this allowance as additional financial help; and he will receive the allowance from the United States, supplementing his own allowance and his own pay to take care of his family requirements. I say again that if there are hardship cases, the screening boards are not supposed to release a man merely because he has dependents; but these boards are supposed to apply the test as to whether these dependents may have caused a hardship. The criterion is hardship and not dependents.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman means financial hardship?

Mr. BROOKS. Financial or otherwise.

Mr. JENSEN. The physical health of the family?

Mr. BROOKS. It might be other than financial; but within the purview of the work of the subcommittee, we are dealing with financial hardship.

Here is the situation, to be very frank: We feel that we are not in a period of all-out mobilization and we frankly feel very strongly that cases of hardship due to multiple dependents should be screened out of the service and those men allowed to return to their homes in spite of the fact that they volunteered themselves and that they have received training pay of \$5 per night for drills, and in spite of the fact that an emergency has arisen; the committee says that in spite of those things, we think this is only a partial mobilization and it may not be necessary to keep those hardship cases. Let the services screen them out and return them to their homes.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman realizes, of course, that over the past several years, as a matter of fact, we have been getting many volunteers in the armed services. What provision has been made to credit to each community from which these men came the fact of their volunteering for service?

Mr. BROOKS. General Hershey told the committee that he was taking that into consideration in his inductions.

Mr. VINSON. May I say that the draft act requires credit to be given to communities for any voluntary enlistments that are made.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. This bill deals with enlisted men. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the committee what they are going to do about doctors.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman that the chairman of the full committee has just told me that he is taking up that matter; but I would rather let him answer himself.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman would yield further, I would like to give this specific instance: There is a doctor from my district who served 4 years and 8 months in the Army in World War II, including overseas service, who was told he was separated at Camp Atterbury, that his commission had expired. He now has three children; he is very necessary in his specialty in my home community, yet he has been notified that he will receive orders to report in 10 days.

Now, here is a doctor who was told he was not in the reserves; in any case he did not join the active reserve and did not accept active duty pay. Is that man going to be called in 10 days to go back into service while these physicians trained at Government expense stay home? It seems to me that that presents an immediate problem that this committee should solve promptly by legislation brought to the floor.

Mr. VINSON. I may say to the committee, without specifically answering the gentleman's question, that I have requested the Department to prepare the necessary legislation to amend the Draft Act. That will deal with what is known as the B-12s and the AFTP class. Those are the ones that were educated and deferred and trained to become doctors by the Government. We propose to make the Draft Act extend to them. In the administration of the Draft Act it is to be hoped that the Department will take into consideration that a great many of this group have never served. A man who is a doctor in the Reserve Corps, of course, got in voluntarily. It was by his own patriotism that he signed up. We cannot exclude him. But in the administration of it we can at least hope that some of these others who have not served will be called upon to serve in view of their education. That is going to be dealt with just as soon as the House will let us get back to our committee room and go to work on it. We are very anxious to handle that legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

IS UNCLE SAM AWAKENING TO THE NEEDS OF AMERICA'S AGED?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, during my 12 years in the House of Representatives, I have deemed it a great privilege to have supported throughout my entire service legislation designed to give needed help to the aged of America in their declining years. I am the author of H. R. 2136 in the Eighty-first Congress. The purpose of this bill and its companion bill; H. R. 2135, introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative BLATNIK, is to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at the age of 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

The supporters of this legislation filed discharge petition No. 15 and 200 Members of the Eighty-first Congress have signed that petition to bring this legislation on the floor for a vote. I want to commend my colleagues who signed this petition for their loyalty to the old people of America and for their willingness to stand up and be counted so that the whole world might know that there are 200 Members of the House of Representatives of the United States who have officially gone on record to bring to a vote this needed legislation. I am sure the constituents in the respective districts of these Members will be proud of their Representatives in their fearless and whole-hearted support of the aged of America.

I have received a good many letters with respect to H. R. 6000 which has now passed both Houses of the Congress and is before the President for signature. The passage of this compromise bill, while it does not embody the provisions of the Townsend program, does show a decided advance in the thinking of the Members of Congress of the United States on the need of reform of social-security legislation for America's aged. It is the first time in all of the years that the leaders in the Senate particularly have gone on record to the need of a national, universal program on a pay-as-you-go system covering all citizens. It is the first time that the work of the Congress on pension planning has been given wide newspaper publicity throughout the Nation and the first time the need for universal pensions has been so generally acclaimed in the public press.

During the tenure of the Eighty-first Congress there has come to a head an entirely new general public concept of what an adequate living standard for elderly, retired citizens should be. Undeniably certifying this fact are the \$100 a month and \$125 a month industrial pensions negotiated by labor and management. Together with the already announced plans to up these systems to still higher levels, these plans show a rapid progress on the part of public opinion toward the Townsend level of living standards.

There is a growing effort to integrate plans other than the Social Security Act with that act—the plain evidence of public opinion turning into the direction of a single, over-all national system of social security, on the basis of standards that repudiate the "bare subsistence level" principles of the Social Security Act. This effort is further evidenced by the action of the Senate in directing a special study to be made under the Senate Finance Committee, aiming to replace the present system of old age and survivors' insurance by a universal system covering all citizens of the Nation based on a strictly pay-as-you-go system. The bi-partisan leadership in the Senate agreed that the directive resolution specifically meant making a complete study of the Townsend program with that end in view. In the course of the Senate debate the present system of social security and the action taken this year to amend the present system was generally admitted to be nothing better than stopgap legislation pending the

development of a satisfactory system to take its place.

The action taken by the Eighty-first Congress in passing H. R. 6000 to amend the social-security law reflects the growing effort to solve this important problem. The changes made are gains that almost unexceptionally indicate the turning tide toward the objectives of the Townsend plan.

Coverage under OASI is extended to some 10,000,000 more workers, and their dependents. This is an expansion of nearly 30 percent in the portion of the population the act is intended to cover. It is a great advance in terms of benefits to the people and in terms of repudiation of the principles of narrow limitation of coverage in favor of universal coverage, a basic Townsend plan principle.

Benefits are appreciably increased under OASI. In over-all terms, present benefits are due for immediate increases ranging from 50 percent to 100 percent, averaging between 75 percent and 80 percent. It is to be noted that these increased benefits were mainly based upon making up for the increase in living costs since about 1939 and 1940 and did not take into consideration the now developing increases in living costs due to the newly intensified international emergency. Some 3,000,000 people who are now beneficiaries of OASI will benefit from these increases in the very near future. Starting in mid-1952 a new formula for computing benefits of workers retiring will result in even higher benefits.

OASI will henceforth allow retired workers to earn up to \$50 a month in covered employment, instead of only \$14.99. This adds up to a better income level for those oldsters able to command part-time employment.

There are, under the Social Security Act, two kinds of old-age payments. One is old-age insurance, acquired through contributions the employee and employer have made during the recipient's working career. The other, old-age assistance, is paid in the nature of cash relief to all elderly and needy people not covered by old-age insurance and to a few whose insurance benefits as yet are too small for subsistence. The bill now passed by both Houses of Congress will draw into the old-age insurance system about 5,000,000 self-employed persons, 1,000,000 domestic servants, 700,000 farm workers, and some others, adding them to the 35,000,000 mostly industrial and service employees for whom payroll taxes are now collected.

Mr. Chairman, of great importance in terms of benefits to people and in terms of repudiating narrower principles in social security thought is the new system of calculation benefits. Under it a worker, based upon his average wage, would have the same primary benefit upon retirement whether he was covered for 5 years or for 40 years. This recognition of the prime importance of the living standard required as opposed to emphasis upon the incidents that determine what part of a person's life may be spent in or out of covered employment is a great change and advance.

Recognition is given in terms of dollars and cents benefits, to the obligation of supporting children in the families dependent upon the OASI system. This is an important feature of the Townsend plan. The 1950 amendments provide that the wife of a retired man who is receiving old-age benefits, although she has not reached retirement age, may receive benefits in the future if she has in her care—individually or jointly with her husband—at the time of filing such application, a child entitled to a child's insurance benefit on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of her husband.

There will be more liberal benefits for survivors of married women who were covered workers and old-age benefits will be paid to dependent husbands.

A wage credit of earnings of \$160 a month is allowed to all veterans of World War II covering the time they served in that war.

Benefits to dependent parents are increased from one-half to three-fourths of the primary benefit.

Important changes are also made in the provisions for old-age assistance and aid to the blind. The Federal Government will share in medical expenses unless the beneficiary is receiving the maximum amount, \$50 per month, to which the Federal Government will contribute. The States are directed to permit all individuals to apply for old-age assistance and are directed that they must provide assistance to all who qualify under their respective State programs. Blind aid recipients will be allowed to earn up to \$50 a month without raising any question as to their need for public assistance.

The new form of the Social Security Act is not adequate. It neither provides protection to all the people, nor does it provide benefits that are, on the average, sufficient to support better than poverty-level living standards for its beneficiaries. It is not the answer to the problem of social security in America, by any stretch of the imagination.

However, it does go a long way toward recognizing the injustice of the narrow, minimum principles on which the Social Security Act is based and toward recognizing the new public opinion as to the standard of living our elderly retired citizen should have—recognition of the objectives of the Townsend plan.

It also sets up the first adoption of disability protection which is a very significant step, and is one of the major objectives of the Townsend program.

Time marches on and the Nation is catching up with the humane and advanced thinking of the American public in providing adequately for the aged of the Nation. In so doing it is adopting step by step the principles embodied in the Townsend program.

It is conceded by all that the existing social-security program is not meeting the needs of America's aged, either in coverage of the needy aged nor in the amounts of the monthly annuities being provided to the recipients. In a letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House on April 6 last, former President Hoover, Chairman of the Commission for the

Organization of the Executive Department, said:

I wish to say at once that I strongly favor Government provision for protection of the aged and their dependents.

The problem before the Nation is to obtain a workable system, with a minimum of bureaucracy, adjusted to the economic strength of the country which gives an assurance of security to this group. In my view, we have not yet found that system.

The testimony of Mr. Arthur J. Altmeier, Commissioner of Social Security Administration, shows that the present system is woefully lacking in providing adequate protection to these worthy citizens who, by reason of age or disability, are unable to receive sufficient funds to meet their minimum needs.

The fact-finding board appointed by President Truman to consider the wage dispute between the United States Steel Corp. and its workers reported:

The concept of providing social insurance and pensions for workers in industry has become an accepted part of modern American thinking. Unless Government provides such insurance in adequate amount, industry should step in to fill the gap. Government . . . has failed to provide social insurance for industrial workers generally, and has supplied old-age retirement benefits in amounts which are not adequate to provide an American minimum standard of living.

The Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Committee on Finance reported that it found three major deficiencies in the old-age and survivors' insurance program which I quote verbatim:

1. Inadequate coverage—only about three out of every five jobs are covered by the program.
2. Unduly restrictive eligibility requirements for old workers—largely because of these restrictions, only about 20 percent of those aged 65 or over are either insured or receiving benefits under the program.
3. Inadequate benefits—retirement benefits at the end of 1949 averaged \$26 a month for a single person.

In fact, almost without exception qualified experts who have examined into this old-age security problem facing our Nation have reported the deficiencies of the present system and the need for major overhauling or substitution of a new system therefor.

The old-age assistance program under the present social security law is wholly inadequate to provide a decent annuity to the old people of our Nation. There is little uniformity in the payments made in the several States. Many old-age annuitants are suffering from malnutrition and starvation.

The aged, through no fault of their own, through the fiat of industry, are denied a part in production. They toiled the longest in production and should not, when old, be deprived of taking part in consumption. They are the victims of an industrial system for which they are not responsible. Society owes a duty to these old folks, and it can only perform this duty by establishing a national annuity system providing against the hazards of old age and disability. There are millions among us, 60 years of age and over, who are not now being cared for in an honorable and just way

by the present system of social security, and are receiving no support from any source or hopelessly inadequate support.

Mr. Chairman, Uncle Sam does show evidence of awakening to the needs of America's aged so long neglected. The heroic fight made by Dr. Townsend and his supporters through the years for a worthwhile old-age security program is bearing fruit. Eventually, I am confident, the full program will be adopted.

As one of the authors of the Townsend legislation, I want again to thank my colleagues who have joined with us in the support of this legislation. I particularly want to extend our thanks to the 200 loyal colleagues who have signed the discharge petition, and most earnestly and sincerely request all other members who are interested in old-age security to join with us in the petition so that we may bring the legislation to the floor for final consideration in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services is to be commended for reporting out H. R. 9477, which is a bill to provide allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services. On August 10 of this year I introduced a bill to accomplish the same purpose, which was H. R. 9400.

This Nation is now engaged in a large expansion of its Armed Forces. It is encouraging to the young men of this Nation to know that the Congress is mindful of their welfare and the many problems which face members of the Armed Forces. National Guard men and reservists are being, or have been, ordered to active duty without their consent; thousands of men are being mobilized under the provisions of the Selective Service Act. Many of the enlisted personnel now being ordered to active duty have families. The world situation may require that selective service draft men with dependents. This type of mobilization creates hardship. The cost of living shows a general rise. It is true the statutory pay increases for enlisted members of the uniformed services between 1942 and 1950 have been substantial. Under the provisions of this bill the Congress recognizes that increases for enlisted personnel with dependents is essential for the support of their dependents. The bill provides for an allowance for all enlisted men with two dependents of \$70 per month, and for all enlisted men with three or more dependents \$85 per month. These allowances are in addition to the pay now received.

The benefits provided in this bill grant enlisted men of all grades an allowance for the support of their dependents greater than those provided by the Servicemen's Dependent's Allowance Act of 1942.

Under that act, which is now repealed by this law, a wife received only \$28 per month as the Government's share for her support; under the proposed bill, she would receive \$45; under the old law, a wife and one child received \$58 a month as the Government's share; under the

proposed law, she would receive \$70; under the old law, a wife and two children received \$78 per month; under the proposed law, she would receive \$85 per month.

In addition to these amounts, however, the bill requires an enlisted man in the lower pay grades to allot from his pay the sum of \$40 per month in order to be entitled to the allowance for dependents provided by the Government. Therefore, a wife with one child would receive a total of \$110, and a wife with two children \$125. This legislation will help families buy groceries, pay rents, doctor bills, and will aid in giving to the members of the armed services peace of mind to know that their families and dependents are being taken care of while they are on the battlefronts of Korea, or wherever they may be in the armed services.

Thousands of young men throughout this country by reason of their patriotism are voluntarily entering some branch of the service. Today I have introduced a bill that would amend the so-called GI bill of rights so as to extend the same privileges and rights to our young men and women who are now going into the service, as provided for in the original Servicemen's Readjustment Act. In my opinion this legislation should be enacted into law at an early date as an extra inducement to the fine young men and women who will help to defend our Nation.

I am an overseas veteran of World War II, and I want to report to the veterans of my district concerning my record in Congress. As your Congressman, I have voted for and worked for the passage of many bills, which benefited veterans and their dependents during the 4 years which I have served. Some of the legislation which I have helped to pass, and voted for, first, authorized cash payment of terminal-leave bonds; second, increased allowances for disabled veterans taking vocational training; third, granted benefits to veterans holding Government insurance and worked to bring about the payment of dividends on insurance policies; fourth, increased pensions to Civil War and Spanish American War veterans 20 percent; fifth, increased educational subsistence allowances for both single and married veterans; sixth, raised ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job; seventh, legislation which came up in 1947 to improve the on-the-farm training, which makes a 4-year program; eighth, legislation to permit World War I veterans who have reached the age of 55 to draw compensation upon showing of 60-percent disability without showing service connection passed in 1948; ninth, voted to pass legislation in the House to grant pensions to World War I veterans; tenth, voted for 20-percent increase to disabled veterans and their dependents, including orphans and widows; eleventh, voted to extend the right to borrow money to build veterans houses; twelfth, voted to restore the 16,000 beds in the VA hospitals; thirteenth, voted for House bill 87 to strengthen veterans' civil-service preference on Government jobs; fourteenth, have helped

thousands of veterans with pension claims and other benefits.

Under our Constitution the Congress has the power to declare war. There is no responsibility, and no power that is so far-reaching as the power of a legislative body to visit every home and set the machinery in operation to place free men and women into uniform. It is an honor and distinction to serve one's country. With that privilege, however, there goes the responsibility of a grateful Congress, and a great American public, the solemn duty to properly recognize and care for the aged and disabled veterans. There is also the No. 1 responsibility to see that the disabled veterans, as well as the orphans, widows, and dependents of men and women who have worn the uniform with honor, be given proper recognition, and be properly taken care of consistent with their needs.

We have heard much talk in recent years about the forgotten man in America. He is sometimes referred to as the veterans of World War I, who has no service-connected disability, who is not totally and permanently disabled, and who has not yet reached an age at which he might participate in an aid-for-the-aged program, and yet is so physically disabled that he cannot secure employment because of either age or disability. Surely these men deserve consideration. I trust that some kind of legislation will be enacted into law so that this great country will never allow any veteran who has worn the uniform in defense of this country to become a beggar or a public charge, or to stand on the streets of this country destitute, and in his last days live in want in a land which he helped to defend, and for which he was willing to die if necessary. The young men and women of this country, who are willing to face danger, and who have demonstrated their courage on the battlefields of the world will continue to have my support in the Congress of the United States.

May I take this opportunity to express my desire to assist the home folks in carrying out their desire by urging that we as Members of this great body take the necessary steps to strengthen our national defense including the Armed Forces, the Navy, the Air Force, and the weapons of national defense so that our fighting men throughout the world will have the finest equipment and the latest weapons of modern warfare. Throughout the district which I have the honor to represent, my constituents everywhere are vitally concerned about a strong national defense program.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that this subcommittee has done lots of hard work on this bill, but frankly, I am not satisfied with it. I think the committee has been more concerned with the cost to the Government than it has been with the welfare of the families of these boys who are being called back into the service, especially the Reservists and the National Guardsmen. In my opinion, the bill is wholly inadequate, but I am going to support it

because it would be criminal if we did not do something at this time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to say something perhaps I should not say because I can hear my opponent hollering to the heavens from now until November how I am against the serviceman, although I have supported all veterans' legislation ever since I have been a Member of this body, for 18 long years. My constituents know that I have always supported them.

I am for the National Guard men, I am for the reservists, but I am not going to get up here and dish out a lot of slushy sentimentality and shed crocodile tears over them. These men were not compelled to enlist in the National Guard or the Reserves. They went in voluntarily. They like to wear the uniform and strut their stuff at parades. We voted them an increase in pay, we voted them retirement benefits; oh, yes, they like to get the check and they like to look forward to retirement, but when we get into a little trouble and difficulty, a few of them—thank God there are only a few of them—start squawking. They do not squawk half as much, though, as some Members of Congress who listen to the bellyaches and the gripes of some of these people. The overwhelming majority of the members of the National Guard and the reservists are patriotic Americans; they are anxious and willing, not only willing but eager, to serve their country in time of an emergency. Maybe this bill is not giving them the dome off the Capitol, but heaven knows our committee has been not only considerate but it has been liberal, it has been generous, and the committee has gone as far as its common sense and human reason would permit it to go. People will understand. These men do not ask for special favors.

Mr. LANHAM. I am sure all of these men are patriotic and want to go back into the services if their services are necessary, but they do not want to go back in knowing that their families are not adequately cared for. These allotments will not do it and every Member of this House knows it.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is perfectly at liberty to offer any amendment he wants to, of course, when we take the bill up under the 5-minute rule. I do not cast any aspersions upon the gentleman from Georgia. I know he is a patriotic gentleman, a fine American, and a friend of the veteran. But there are limits to which we can go. I want the gentleman to help us in this crisis and not cause us undue work and worry. God knows we will have enough of both.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], a question. Is the gentleman from Georgia and is the gentleman from Missouri satisfied that the Army and Navy are going to reopen certain hospitals that have been closed in order

to take care of these service men and women and their dependents who are entitled to hospitalization?

Mr. VINSON. May I assure the gentleman from Massachusetts that we hope to take adequate care of that matter.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, this legislation providing necessary financial assistance to families of men in the Armed Forces should be approved as promptly as possible. It is an emergency measure. However, I am concerned with respect to section 13 of the bill. As I understand the situation now the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services has agreed to submit at the proper time an amendment which complies with the recommendation of the Comptroller General and in line with his suggestions, also in line with an amendment that was approved by the Senate on Tuesday of this week. Am I correct?

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman that he is correct. We are going to offer the language of the Senate bill, which was written, as far as I know, by the Comptroller General.

Mr. REES. It was my intention to offer such amendment. It should be made clear that section 13 does not relate to members in the Armed Forces fighting in the present crisis. It deals with overpayments of former members in the Armed Forces. I shall want to discuss that subject matter later on.

Mr. BROOKS. The new amendment will strike out section 13 and rewrite it in line with the provisions of the Senate bill.

Mr. REES. I had a similar amendment on the desk which I would have offered.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, credit should be given to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas. It was his carefulness and his keen observation that brought this matter to my attention and that caused the Armed Services Committee this morning to agree with him. The gentleman is due the thanks of the committee and the thanks of the House for his watchfulness and carefulness in considering legislation.

Mr. REES. I thank the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Forces. He is more than generous. He is carrying a heavy load. He has tremendous responsibility. More than we realize. The House of Representatives and the country is fortunate to have him at the head of this important committee during this crisis.

It is because of section 13 I want to discuss the problem involved, as well as a number of matters relating thereto. I want it clearly understood that I am sure section 13 was not prepared by the committee, although it appears in the present bill. The fact that the committee has agreed to the amendment, after its effects have been explained, is sufficient proof that the committee members do not favor it. Let me say further that my criticism is not with regard to the Army as a whole but specifically to the

service known as the Office of Chief of Finance and the Army Finance Center.

In order for the members to understand the real purpose of this section I want to explain it. Then I want to add some further comments.

Section 13 in this bill provides, first, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, or any subordinates they designate, may, for any reason whatsoever, waive indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments of dependency benefits made during World War II; second, the heads of these departments need not refer to the General Accounting Office such overpayments which are declared uncollectible by the Military Establishment; and, third, by a redetermination, the Military Establishment could require repayments of amounts collected by the Government in overpayment cases subsequent to October 1, 1949.

This section of the bill, if retained, in my judgment, is an attempt on the part of the Armed Forces to relieve it of embarrassment caused by maladministration and improper and irregular procedures which resulted in the Army alone making overpayments of family allowances of over \$160,000,000 during and after World War II. To my knowledge no determination of Navy overpayments has been made public. I do know that the Navy has not utilized the General Accounting Office in collecting these overpayments. This amendment will result in standard procedure for collection, and waiver in case of hardship, for each branch of our Armed Forces.

On June 30, 1950, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee submitted a report to the Congress which establishes the serious maladministration and irregularities of top officials of the Office of the Chief of Finance. Section 13 as written would secure congressional sanction of past derelictions of Army officials in connection with the recovery of overpayments when hardship is not involved.

The amendment will assure that improved administrative procedures placed into effect as a result of our committee's investigation will continue. The amendment provides that the Comptroller General, upon recommendations of the heads of the departments in the Military Establishment or such subordinates as they may designate, may waive indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments of family allowances if a showing is made that collection would be against equity and good conscience.

In other words, where it is shown that a hardship would result by the collection of the erroneous overpayment of family allowances the indebtedness will be waived.

This bill is proposed as legislation relating to the Korean war. In general, its provisions do relate to increasing benefits for the members of the Armed Forces who are gallantly serving their country in this period of national crisis. I wholeheartedly support and endorse the provisions that relate to maintaining good morale and increasing benefits to members of the Armed Forces. However, as I have stated, section 13 is not pertinent to the bill because it deals with over-

payments involving family allowances of former members of the Armed Forces.

The General Accounting Office has advised me that approximately \$30,000,000 has been reported to that Office by the Department of the Army as uncollectible, and which has not been waived as involving hardship. The Comptroller General further advised me that the United States Government is collecting this indebtedness at the rate of approximately \$3,000 a day, or almost \$100,000 a month. Under the present language of section 13, the Department of the Army could require the General Accounting Office to repay the collections which it has made since October 1, 1949.

During recent weeks the Members of the House, including members of the Armed Services Committee, have been greatly concerned about reducing appropriations for Government functions and activities unrelated to the Korean war and the present emergency. Section 13 as written would have the Congress to do an about-face. Instead of insuring continued collection of overpayments with appropriate authority for waivers only in hardship cases, it would vest the Military Establishment with retroactive authority to waive all overpayments, regardless of whether hardship is involved. Why the Department of Defense should want this complete authority, I do not understand.

Now, I want to talk a little further about these overpayments.

Until the investigation by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee no figures were available to the Congress with respect to the total amount of overpayments made in connection with family allowances during the 4 years following World War II. Based upon reports of the Department of the Army and the General Accounting Office, these are the statistics: Total overpayments, \$160,000,000; overpayments recovered by the Department of the Army, \$80,000,000; overpayments waived on the basis of hardship, \$15,000,000; overpayments declared uncollectible by the Army and referred to the General Accounting Office for collection, \$30,000,000; and overpayments being processed by the Department of the Army for collection or waiver, \$35,000,000. This does not take into consideration approximately 260,000 cases which have not been located and seem to have disappeared in the voluminous files of the Army Finance Center. Thus, the question raised by the present language in section 13 is: "Are we going to let approximately \$65,000,000 trickle through our fingers while we strain to reduce appropriations by a few million dollars?"

Based upon the statistics of the Department of the Army, it has been determined that out of 100 cases involving erroneous payment, recovery can be made in 91 cases without any hardship on the former members of the Armed Forces. It has been demonstrated time and again that these former members of our Armed Forces are willing to cooperate by repaying money to which they are not entitled.

Section 13 merely says in effect the Congress will overlook the maladministration of a succession of Army finance administrators.

I have listened with great interest to the eloquent speeches of the ranking minority member of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. SHORT, in which he explained how we have become involved in the present world crisis through the lack of foresight on the part of the military and foreign-policy leaders at the international conferences following World War II. Also, it is no secret that our valiant men in the Armed Forces have almost been pushed into the sea because of inadequate equipment and supplies and improper planning. May I say to my colleague from Missouri that it is no wonder to me that such incompetency exists in some areas in the Armed Forces when the Inspector General testified before our committee that the type of mismanagement which was proven to exist at the Army Finance Center was typical of some other Army installations and "entirely satisfactory."

On November 21, 1949, the chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee wrote to the Secretary of Defense outlining seven major deficiencies developed through a committee preliminary investigation. This letter is as yet unanswered, although 9 months have passed and the Army has publicly stated that it conducted the most extensive investigation in its history by the Army Inspectors General.

The chairman's letter pointed out the following matters: First, the presence of alleged Communists and fellow travelers in the employment of the Army Finance Center; second, the unsuitability of certain civilian employees who occupy high positions of responsibility at the center; third, falsification of personnel records; fourth, coercion of witnesses to discredit loyalty investigations; fifth, violations of civil service rules and regulations; (6) undue influence on civilian and military officials in the Army Finance Center by outside interests; and seventh, a general laxity of officials of the Army Finance Center in providing adequate safeguards to protect the interests of the Federal Government.

To illustrate the situation with respect to security, the Inspector General reported the following to our committee. Here is what he said:

Due to the nature and size of the Army Finance Center operation, the present administration of the Security and Safety Office is considered inadequate and does not fully safeguard the best interests of the Government. It is evident that neither the commanding general nor his predecessor have fully appreciated the seriousness of the responsibilities of the AFC security officer.

The other deficiencies covered in the chairman's letter have also been substantiated.

I think you should know that most of the action which has been taken toward correcting deficiencies was initiated through agencies outside the Department of the Army, such as the Civil Service Commission and the General Accounting Office.

I am in favor of the provisions of this bill with the amendment to section 13. Without the amendment thousands of former members of the Armed Forces who have repaid erroneous payments made to them would be discriminated

against, and we would be encouraging mismanagement, laxity, and errors on the part of officials in the Military Establishment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to the fact that under the ASTP program and the V-12 program there were 12,500 doctors educated. Eight thousand of them have seen service and 4,500 of them have not seen service. That is a matter that should be given immediate consideration by the Medical Director of the Department of Defense relative to drafting that group that has not already seen service.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. It seems to me that the doctors in the last war were treated differently from other kinds of people. The important thing to do this time is not only to make sure that those who saw no service see it now but that those who saw very brief service take the place of those who have already done their fair share. We ought to use our supply of medical brains just as we use our other manpower resources, to share the burden somewhat equitably. It seems to me that it will not be enough merely to make sure that those who saw no service come in, but that the whole thing be made fair across the board for all doctors.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the committee a couple of questions, if I may. I do not know as I heard any member of the committee say that eventually there is going to be some provision made so far as medical care is concerned.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that will be by separate legislation. We took it up this morning.

Mr. FURCOLO. The other suggestion is this: It did seem to me that if there was any way to make this bill retroactive to an earlier date, it would be much better.

Mr. VINSON. Let me say that the Senate bill is retroactive to July 1. Ours is retroactive to August 1. We will deal with that question in conference.

Mr. FURCOLO. The other comment I wanted to make is this: This does not have anything to do with the patriotism of any member of the National Guard or the Reserves, but it seems to me the committee should take into consideration the fact that if the National Guard and the reservists are not given adequate treatment in this emergency, and once again the country wants to have a good National Guard and Reserve, you are apt to find that you have broken the back of both and you may not be able to get as many folks in under the present set-up.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think in the future, with reference to guardsmen and

reservists, we should take into consideration the question of dependents, which we have not done in the past. I think that is something we have to review in the light of our experience.

Mr. FURCOLO. I know any number of young men who wanted to go in and tried to be available when necessary, but under the situation in which they found themselves in the past month, if they ever get a chance to get out of the service and out of the Guard and out of the Reserve, the Lord knows you will never get them back in.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point and be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

(The bill reads as follows:)

Be it enacted, etc., That for the duration of this act the provision in the second sentence of section 102 (g) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Pub. Law 351, 81st Cong.), which reads " * * * and actually resides in the household of said member" is suspended: *Provided*, That the dependency of the father or mother as required by said section 102 (g) shall be determined on the basis of sufficient evidence, including an affidavit submitted by such father or mother, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

SEC. 2. For the duration of this act the proviso in section 302 (a) of the Act of October 12, 1949 (Pub. Law 351, 81st Cong.), is suspended.

SEC. 3. For the duration of this act, section 302 (f) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Pub. Law 351, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out that portion of the table appearing therein which prescribes monthly basic allowances for quarters for enlisted members in pay grades E-1 to E-7, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new table:

	Not over 2 depend- ents	Over 2 dependents
E-7.....	\$70	\$85
E-6.....	70	85
E-5.....	70	85
E-4.....	70	85

	1 depend- ent	2 depend- ents	Over 2 dependents
E-3.....	\$45	\$70	\$85
E-2.....	45	70	85
E-1.....	45	70	85

SEC. 4. For the duration of this act section 302 of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(g) Subject to the provisions of this section, enlisted members without dependents shall be entitled to a basic allowance for quarters at the rate of \$45 per month.

"(h) The payment of the basic allowance for quarters provided in subsection (f) of this section for enlisted members in pay grades E-1, E-2, and E-3 shall be made only

for such period as the enlisted member has in effect an allotment of pay not less than the sum of the basic allowance for quarters to which he is entitled and \$40 for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed: *Provided*, That such allotment shall not be required (1) for the calendar month in which such member enters on active duty in a pay status if the allotment is effective from the following month; (2) for the calendar month in which such member is discharged, if not immediately reenlisted; (3) for the calendar month in which such member is released from active duty; (4) for the calendar month in which dependency ceases; (5) for the calendar month in which dependency commences if the allotment is effective from the following month; (6) for the calendar month in which such member is assigned to quarters for himself and his dependents or for the calendar month in which such assignment is terminated: *Provided further*, That such allotment may be initiated, continued, modified, or discontinued in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Department concerned: *And provided further*, That the minimum allotment required for any month shall be based on the lowest rate of basic allowance for quarters to which the member is entitled and the lowest pay grade in which the member is serving during such month.

"(i) The allotment required by subsection (h) of this section shall be paid to or on behalf of such dependent or dependents as may be specified by the enlisted member concerned, subject to such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe.

"(j) Any delay in initiating an allotment as required by this section shall not invalidate entitlement to basic allowance for quarters, provided that such allotment is made retroactive for such period as the member may elect to claim the allowance for his dependent or dependents. If the Secretary concerned finds that such delay was caused by the exigencies of the service he may waive the allotment requirement, or the additional increment thereto, as applicable, for such retroactive period.

"(k) The entitlement to the basic allowance for quarters provided for by this section shall be substantiated in such manner and in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe."

Sec. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the basic allowance for quarters to which an enlisted member may be entitled as a member with dependents shall not, for such period as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be contingent on the right of such member to receive pay.

Sec. 6. The Secretary concerned may, at his discretion, with or without the consent of the enlisted member concerned, authorize and direct the payment of the basic allowance for quarters and the establishment and payment of such allotment or allotments as he shall determine to be in conformity with the provisions of this act for any enlisted member with dependents in any case in which such member does not claim such allowance.

Sec. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this act shall not apply to enlisted members on training duty, to enlisted men entitled to pay and allowances pursuant to the provisions of section 507 of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), to any member of the Samoan Native Guard or Band of the Navy, or the Samoan Reserve Force of the Marine Corps. Such persons shall continue to be entitled to the appropriate allowances prescribed by the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), on the day prior to the effective date of this act.

Sec. 8. For the purpose of this act, personnel enumerated in sections 527 and 528 of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), with dependents as defined in

section 102 (g) of said act, as amended, shall be entitled to a basic allowance for quarters under the conditions and at the rates prescribed for members in pay grade E-4.

Sec. 9. For the duration of this act, the fourth proviso of section 515 (b) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.) is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That when a member is furnished Government quarters adequate for himself and his dependents, the total sum saved for him by this subsection shall be reduced at the rate of \$45 per month for members in pay grades E-1, E-2, E-3, and E-4 (less than 7 years' service), and \$67.50 per month for members in pay grades E-4 (7 or more years' service), E-5, E-6, and E-7."

Sec. 10. The Secretaries of the Departments concerned are authorized to prescribe such regulations for the administration of this act as may be deemed necessary to enable them to carry out the provisions of this act and such regulations shall, as far as practicable, be uniform. All waivers and determinations, including determinations of dependency and relationship shall be made by the Secretary of the Department concerned or such other person or persons as he may designate, and the Secretary of the Department concerned or his designee is authorized to delegate or redelegate such authority: *Provided*, That the authority granted in this section to the several Secretaries of the Departments concerned may by joint agreement be exercised by any one of the Secretaries for any other Department or Departments concerned.

Sec. 11. Any determinations or waivers made under this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government, except for cases involving fraud or gross negligence. The Secretary of the Department concerned may at any time on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause reconsider or modify any such determination, and may waive the recovery of any money erroneously paid under this act whenever he finds that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience.

Sec. 12. The General Accounting Office shall not refuse to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing officer for any erroneous payment or overpayment made by him in carrying out the provisions of this act unless such erroneous payment or overpayment was made by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States, and no recovery shall be made from any officer authorizing any erroneous payment or overpayment under this act unless such payment was authorized by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States.

Sec. 13. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 515 (c), 531 (d), and 533 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, the heads of the departments concerned or such subordinates as they may designate, may from and after October 1, 1949, waive indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments of, and may make any and all necessary determinations and redeterminations as to entitlement to, allowances under the authority of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, and make payments based thereon, on applications filed by enlisted and former enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard, or their dependents, and not finally acted upon prior to October 1, 1949, and all such waivers and determinations shall be final and conclusive: *Provided*, That in cases where no deductions have been made from the pay of enlisted or former enlisted members the allowances paid hereunder may be limited to the amount of the Government's contribution to such allowances: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for current pay of enlisted members of the services concerned shall be available for payments authorized to be made hereunder.

Sec. 14. The Secretary of the Department concerned shall take cognizance of the provisions of this act and shall establish policies, under which enlisted members with dependents may be discharged for hardship.

Sec. 15. This act shall be effective from August 1, 1950, except that the allotment requirements of this act shall not be a condition precedent to the entitlement to a basic allowance for quarters prior to the second month following the month in which this act is enacted.

Sec. 16. This act, except sections 10, 11, and 12 hereof, shall terminate on April 30, 1953.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "of", insert "sufficient evidence, including."

Page 2, line 14, strike out the word "Section" and insert "For the duration of this act section."

Page 4, line 14, strike out "quarters: *Provided*, That" and insert "quarters, provided that."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say in comment on what the gentleman said a few minutes ago with respect to the procurement of men for the National Guard. There is some danger that you can injure the Guard in the future. A great many noncoms have been encouraged to come in even though they had a great number of dependents, because they had some experience and could act as instructors. I think it would be unfortunate in the future policy of the Guard to say that we do not want any men with dependents. It will probably be true in the future as in the past that many of the best men in the Guard have families.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have not in my remarks or observations made the recommendation, but I have just been thinking out loud. I had no reference to noncommissioned officers as a whole. I had reference to the first three enlisted grades. May I say further that the specific tables for the Guard show that the percentage of dependents in the first three enlisted grades is relatively small.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. And the heavy dependency rises in the higher grades of noncommissioned officers, and it is in those grades that, generally speaking, the noncommissioned officers draw more than \$200 a month. When we get to a grade above \$200 a month, we reach a grade in which men are normally more careful about their financial affairs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Some of these men have special obligations; they have furnished their homes and they have to make installment payments on everything from furniture to automobiles. No one expected to have this crisis come on as quickly as it did.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think probably the gentleman has in mind the same thing I did, that we do not want to have these people feel we are penalizing them for going into the Guard.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We do not want to destroy the backbone, as the gentleman says, of the National Guard.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say this, what I have in mind is that the provision with reference to dependency which applies to the regular service to my mind ought to apply to the reservists and the Guard also. Heretofore that has not been the policy.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the crux of the question is the date this law will take effect. I talked with many reservists, veterans of World War II, who have families, and I believe if the dependency allowance becomes effective July 1 their problems will be taken care of. In Pennsylvania the Pennsylvania Veterans Commission is actually giving money to men who have been called up in order to tide them over from the day they are called in until the day the dependency allowance goes into effect.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Many communities are adopting programs of that sort.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say is sometime of little interest to my friends on the right but this time just listen a minute, if you will, because on November 7 some of us hope to have our applications for a job for the next 2 years favorably passed upon by our constituents, and some of us, like my colleagues from Michigan, have to go through a similar ordeal on the 12th day of September.

Our New York colleagues have just been through that mill. I hold in my hand a letter purporting to be published on the stationery of the Times-Herald by a gentleman whose name is Charles Lattin. Am advised he is a janitor down there in the Times-Herald building, and he wrote to the opponent of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], a gentleman who has the respect of every Member of the House.

The letter was reprinted in the campaign literature sent out by the committee which supported candidate John D. Young. I am calling your attention to this attempted smear and vilification of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], so that you may know what to expect if the mudslingers and smear artists get busy in your district.

The letter reads as follows:

THE TIMES-HERALD.

Washington, D. C., August 11, 1950.

Mr. JOHN D. YOUNG,
First National Bank Building,
Corning, N. Y.

MY DEAR Mr. YOUNG: My home district certainly is sorely in need of competent representation. For years, the present Repre-

sentative of the district has enjoyed the office without performing his duties to the fullest. Many, many times I have tried to contact Mr. COLE, but still have never spoken to him. At the same time I have freely reached most every other Senator and Congressman personally.

I have visited his office frequently as well as attempting telephone contacts. Once in a great while I have been told he was on the floor. Ninety-nine percent of the time it seems he is reported to be back in the district.

His trips back in the district combined with his foreign jaunts have left him little time to "represent" those who entrusted him with one of the most sacred privileges—representing them in Congress—within the power of the American people. I, personally, feel that STERLING COLE has failed in his trust. Published records of voting will show that relatively seldom is his name listed; it is a known fact that he was not diligent in securing the flood-control projects for the district. Had he been properly informed and interested, as he obligated himself to be, the projects would have been completed before World War II. I have the word of the Army engineer, originally in charge of planning the projects.

STERLING COLE, over the past 5 years, has been absent from committee meetings, general sessions, roll calls, and so forth, as much as he has been present. Reporters covering these assignments state that he misses more sessions than he attends. Published accounts testify to the accuracy of these statements.

The greatest need of America in these days is to have men in Congress with unblemished characters; with unquestioned loyalty; with high moral purpose; with conscience; hard working; religiously minded. If we continue to elect to office men who place self ahead of duty; who fall in their obligations, the time is not far off when the people will no longer be allowed to choose.

I wish you could have heard replies of Members of Congress when I have asked about the capabilities of my own Representative. What they did not say was more revealing than what they did say. You may rest assured that, although a registered Republican, I would under no circumstances cast a vote for him.

Please get across to the voters that America is in grave peril and that absent Representatives can do nothing to prevent eventual collapse. I wish I could reveal some of the frightening information that has come to my attention. It would awaken the people to the immediate need to elect men who will truly represent them.

It can't be done back in the districts; it can't be done on foreign junkets; it can't be done by staying away from assigned duties.

With sincere hopes that the folks back home will awaken to the need of making the change which is long overdue, I wish you every success. I believe you are a man whom the country needs. Your affiliations stamp you as a man of good character; of faith and of ability.

Sincerely,

CHAS. LATTIN.

Let me repeat.

Public records of voting will show that relatively seldom is his name listed; it is a known fact that he was not diligent in securing the flood control projects for the district—

And so on.

Once in a great while I have been told he was seen on the floor.

I have the word of the Army engineer originally in charge of planning the projects that if Mr. COLE had been on the job, the Army engineers would have put the job through.

I never knew that any Congressman or group of Congressmen combined could make the Army engineers jump through a hoop and complete a job.

The letter reads further:

STERLING COLE over the past 5 years has been absent from committee meetings, general sessions, roll calls and so forth, as much as he has been present.

Every Member of the House who makes any pretense even of attending the sessions of the House knows that that is a bare-faced—what should I say?

Mr. SHORT. Lie.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is a bare-faced prevarication—all right, I will accept the word of the gentleman from Missouri—it is a bare-faced lie.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; in just a moment.

Listen, my colleagues:

The greatest need of America these days is to have men in Congress with unblemished character.

What does this man mean when he writes that kind of sentence? Does he mean STERLING COLE is a man of bad character? We all know he is a man of most excellent character. Listen further:

With unquestioned loyalty.

Does he mean that STERLING COLE is disloyal? Why, the writer of that letter is a contemptible liar, if the rules permit the use of such language. Listen further:

With high moral purpose.

Did anyone of you ever hear, even an insinuation against the high moral purpose of STERLING COLE? The answer is: You did not. Yet that is the kind of smear stuff they put out. Now I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, if he has words adequate to express his indignation.

Mr. SHORT. Of course the constituents of STERLING COLE did not believe any of that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But some few of them may have believed some of the other statements in that letter.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; too many of them did. But let me say this to the gentleman. Having served more than a dozen years with STUB COLE in the House of Representatives, and as one of the members of our Committee on Armed Services, I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, our chairman, as well as every member of the committee on both sides of the aisle will agree, there is no finer Christian gentleman, no abler, harder working member of our committee than W. STERLING COLE.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. With that statement we all agree. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan that several years ago I wrote a letter, a public letter, in behalf of STERLING COLE which was published in his district. I have not changed my opinion of STERLING COLE, in fact, I have even greater re-

spect for him. I know of no Member with whom I have served in my 36 years in this House who is more capable than STERLING COLE. His ability, his loyalty, and his diligent attendance are outstanding. I will say that I know of no Member during the 18 years I was chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the 2 years that I have been chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, upon whom I rely more than STERLING COLE. Of course, such a slanderous statement is beneath the dignity of all of us, and we repudiate it completely; and privately in language which parliamentary rules do not permit us to use. No district in the Nation is more ably represented in the Congress than the Thirty-ninth District of New York. There is no Member of the House more attentive to his duties than STERLING COLE. I resent with every fiber of my body this slander on the brilliant and outstanding services of one of the Nation's most capable lawmakers.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just wanted to let the Members know about this, as an example of what an honest, sincere, conscientious, capable, hard-working Member had to face when he came up for renomination.

Mr. SHORT. I think that we should treat the whole matter with contemptuous silence.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That may be all very well, but I cannot permit a vile, false charge like that to pass uncontradicted.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Gladly.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I arise to make a few remarks about the dastardly attack made upon my colleague from New York, the Honorable STERLING COLE. This type of propaganda sent out by an employee of a concern here in the city of Washington criticizing Mr. COLE's record, his character, and his ability is most distasteful to those who know him.

When I first came to Washington in 1947 Mr. COLE was one of the first Members of the House whom I contacted for advice and consultation and during the past 4 years I have gone to him for information and assistance. Needless to say, I have always found his judgment sound and reliable. To me he is one of the most conscientious, hard-working, and well-informed Members of the House. His attendance and voting record on all major legislative matters speak for themselves.

My congressional district in New York State is very close to that of Mr. COLE's and I am confident that the type of people he represents know very well his fine record and will have no part of such vicious appeals. That was definitely demonstrated Tuesday when they renominated him for their candidate on the Republican ticket by a comfortable majority.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, my colleague carries the name "Sterling" which Webster defines as "genuine." Moreover, he is a man of genuine character, genuine ability, and is a genuine American citizen.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I regret the unfair attack upon our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. COLE]. There is no one more devoted to the public service than Mr. COLE. He has rendered a tremendous service as a member of the Armed Services Committee and upon the special commission concerning atomic energy. The work of these committees is exacting and laborious. Mr. COLE never stinted in his work. In this day when the fate of America and of the world is in issue, we need men like Mr. COLE. His intelligence, his courage, his integrity and high purpose are essential in the battle to keep America strong and solvent. I congratulate him on his primary victory and am sure that primary verdict will be ratified in November with an emphatic vote of confidence from the constituents he has so loyally served through the years.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I was astounded when I read a letter purporting to be signed by Charles Lattin attacking the record of Hon. W. STERLING COLE as a Representative in Congress from the Thirty-ninth Congressional District of the State of New York.

I have had an opportunity during the entire period of W. STERLING COLE's eight terms of admirable service as a Member of the House of Representatives to observe the meticulous care with which he has discharged his duties to his constituents. I am sure that if a poll were taken of the 435 Members who have served with Representative COLE their opinion as to his excellent service would be of the highest commendation. I have been in a position to know of the careful and constant attention which Representative COLE has given, not only to the problems of his own district, but to those of a national character. I wish to say further that his fine ability has been a distinct contribution to the welfare and security of the Nation. I am sure that the intelligent people of the Thirty-ninth District of New York are proud, and justly so, to have a man of the integrity, honesty, and ability of Representative COLE serving them and the Nation on the Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Furthermore, it means much to all of the people of the State of New York to have the benefit of the distinguished and able service of Representative COLE.

The question is sometimes asked, "Is it worth while to keep such a capable and energetic man in public office?" "Is his experience as a legislator of value to the people of his district, his State, and to the people of the Nation?" Let me quote at this point Hon. DeAlva Stanwood Alexander, former Member of Congress, formerly United States Attorney for the Northern District of New York, and the distinguished author of the Political History of New York State, who, in referring

to the value of an experienced legislator, had this to say:

Prominence gained in one vocation is rarely transferred to another. Legislation is a profession as much as medicine or law or journalism, the practice of which, to gain leadership, must be long and continuous, until proposed public measures and their treatment worked out in the drudgery of the committee room, become as familiar as the variety of questions submitted, to lawyers and physicians.

I am happy for the good of the Nation that the people of the Thirty-ninth New York District have selected Hon. W. STERLING COLE to run on the Republican ticket for reelection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I learned to know W. STERLING COLE when he was a Member of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and it was my honor to be commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I found "STUB" COLE to not only be a true friend of the veteran but a strong advocate of an adequate national defense and one of the ablest and most sincere legislators in the Congress of the United States. When I was elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress, I found Congressman COLE very helpful to a freshman in the House of Representatives. Time and time again I contacted him for advice, and found him a storehouse of knowledge.

"STUB" COLE is a man of strong character, a convincing speaker, and one who has constantly fought for those things that have made America great. I am pleased to include "STUB" COLE among my close personal friends, for he is a colleague whose record is an open book and above reproach.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I think it is terribly unfortunate that anyone at this critical hour for political purposes would utter the statements that have just been quoted by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. These statements are not only intended to discredit our colleague, the Honorable STERLING COLE, but to injure his character and his reputation.

I have known STERLING COLE for a number of years. He is highly respected on both sides of the aisle of this House and is one of the outstanding, hard-working members of the Committee on Armed Services. He is earnest; he is painstaking and sincere.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with the statements of my very good and able colleagues, Mr. VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Mr. SHORT, the ranking minority member of that committee.

I have known STERLING COLE since coming to Congress, and know him as a man of fine character, integrity, and extreme loyalty.

Ordinarily one would not dignify such an attack with a reply. But I want to state, after my several years of experience of working with my good friend from New York, that he has been without question one of the outstanding

members of the Armed Services Committee.

He is a sound, clear thinker, intensely interested in all the affairs of our committee, of the Congress, and of our great Nation. He has made many valuable contributions.

By his fair and honest work he has won for himself the hearty commendations of all his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I cannot speak too highly of him or of his work in the Congress, and I consider it a privilege and honor to serve with him.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to extend to the people of the Thirty-ninth Congressional District of New York heartiest congratulations on the renomination of our distinguished colleague, STERLING COLE, to represent them in Congress.

I do not know anyone who has more faithfully served his district and his country than STERLING. In my opinion he is one of the outstanding men in Congress, and I am pleased to learn that the people he has so ably represented appreciate his worth. They were not misled by the slanderous propaganda that was deliberately circulated about him in the recent primary campaign.

Ordinarily, I avoid any comment in party primary contests, but when I learned of the baseless and unfounded charges made against STERLING I felt constrained to write a letter to his district to give them the actual facts. As the Republican whip of the House, I am in constant touch with the attendance and performance record of the Members. It is part of my responsibilities. I probably know more about STERLING COLE'S record in Congress than any other Member.

I could not remain silent when I knew as a fact that STERLING COLE, a Member with an enviable record, was being deliberately slandered. I had to speak out, not simply in behalf of STERLING, for whom I have such great affection and respect, but I had to speak out to give the people the facts in the interest of encouraging all members in the rewards of loyal and diligent service.

All of us look upon STERLING as a man of unusual ability. For that reason he is called upon to do much more than he would normally have to bear. The work load he has carried was more keenly appreciated by us when he was obliged to be absent for a period during an illness in his family.

He has served as assistant whip, and in that capacity he has been invaluable to me. And he has served with me on the Republican Policy Committee. I, and every member of that committee, can testify to the help he has been in the formulation of party policy, and the sound counsel he has given on many major questions.

There is no public acclaim and applause for this type of work. There is no public record that one can point to, but STERLING is not the kind of man to want a lot of noise and fanfare. He simply wants to get the job done, and very few know, as I do, the extent to which he has made his influence felt on many vital decisions.

In addition to this unpublicized work, STERLING has served with me on the Committee on Armed Services. Every member of that committee will testify to the long hours he has spent on committee work, and the constructive contribution he has made to solving our national-defense problems.

The burden of work that STERLING has handled is really more than one should expect of any one man, but he gladly assumed these time-consuming responsibilities and performed brilliantly. He has assumed even more. There is hardly any more important committee in the Congress today than the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. STERLING is ranking minority member of that committee. The contribution he has made to the work of that committee, with the manifold duties and heavy responsibilities that inevitably fall on the ranking member, are well known to all of us.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, the Thirty-ninth District of New York has good reason to be proud of Congressman COLE. He is one of the ablest and hardest working Members of this House. He is a man of unquestionable loyalty and exemplary character. He is an experienced legislator of national stature.

It is a great privilege for me to know STERLING COLE intimately and to work with him daily. It is a great satisfaction to me to see that his people appreciate his worth. I congratulate them.

As a part of my remarks I am including an editorial which appeared in the Ithaca, N. Y., Journal on August 15, prior to the primary election, and an editorial which appeared in the Sayre, Pa., Evening Times on August 24, after the election. I am including these editorials because they so well express the high regard in which STERLING COLE is held by those who really know his outstanding record in Congress. The editorials follow:

[From the Ithaca (N. Y.) Journal of August 15, 1950]

REMEMBER THE PRIMARY

Preoccupation with Korea, the confusion and squabbling in Washington, and the lack of a local contest tend to obscure the importance of the forthcoming primary election. So we venture to remind our readers that Tuesday, August 22, is primary day and that an important duty confronts them.

The Republican primary will determine who is to be our Representative in Congress the next 2 years. Whoever is nominated in this primary is sure to be elected. So, for Republican voters, August 22 is election day as far as the choice for Member of Congress is concerned.

It seems to the Journal that the choice is clear. With all due respect to John Young, of Corning, it would be most unfortunate if STERLING COLE should fail of renomination. He has long been a useful Congressman to his constituents, no matter what their political faith. But beyond and above that Mr. COLE is an important figure in the National Legislature. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and the Congressional Atomic Energy Committee he is in close touch with some of our most pressing and fundamental problems. His advice and counsel as a member of those committees and his votes are valuable not only to his associates but to the country. There is no question whatever that the Republican leadership in the House, would, if it could vote in our primary election, be solidly for Mr.

COLE, who is a member of the Republican policy committee.

Mr. COLE is completing his eighth term in Congress. That means he has been our Representative for 16 years. As everyone knows seniority and experience play a big part in the prestige of a Member of Congress. If Mr. Young were chosen by the Republicans he might some day become an effective Representative from this district. But the point is that Mr. COLE is now and for years has been an effective Representative.

His record and his experience certainly entitle him to a new vote of confidence. Rarely, if ever, have we had a Congressman who has been as helpful and sympathetic to the interests and needs of his constituents. The charge of absenteeism raised against him is not to be taken seriously. It has been branded as unwarranted by the Republican whip of the House. Of course, Mr. COLE has sometimes been away from the floor. No Congressman who must as a matter of duty participate in such important conferences and meetings as those conducted by the committees of which Mr. COLE is a member could possibly respond to every roll call. In fact his main duty frequently requires him to be elsewhere in the national interests, but at no time has Mr. COLE failed to discharge his full duties as a Member of the House and at no time has he failed to respond promptly and cheerfully to all reasonable requests from the folks back home.

Mr. COLE certainly deserves reelection but he won't be reelected if the enrolled Republican voters fail to participate in the contest for Congress.

So put down Tuesday, August 22, as an important date on your calendar and be sure to vote in the primary.

[From the Sayre (Pa.) Evening Times of August 24, 1950]

COLE'S VICTORY IS A TRIBUTE TO A NATIONAL FIGURE

If Representative W. STERLING COLE'S margin of victory—some 5,500 votes out of 31,000 cast—over John D. Young, Republican aspirant for the veteran Congressman's seat in the House, was less than his many close friends hoped, it was certainly a resounding indication of what the GOP voters of the Thirty-ninth District think of the man who has represented them for 16 years in Washington.

Mr. Young was a rugged and hard-hitting opponent—probably the most serious threat Mr. COLE has had in nine campaigns—but his majority was nevertheless a healthy one, especially in view of the fact that veteran legislators such as Mr. COLE, who has been in the limelight on Capitol Hill for more than a decade, are apt to make not a few enemies in the course of conducting the business of their office.

One of the strongest arguments against veteran legislators is the feeling that a few new faces in Washington are needed, an opinion that is almost universally held. But the voters of the Thirty-ninth District decided that whatever changes should be made in the House of Representatives they should not start with the elimination of the man who has, by and large, given his constituency reason for pride for half a generation, though he is yet a comparatively young man as Congressmen go.

As a matter of fact, STERLING COLE has not been merely a representative of the five-county area along the southern border of New York. He has been a national figure, one of the leaders of the young bloc of progressive Republicans, an ardent supporter of adequate defense, and a man of vast knowledge of military requirements learned over the bitter, hard years of World War II, when he was one of the hardest workers on the Naval Affairs Committee. He not only knows what the Thirty-ninth District needs,

he also is vitally aware of the requirements of the military, and his present post on the Armed Services Committee puts him in position to see that the requirements are met.

His nomination in spite of a highly capable and admittedly astute politician as an opponent is the Thirty-ninth District's best way of showing that it has faith in what STEALING COLE may do in the country's current hour of need; it is also a fitting appreciation for his great service in the past. One thing is certain: He will not let them down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the other committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

On page 8, line 4, after the colon strike out the remainder of the section through line 9.

On page 9, line 11, strike out all of section 15.

Page 10, line 11, strike out "16" and insert "15."

Page 10, line 16, strike out "17" and insert "16."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brooks: Strike out section 13 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 515 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, the Comptroller General, upon the recommendations of the heads of the departments concerned, or such subordinates as they may designate, and a showing that collection would be against equity and good conscience, may waive indebtednesses growing out of erroneous payments of allowances under the authority of the Servicemen's Dependents Act of 1942, as amended, and authorize payments based thereon, on applications filed by enlisted and former enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard, or their dependents, and not finally acted upon prior to October 1, 1949."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which has been so completely discussed.

I ask for its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, may it please the Committee: In the time I have I cannot possibly go into detail. Let me say that it is imperative that we pass legislation providing care for dependents of servicemen. No one can devote his full energies to wartime service if he is wondering if his wife, children, or parents have enough food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and the other necessities of life. Our servicemen must be easy in their minds about their families at home. We must not be penny wise and pound foolish in determining what provision should be made for dependents of servicemen. A good family allowance bill is the greatest morale builder we can provide our servicemen. We must assure them that no family will suffer because a husband, father, or child has been called to defend this Nation. Words will not meet that obligation, but proper and sufficient dependency allowances will. We are not keeping faith if we do not provide adequate family allowances.

Let me also say that of course the bill should be retroactive to be sure that no

discrimination has been practiced against those families whose men have already gone into service. I think that is only fair.

I regret that the time that I have does not permit me to discuss other features of the bill. However, I have discussed different phases of it in some detail with Members who are keenly interested in this legislation.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, war, in spite of our best efforts, always brings injustice. Absolute equality in the distribution of the sacrifices entailed is not possible, but we must at least do all we can to equalize this sacrifice.

Men in the National Guard and in the Reserves are being ordered to active duty. Thousands of men are being mobilized under the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948 as amended. Many of these men have families. They have living expenses and commitments quite out of line with the pay of enlisted men. The pay for the first three grades was fixed with the idea that such men in the career service would be quite young and not have dependents—that they would take on family obligations as they went up in the service.

This is not true of enlisted men in the National Guard and in the Reserves. They are older. In civilian life their earnings are on a quite different level. Willing as the men are to serve their country the practical question of day-by-day living has to be faced by their families.

It has been a traditional policy of our Government to provide allowances for the dependents of servicemen during periods of mobilization. No time can be lost in making this allowance available. The bill before us makes it retroactive as it should, for since the men have been called up bills have been accumulating.

This bill would apply to all enlisted men in the services—Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, the National Guard, and the Reserves. The requirement of a \$40-a-month allotment from men in the lower grades is a wise protection. The committee has worked out a fair scale of allowances which in combination with what a man might fairly be expected to send home will give for a wife and child a minimum of \$110 a month.

I hope this bill will pass and that the allowance will be promptly disbursed. There will still be need for further legislation, notably in the matter of housing loans. Of course, a man called up who has a GI loan, for example, will be protected during his time of service, but we must make provision for the period immediately after his demobilization when payments will again become due and when he may well not be in a position to meet them until he is established in a civilian job again.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, there is really one principle at issue in our consideration of allowances to the families of servicemen—the obligation of this Congress to make sure that the only men who are being called upon to

make any real sacrifice in the Korean conflict not be forced to make a double-sacrifice.

We are expanding our armed forces of real and deep necessity. Service in the Armed Forces has ceased to be a matter of individual will or preference. In many cases it involves family and financial hardship.

We must do everything possible to see that those hardships are reduced, not multiplied by our failures. I think allowances ought to be generous, even if it should cost civilian taxpayers a little more money. There is no way in which those of us who do not serve can match the sacrifices of most servicemen. This is our opportunity to keep their sacrifices at a minimum.

I trust this bill will be enacted with dispatch.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee should be commended highly for the speed with which they have prepared and reported this most important bill.

My interest in adequate family allowances is not of recent date. Members of the Armed Services Committee will recall that more than a year ago, when the military-pay bill was before the House, I protested provisions which would have terminated the family allowances of many servicemen in the middle of their enlistment periods. At that time I pointed out that termination of these allowances would in a sense be breaking faith with the men of our Armed Forces. The committee gave fair and full consideration to my recommendations, and later reported a bill which provided more adequate recognition of the problems of servicemen's families.

No piece of legislation now before the Congress is more essential than H. R. 9477. Once again, we are taking young men from their homes and families and sending them to the dangers of combat. Many of these men are leaving wives and children behind.

We will supply these men with the best available equipment. We will make sacrifices here at home to assure them adequate food and supplies. It is equally important that we make sure their families do not suffer hardship or privation. This is our first responsibility on the home front.

I have talked to several young men from my own State of Colorado who are leaving wives and children behind them as they return to military service. These men were not primarily concerned with the dangers they themselves might be facing in the months to come. Rather, they were worried about their families. They wanted reassurance that the Nation would not let their wives and children suffer hardship while they were away.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot fail these men. There is nothing so important to them as the well-being of their families. They would give their lives to protect their wives and children and the families of their comrades—indeed, some have made this sacrifice already. To keep faith with them, we must enact H. R. 9477 into law as speedily as possible.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9477. The distinguished chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee are to be congratulated for bringing this legislation to the House so speedily for a vote. The purpose of the legislation is to provide allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services. National Guard men and reservists are being called to duty without their consent; thousands of men are being mobilized under the provisions of the Selective Service Act.

Many of the enlisted men now being ordered into active duty are leaving dependents behind, their children and their wives. Provision must be made for these loved ones. It is also expected that the Selective Service may have to draft men with dependents and their loved ones must be provided for.

There were some of us, and I was one of them, who protested the termination of family allowances a year ago when the Armed Services Committee brought the military pay bill before the House.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that every Member of the House will support this legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9477, providing allowance for dependents of enlisted members of the armed services, should be passed unanimously.

Thousands of men are being mobilized under the provisions of the Selective Service Act and many of the enlisted personnel being ordered to active military duty have families and it may become necessary that the Selective Service draft men with dependents. These servicemen must make drastic adjustments in their standards of living and cannot support their immediate dependents on the basis of military pay alone.

This legislation will provide satisfactory benefits which will aid families of noncareer enlisted personnel and prevent hardships. This legislation does not deprive any member of the uniformed services of any benefits which they now enjoy. The provisions of this bill will give a total increase for members of the lower grades of the service, \$45 per month for men with only one dependent, a total increase of \$70 per month for two dependents, and a total increase of \$85 per month for those with over two dependents. Enlisted men in the higher grades who have only one or two dependents and are presently entitled to an allowance of \$67.50 per month would receive an increase of \$2.50 per month and those with three or more dependents would receive an increase of \$17.50 per month. These rates set out in the bill are equitable and represent a needed allowance to supplement the present pay of enlisted men for the support of their dependents. It is estimated that the cost of this proposed legislation for the fiscal year 1951 on an 11-month basis and on the basis of monthly increase in the size of the armed service, will be approximately \$240,000,000.

After extended hearings and deliberation on the part of the Committee on Armed Services, this legislation was passed out of committee by unanimous vote. This legislation should be enacted into law and it will, in a measure,

contribute toward making the life of the enlisted men in our military service a little more pleasant and avoid some of the mental and physical hardships which he is compelled to undergo.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STIGLER, 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. 9477) to provide allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services, to suspend certain provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4071) to provide allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services, to suspend certain provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill (H. R. 9477) just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the duration of this act that part of the second sentence of section 102 (g) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), which reads " * * * and actually resides in the household of said member" is suspended: *Provided,* That the dependency of the father or mother as required by said section 102 (g) shall be determined on the basis of an affidavit submitted by such father or mother, and such other evidence as the Secretary concerned may deem necessary under such regulations as he may prescribe, and no such father or mother shall be deemed dependent unless—

(1) the member of the uniformed services claiming such dependency has provided over one-half of the support of such father or mother for such period of time as the Secretary concerned may prescribe; or

(2) in the case of claimed dependency arising by reason of changed circumstances after the entrance of such member into active service subsequent to the effective date of this act, such father or mother becomes

in fact dependent upon such member for over one-half of his or her support.

SEC. 2. For the duration of this act the proviso in section 302 (a) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), is suspended.

SEC. 3. For the duration of this act, section 302 (f) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out that portion of the table appearing therein which prescribes monthly basic allowances for quarters for enlisted members in pay grades E-1 to E-7, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new table:

	Not over 2 dependents	Over 2 dependents
E-7.....	\$67.50	\$75.00
E-6.....	67.50	75.00
E-5.....	67.50	75.00
E-4.....	67.50	75.00

	1 dependent	2 dependents	Over 2 dependents
E-3.....	\$45.00	\$67.50	\$75.00
E-2.....	45.00	67.50	75.00
E-1.....	45.00	67.50	75.00

SEC. 4. Section 302 of the Act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(g) Subject to the provisions of this section, enlisted members without dependents shall be entitled to a basic allowance for quarters at the rate of \$45 per month.

"(h) The payment of the basic allowance for quarters provided in subsection (f) of this section for enlisted members with dependents shall be made only for such period as such enlisted member has in effect an allotment of pay not less than the sum of the basic allowance for quarters to which he is entitled plus \$40 (or in the case of enlisted members in pay grades E-4 and E-5, \$60; or in the case of enlisted members in pay grades E-6 and E-7, \$80), for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed. No such allotment shall be required (1) for the calendar month in which such member enters on active duty in a pay status if the allotment is effective from the following month; (2) for the calendar month in which such member is discharged, if not immediately reenlisted; (3) for the calendar month in which such member is released from active duty; (4) for the calendar month in which dependency ceases; or (5) for the calendar month in which dependency commences if the allotment is effective from the following month. Any such allotment may in special cases be initiated, continued, modified, or discontinued in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned. The minimum allotment required for any month shall be based on the lowest rate of basic allowance for quarters to which the member is entitled and the lowest pay grade in which the member is serving during such month.

"(i) The allotment required by subsection (h) of this section shall be paid to or on behalf of such dependent or dependents as may be specified in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe.

"(j) Any delay in initiating an allotment as required by this section shall not invalidate entitlement to basic allowance for quarters, provided that such allotment is made retroactive for such period as the member may elect to claim the allowance for his dependent or dependents.

"(k) The entitlement to the basic allowance for quarters provided for by this Act shall be substantiated in such manner and

in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe."

Sec. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the basic allowance for quarters to which a member may be entitled as a member with dependents shall not be contingent on pay accruing to such member for such period as the Secretary concerned may prescribe.

Sec. 6. The Secretary concerned may, at his discretion, with or without the consent of the enlisted member concerned, authorize and direct the payment of the basic allowance for quarters and the establishment and payment of such allotment as he shall determine to be in conformity with the provisions of this act, for any enlisted member with dependents in any case in which such member does not claim such allowance.

Sec. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this act shall not apply to enlisted members on training duty, to enlisted men entitled to pay and allowances pursuant to the provisions of section 507 of the Act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), to any member of the Samoan Native Guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan Reserve Force of the Marine Corps. Such persons shall continue to be entitled to the appropriate allowances prescribed by section 302 of the Act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), on the day prior to the effective date of this act.

Sec. 8. For the purposes of this act, personnel enumerated in sections 527 and 528 of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), with dependents as defined in section 102 (g) of said act, as amended, shall be entitled to a basic allowance for quarters under the conditions and at the rates prescribed for members in pay grade E-4.

Sec. 9. For the duration of this act, the fourth proviso of section 515 (b) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That when a member is furnished Government quarters adequate for himself and his dependents, the total sum saved for him by this subsection shall be reduced at the rate of \$45 per month for members in pay grades E-1, E-2, E-3, and E-4 (less than 7 years' service), and \$67.50 per month for members in pay grades E-4 (over 7 years' service), E-5, E-6, and E-7."

Sec. 10. The Secretaries concerned are authorized to prescribe such regulations for the administration of this act as may be deemed necessary to enable them to carry out the provisions of this act, and such regulations shall, as far as practicable, be uniform. All waivers and determinations, including determinations of dependency and relationship, shall be made by the Secretary concerned or such other person or persons as he may designate, and the Secretary concerned or his designee is authorized to delegate or redelegate such authority: *Provided*, That the authority granted in this section to the several Secretaries concerned may by joint agreement be exercised by any one of such Secretaries for any Department or all Departments concerned.

Sec. 11. Any determinations or waivers made under this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government. The Secretary concerned may at any time on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause reconsider or modify any such determination, and may waive the recovery of any money erroneously paid under this act whenever he finds that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience.

Sec. 12. The General Accounting Office shall not refuse to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing officer for any erroneous payment or overpayment made by

him in carrying out the provisions of this act unless such erroneous payment or overpayment was made by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States, and no recovery shall be made from any officer authorizing any erroneous payment or overpayment under this act unless such payment was authorized by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States.

Sec. 13. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 515 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, the Comptroller General, upon the recommendation of the heads of the departments concerned, or such subordinates as they may designate, and a showing that collection would be against equity and good conscience, may waive indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments of allowances under the authority of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, and authorized payments based thereon, on applications filed by enlisted and former enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard, or their dependents, and not finally acted upon prior to October 1, 1949: *Provided*, That in cases where no deductions have been made from the pay of enlisted or former enlisted members the allowances paid hereunder may be limited to the amount of the Government's contribution to such allowances: *And provided further*, That appropriations available for current pay of enlisted members of the services concerned shall be available for payments authorized to be made hereunder.

Sec. 14. It is the sense of the Congress that it is not in the national interest for men to be inducted, enlisted, recalled to active duty, or retained in the Armed Forces who have more than three dependents when such inductions, enlistments, recalls, or retentions in the service would impose severe financial hardship upon such dependents. The Secretaries concerned and the Director of Selective Service shall take cognizance of the provisions of this act in establishing policies under which inductions, enlistments, calls and recalls to active duty, reliefs from active duty, and discharges, will be effected. To the greatest practicable extent consistent with the needs of the several armed services, the Secretaries thereof shall refrain from employing in active service any person in any enlisted grade below that for which pay of grade E-4 is provided if such person (a) has more than three dependents, as dependents are defined in section 102 (g) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and (b) does not have means which, when included with the service pay and allowances to which he is or would be entitled on active duty, would enable him to provide adequate support for such dependents.

Sec. 15. This act shall be effective from July 1, 1950, except that the allotment requirements of this act shall not be a condition precedent to the entitlement to a basic allowance for quarters prior to the second month following the month in which this act is enacted.

Sec. 16. This act shall terminate on April 30, 1953.

Sec. 17. This act may be cited as the "Dependents Assistance Act of 1950."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That for the duration of this act the provision in the second sentence of section 102 (g) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), which reads '* * * and actually resides in the household of said member' is suspended: *Provided*, That the dependency of the father or mother as re-

quired by said section 102 (g) shall be determined on the basis of sufficient evidence, including an affidavit submitted by such father or mother, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

"Sec. 2. For the duration of this act the proviso in section 302 (a) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), is suspended.

"Sec. 3. For the duration of this act, section 302 (f) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out that portion of the table appearing therein which prescribes monthly basic allowances for quarters for enlisted members in pay grades E-1 to E-7, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new table:

	Not over 2 dependents	Over 2 dependents
E-7-----	\$70	\$85
E-6-----	70	85
E-5-----	70	85
E-4-----	70	85

	1 dependent	2 dependents	Over 2 dependents
E-3-----	\$45	\$70	\$85
E-2-----	45	70	85
E-1-----	45	70	85

"Sec. 4. For the duration of this act section 302 of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(g) Subject to the provisions of this section, enlisted members without dependents shall be entitled to a basic allowance for quarters at the rate of \$45 per month.

"(h) The payment of the basic allowance for quarters provided in subsection (f) of this section for enlisted members in pay grade E-1, E-2, and E-3 shall be made only for such period as the enlisted member has in effect an allotment of pay not less than the sum of the basic allowance for quarters to which he is entitled and \$40 for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed: *Provided*, That such allotment shall not be required, (1) for the calendar month in which such member enters on active duty in a pay status if the allotment is effective from the following month; (2) for the calendar month in which such member is discharged, if not immediately reenlisted; (3) for the calendar month in which such member is released from active duty; (4) for the calendar month in which dependency ceases; (5) for the calendar month in which dependency commences if the allotment is effective from the following month; (6) for the calendar month in which such member is assigned to quarters for himself and his dependents or for the calendar month in which such assignment is terminated: *Provided further*, That such allotment may be initiated, continued, modified, or discontinued in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Department concerned: *And provided further*, That the minimum allotment required for any month shall be based on the lowest rate of basic allowance for quarters to which the member is entitled and the lowest pay grade in which the member is serving during such month.

"(i) The allotment required by subsection (h) of this section shall be paid to or on behalf of such dependent or dependents as may be specified by the enlisted member concerned, subject to such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe.

"(j) Any delay in initiating an allotment as required by this section shall not invalidate entitlement to basic allowance for quarters, provided that such allotment is

made retroactive for such period as the member may elect to claim the allowance for his dependent or dependents. If the Secretary concerned finds that such delay was caused by the exigencies of the service he may waive the allotment requirement, or the additional increment thereto, as applicable, for such retroactive period.

"(k) The entitlement to the basic allowance for quarters provided for by this section shall be substantiated in such manner and in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe."

"Sec. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the basic allowance for quarters to which an enlisted member may be entitled as a member with dependents shall not for such period as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be contingent on the right of such member to receive pay.

"Sec. 6. The Secretary concerned may, at his discretion, with or without the consent of the enlisted member concerned, authorize and direct the payment of the basic allowance for quarters and the establishment and payment of such allotment or allotments as he shall determine to be in conformity with the provisions of this act for any enlisted member with dependents in any case in which such member does not claim such allowance.

"Sec. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this act shall not apply to enlisted members on training duty, to enlisted men entitled to pay and allowances pursuant to the provisions of section 507 of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), to any member of the Samoan Native Guard or Band of the Navy, or the Samoan Reserve Force of the Marine Corps. Such persons shall continue to be entitled to the appropriate allowances prescribed by the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), on the day prior to the effective date of this act.

"Sec. 8. For the purpose of this act, personnel enumerated in sections 527 and 528 of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), with dependents as defined in section 102 (g) of said act, as amended, shall be entitled to a basic allowance for quarters under the conditions and at the rates prescribed for members in pay grade E-4.

"Sec. 9. For the duration of this act, the fourth proviso of section 515 (b) of the act of October 12, 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Provided further, That when a member is furnished Government quarters adequate for himself and his dependents, the total sum saved for him by this subsection shall be reduced at the rate of \$45 per month for members in pay grades E-1, E-2, E-3, and E-4 (less than 7 years' service), and \$67.50 per month for members in pay grades E-4 (7 or more years' service), E-5, E-6, and E-7."

"Sec. 10. The Secretaries of the Departments concerned are authorized to prescribe such regulations for the administration of this act as may be deemed necessary to enable them to carry out the provisions of this act and such regulations shall, as far as practicable, be uniform. All waivers and determinations, including determinations of dependency and relationship shall be made by the Secretary of the Department concerned or such other person or persons as he may designate, and the Secretary of the Department concerned or his designee is authorized to delegate or redelegate such authority: *Provided*, That the authority granted in this section to the several Secretaries of the Departments concerned may by joint agreement be exercised by any one of the Secretaries for any other Department or Departments concerned.

"Sec. 11. Any determinations or waivers made under this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes and shall not be

subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government, except for cases involving fraud or gross negligence. The Secretary of the Department concerned may at any time on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause reconsider or modify any such determination, and may waive the recovery of any money erroneously paid under this act whenever he finds that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience.

"Sec. 12. The General Accounting Office shall not refuse to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing officer for any erroneous payment or overpayment made by him in carrying out the provisions of this act unless such erroneous payment or overpayment was made by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States, and no recovery shall be made from any officer authorizing any erroneous payment or overpayment under this act unless such payment was authorized by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States.

"Sec. 13. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 515 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, the Comptroller General, upon the recommendations of the heads of the departments concerned, or such subordinates as they may designate, and a showing that collection would be against equity and good conscience, may waive indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments of allowances under the authority of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, and authorize payments based thereon, on applications filed by enlisted and former enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard, or their dependents, and not finally acted upon prior to October 1, 1949.

"Sec. 14. The Secretary of the Department concerned shall take cognizance of the provisions of this act and shall establish policies, under which enlisted members with dependents may be discharged for hardship.

"Sec. 15. This act shall be effective from August 1, 1950, except that the allotment requirements of this act shall not be a condition precedent to the entitlement to a basic allowance for quarters prior to the second month following the month in which this act is enacted.

"Sec. 16. This act, except sections 10, 11, and 12 hereof, shall terminate on April 30, 1953."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 361, nays 0, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]
YEAS—361

Abbott	Auchincloss	Bolling	Burke	Herlong	O'Toole
Abernethy	Bailey	Bolton, Md.	Burleson	Herter	Pace
Addonizio	Barden	Bolton, Ohio	Burnside	Heselton	Passman
Albert	Baring	Bonner	Burton	Hill	Patman
Allen, Calif.	Barrett, Pa.	Bosone	Byrne, N. Y.	Hobbs	Patten
Allen, Ill.	Bates, Ky.	Boykin	Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeben	Patterson
Allen, La.	Bates, Mass.	Bramblett	Camp	Hoffman, Ill.	Perkins
Andersen,	Battle	Breen	Canfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Peterson
H. Carl	Beall	Brooks	Cannon	Hollifield	Philbin
Anderson, Calif.	Beckworth	Brown, Ga.	Carlyle	Holmes	Phillips, Calif.
Andersen,	Bennett, Fla.	Brown, Ohio	Carnahan	Hope	Phillips, Tenn.
August H.	Bennett, Mich.	Bryson	Case, N. J.	Horan	Pickett
Andrews	Bentsen	Buchanan	Case, S. Dak.	Howell	Plumley
Angell	Bishop	Buckley, Ill.	Cavalcante	Huber	Poage
Arends	Blatnik	Burdick, N. Y.	Celler	Hull	Polk
Aspinall	Boggs, Del.	Burdick	Chatham	Irving	Potter
			Chelf	Jackson, Calif.	Poulson
			Chesney	Jackson, Wash.	Preston
			Chipfield	James	Price
			Christopher	Javits	Priest
			Clemente	Jeavons	Rabaut
			Clevenger	Jenkins	Rains
			Cole, Kans.	Jennings	Ramsay
			Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Rankin
			Colmer	Jonas	Redden
			Combs	Jones, Ala.	Reed, Ill.
			Cooley	Jones, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.
			Cooper	Jones, N. C.	Rees
			Corbett	Judd	Rhodes
			Cotton	Karst	Ribicoff
			Coudert	Karsten	Rich
			Cox	Kean	Richards
			Crook	Kearns	Riehlman
			Crosser	Keating	Robeson
			Cunningham	Kee	Rodino
			Curtis	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Fla.
			Dague	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Mass.
			Davenport	Kennedy	Rooney
			Davis, N. Y.	Keogh	Roosevelt
			Davis, Ga.	Kerr	Sadlak
			Davis, Wis.	Kilburn	Sanborn
			Dawson	Kilday	Sasscer
			Deane	King	Saylor
			DeGraffenried	Kirwan	Scott, Hardie
			Delaney	Kruse	Scrivner
			Denton	Kunkel	Scudder
			D'Ewart	Lane	Secrest
			Dollinger	Lanham	Shafer
			Dolliver	Larcade	Shelley
			Donohue	LeCompte	Sheppard
			Doughton	LeFevre	Short
			Douglas	Lichtenwalter	Sikes
			Doyle	Lind	Simpson, Ill.
			Durham	Linehan	Simpson, Pa.
			Eaton	Lovre	Sims
			Eberharter	Lucas	Smathers
			Elliott	Lynch	Smith, Va.
			Ellsworth	Lytle	Smith, Wis.
			Elston	McCarthy	Spence
			Engle, Calif.	McConnell	Stanley
			Evins	McCormack	Steed
			Fallon	McCulloch	Stefan
			Feighan	McDonough	Stigler
			Fenton	McGrath	Stockman
			Fernandez	McGregor	Sullivan
			Fisher	McGuire	Taber
			Flood	McKinnon	Tackett
			Fogarty	McMillan, S. C.	Talle
			Forand	McSweeney	Tauriello
			Ford	Mack, Ill.	Teague
			Frazier	Mack, Wash.	Thomas
			Fugate	Madden	Thompson
			Fulton	Magee	Thornberry
			Furcolo	Mahon	Towe
			Garmatz	Mansfield	Trimble
			Gary	Marcantonio	Underwood
			Gathings	Marsalis	Van Zandt
			Gavin	Marshall	Vinson
			Gilmer	Martin, Mass.	Vorys
			Golden	Meyrow	Vursell
			Goodwin	Meyer	Wardsworth
			Gordon	Michener	Wagner
			Gorski	Miller, Md.	Walsh
			Gossett	Miller, Nebr.	Walter
			Graham	Mills	Weichel
			Granahan	Mitchell	Weich
			Granger	Monroney	Wheeler
			Grant	Morgan	White, Calif.
			Green	Morris	White, Idaho
			Gross	Morton	Whitten
			Gwinn	Moulder	Wickersham
			Hale	Multer	Widnall
			Harden	Murdock	Wier
			Hardy	Murray, Tenn.	Wigglesworth
			Hare	Nelson	Willis
			Harris	Nicholson	Wilson, Ind.
			Harrison	Nixon	Wilson, Okla.
			Hart	Noland	Wolcott
			Harvey	Norblad	Wolverton
			Havenner	Norrell	Wood
			Hays, Ark.	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodhouse
			Hays, Ohio	O'Brien, Minn.	Woodruff
			Hedrick	O'Hara, Minn.	Yates
			Heffernan	O'Konski	Young
			Heller	O'Sullivan	Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—69

Barrett, Wyo.	Hébert	Quinn
Biemiller	Hinshaw	Regan
Blackney	Jacobs	Rivers
Boggs, La.	Johnson	Sabath
Brehm	Kearney	Sadowski
Bulwinkle	Keefe	St. George
Carroll	Klein	Scott,
Chudoff	Latham	Hugh D., Jr.
Crawford	Lodge	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Dingell	Macy	Staggers
Dondero	Martin, Iowa	Sutton
Engel, Mich.	Mason	Taylor
Fellows	Miles	Tollefson
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Velde
Gillette	Morrison	Werdel
Gore	Murphy	Whittaker
Gregory	Murray, Wis.	Whittington
Guill	Norton	Williams
Hagen	O'Hara, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
Hall,	O'Neill	Winstead
Edwin Arthur	Pfeffer,	Withrow
Hall,	Joseph L.	
Leonard W.	Pfeffer,	
Halleck	William L.	
Hand	Powell	

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which the bill, H. R. 9477, was passed were vacated and the bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks during the consideration of the bill just passed and also that they may have five legislative days to extend their remarks with reference to the bill in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Speaker, during the roll call on the dependency allowance bill, I was called out of the Chamber on official business with a delegation of my constituents. Therefore, I was unable to vote on the passage of the bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea," as I am in favor of the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include some resolutions.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include some articles.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. NOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and include an editorial.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues have

asked permission to extend their remarks in connection with the remarks I made concerning our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. I ask unanimous consent that they may be granted that privilege.

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

There was no objection.

WE NEED UNITY, NOT CONFUSION

Mr. NOLAND. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have noted an ever increasing barrage both in the partisan press and in the mouthings of certain politicians which has as its purpose the creating of confusion in the minds of the people. There has been a studied effort on their part to play up temporary defeats and to ignore our successes in the international arena in order to create disunity and confusion among the people.

The time has come to stop throwing mud and put forth some constructive effort. Our men are fighting under the UN banner to maintain democratic world leadership and it is time we the people of the United States throw our shoulders back and accept our world responsibilities.

The so-called statesmen who are now shouting the loudest that we have been betrayed are the very same men who have voted time and time again to weaken our role in promoting a democratic world and halting communism. The Kremlin could not have had more able assistants. Nor do these same "statesmen" who two short years ago were going up and down the land crying unity offer a single constructive suggestion at this time.

I was interested to observe that the presiding chairman at the recent Midwest Republican conference is quoted in the press as saying "The Republicans are willing to support the war effort." Is that not a condescending attitude to take in support of our gallant and courageous men now fighting in Korea? It truly appears that some politicians would welcome military defeat in order to win a victory at the polls in November.

Here in Congress I was discouraged to observe that many of those who voted to break the Government's contract with the gallant men of our Armed Forces and extend their service for a year without a moment's hesitation later "dragged their heels" during consideration of the economic mobilization legislation and charged inadequate hearings.

I suggest that it is high time for those with 20/20 hindsight and the "Monday morning quarterbacks" to put their shoulders to the wheel in constructive effort. I think it is high time that we:

First. Place patriotism above politics.

Second. Continue our bipartisan efforts in the field of foreign policy.

Third. Bend every effort to forging the UN into an effective instrument to preserve the peace.

Fourth. Work to unite the American people in this critical hour for the long-range battle in which we are engaged.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF PANAMA CANAL

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 820) providing for the consideration of H. R. 8677, a bill to authorize and provide for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal by the present corporate adjunct of the Panama Canal, as renamed; to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone, and for other purposes; and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8677) to authorize and provide for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal by the present corporate adjunct of the Panama Canal, as renamed; to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommitt.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield half an hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 820 makes in order the bill (H. R. 8677) which is to authorize and provide for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal by the present corporate adjunct of the Panama Canal, as renamed; to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone, and for other purposes.

In other words, the Panama Canal is one of the great assets of America. I have gone carefully over the reports of other canals in the world and I find that we in America should have the right to adjust our tolls so as to take care of the maintenance of this great undertaking that America has entered into. We find that the Suez Canal probably might be considered a privately owned canal, but we do have criticism from foreign countries to the effect that we are charging more than is justified.

I believe, after going over the bill H. R. 8677 which was introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] that you will all realize that the bill has had very careful consideration. I have had the honor of serving for many years with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], and I have always found that his interests are the interests of the country, that whenever he introduces a bill it is only after very careful consideration.

He always gives to legislation the thought that is necessary to make it applicable to the thing we want to correct in our Government. So I am very glad to have the privilege of presenting the rule that makes this bill in order.

As a young civil engineer on the Pennsylvania Railroad I remember seeing outside of Pittsburgh one of the assembled locks that was to be used in the Panama Canal. I remember it extended to a height equal to that of a five-story building, and I wondered at the time as a young engineer whether that great lock could ever be properly worked. Later I had the pleasure of being in Panama, and I saw that lock operating just as easily as the door of a car or the door of a safe, showing the marvelous engineering skill of the people who had put this great undertaking of America in operation.

Now we have come to a reconsideration of the toll system. We are asking for a renaming of the corporation and many things that we feel will be for the benefit of this portion of America. I believe and I think that the Members will agree that the tolls should take care of those things that are pertinent to the operation of the canal; in other words, we feel that the school system, the sanitary system, and everything connected with the ordinary civilian operation should be borne by those who get the benefit of using the canal.

I remember when the *Oregon*, our great flagship during the Spanish-American War, had to go around Cape Horn through the Straits of Magellan in order to be able to take part in the battle of Manila under Admiral Dewey. This makes us realize what a tremendous facility we have in the Panama Canal; in fact, the Panama Canal has almost doubled the efficiency of our Navy and is a great asset to us. But now we feel we have a right to make it a paying proposition or at least make it return enough income to take care of the civilian activities necessary in connection with the Canal.

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

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Why does not the committee include a provision restoring the Canal toll exemption? The people of the United States built the Canal. Under the original law all our coastwise trade was exempted from paying tolls, and no foreign country can engage in the coastwise trade. Since that exemption was repealed the American people have been shut out of using the Panama Canal to a large extent.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I think the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] will answer that question. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi there is some question about it. We have had a reduction in the number of coastwise ships.

Mr. RANKIN. Last year there were 6,000,000 tons more traffic on the Monongahela River than there was through the Panama Canal. If we are not going to permit the American people to use the Panama Canal we might as well abolish it.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I think the gentleman should bring that up when the

bill is under consideration. The gentleman might offer an amendment, if he cared to. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the passage of the rule. I have no requests for time.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8677) to authorize and provide for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal by the present corporate adjunct of the Panama Canal, as renamed; to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8677) with Mr. SULLIVAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] is entitled to be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] for 30 minutes.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes the operation of the Panama Canal as a Government corporation and contains recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget to the President after a year or more of intensive study by officials of the Budget Bureau. The chief purpose of the bill is to permit operation of the Canal, which is essentially a business enterprise, on a sound business basis. Members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee have also made a thorough study of the Canal's operation and are of the firm opinion that accounting procedures normally used by executive agencies of the Government are not readily adaptable to a business enterprise such as the Canal. For the same good reason that Congress has established Government corporation procedures for other business operations of the Government, I believe that those procedures should be employed in the operation of the Panama Canal.

The Panama Canal, in selling a service to shipping, and in operating a railroad, commissaries, fueling and repair services, power projects, and hotels, is a large and varied business operation. These many business functions can best be operated by the corporate procedure proposed in this bill, and which procedure has been found wholly satisfactory in the operation of 40 or more other Government corporations. The bill, if enacted, will permit a board of directors to know the sources and amounts of revenue in the Canal enterprise. It will, under well-established corporate control methods, give the Congress a thor-

ough and complete accounting for these business functions on an annual basis, and will present annually to the Congress a budget reflecting all the revenues and expenses of these many business enterprises. While the Board of Directors of the proposed Panama Canal Company will have normal powers, matters of policy will be controlled by the Congress through the annual budget submitted to the Congress under the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945.

I firmly believe that the ends sought by this bill are necessary and timely. The legislation does not carry added cost to the Government. On the contrary, the legislation proposes a business-type operation that will pay its own way and which, it is hoped, will effect savings to the Government as a result of the employment of sound methods and procedures.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been reported unanimously by the subcommittee and the entire Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; it has been recommended by the Secretary of National Defense, the Secretary of the Army, and has also been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the State Department.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, some might wonder why I have any particular interest in this bill or why I take this time, but may I say that for a number of years the appropriation subcommittee for the War Department handled the appropriations for the Panama Canal Zone. During the years in which I served on that committee we had considerable trouble with determining the profits of the Panama Railroad Company and the interrelated fiscal affairs between the railroad company and the Canal Zone authorities.

At one time Mr. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General, sent us a report which called attention to the fact it was difficult for him to audit the funds of the Canal Zone because the cash was mingled with that of the railroad company. When we attempted to straighten that out, when we attempted to determine what the hotel was making and things of that sort, we ran into a problem on which the Comptroller General said he could not give a definite answer.

Growing out of that experience I became interested in the Government corporations control bill which had been introduced in the Senate by Senators BYRD and BUTLER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and myself, introduced in the House what became known as the Government Corporations Control Act. That for the first time put all of the functions of the Canal Zone under authority of the General Accounting Office.

The reason I take this time is to ask the committee what the effect is going to be of the language which you propose as a replacement for section 31, chapter 2, under the heading "Accounting for Funds."

The old section 31, according to the report on the bill, page 9, provides that the functions of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Railroad operation

could be consolidated for receiving, disbursing, and accounting. Section 32 provided that the accounting by the collecting officers for the Panama Canal should be transmitted to the General Accounting Office. Section 33 provided for an examination of accounts by persons detailed from the General Accounting Office.

Under the report, sections 31, 32, and 33 will all be repealed and there will be substituted in place thereof this new section 31, reading:

The functions of receiving, disbursing, and accounting for the funds of the Canal Zone Government may, in the discretion of the Governor, be performed for said Government, on a reimbursable basis, by the receiving, disbursing, and accounting officers of the Panama Canal Company.

The question I want to ask the committee is, Will that language result in their again mingling the funds of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company, and at the same time take them out from under control and accounting of the General Accounting Office?

Mr. THOMPSON. I believe the gentleman will find that in the Government corporation law, the law under which all of the Government corporations function, there are adequate means for the General Accounting Office to render this kind of a report. They are not affected at the present time except in regard to the Panama Railroad. What we propose to do is take all the operations of the Canal and place them in the same form; as a matter of fact, consolidate them with the railroad, and let all of the reports, as reports of any corporation in everyday life, go through an audit, in our case the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office thinks, and the Bureau of the Budget thinks, and the committee thinks that the reports that come to this Congress will be far more adequate by this means. We see no reason in the world why there should be any confusion of funds whatsoever. As a matter of fact, it was in order to cure the confusion which seems to have bothered the gentleman as it bothered us that this means was adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course I want this to be under the control of the General Accounting Office, and I want it to stay under the authority of the Government Corporation Control Act. I introduced that bill in the House, and I do not want it upset here. The only thing that disturbs me is that you are repealing sections that refer to the General Accounting Office, and in a substitute section there is no mention of the General Accounting Office whatsoever.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the gentleman will find if he will refer to his own law that it is adequately covered in the basic law, and that there is no possible confusion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure that it is so intended there. The only thing, I wonder whether this being enacted since would be regarded as a subsequent act of the Congress. If the gentleman from Texas who is speaking now on behalf of the committee says that

as a part of the legislative history here that this is not intended to supersede the Government Corporation Control Act, then I think the matter is cleared up.

Mr. THOMPSON. On the contrary, it is not, and it is presumed that it will dovetail in with it, and that is exactly what we are shooting at.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. My understanding was similar to that expressed by the gentleman from Texas. There was to be no mingling or commingling of funds and accounts, but the Corporation might perform the function. There was no intention in any way to take from the provisions of the basic law to which the gentleman has reference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman. I think that clarifies the situation.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FUGATE].

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 8677 is a bill that authorizes and provides the necessary legislation to reorganize the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal.

As a great international utility, second only to that of Suez, the Canal has and will continue to have paramount importance in the movement of United States flag shipping, both military and commercial.

The Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended that "straight line business activities be incorporated so as to secure greater flexibility in management and simpler accounting, budgeting, and audit methods."

This bill provides for the incorporation of all the business units into one body for more efficient management and operation, which is consistent with the recommendation of the Commission.

This bill will not cost the Federal Government any money. On the contrary, it will save money. In addition, it makes other changes in the present law that will contribute to a more orderly procedure in the over-all management.

As already stated by members of the committee, H. R. 8677 transfers the business functions of the Canal to the Panama Railroad Company and renames the Corporation, The Panama Canal Company. The civil functions are grouped together under the heading of Canal Zone Government. It shall be the duty of the Canal Zone Government to perform all civil functions including health and sanitation.

The Panama Canal Company, when reconstituted, will operate the railroad, the Canal, steamships, commissaries, public utilities, and all repair and bunkering of ships transiting the Canal. That is, it shall be responsible for all the business functions that are operated for revenue.

The Corporation will be set up under the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 which provides for a Board of Directors appointed by the President

of the United States who will be charged with establishing policies. The Board will be a rate making body for setting the rate of tolls and determining the charges for services. Tolls for ship transiting cannot be set until hearings have been held after proper notice. Moreover, the bill provides that a 6 months' notice must be given before toll changes are made. Toll changes require Presidential approval. The bill places a ceiling of \$1 per Panama Canal ton on laden ships.

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

Mr. FUGATE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Would the committee oppose an amendment to exempt coastwise trade from tolls on the Panama Canal?

Mr. FUGATE. Yes, we would, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Why?

Mr. FUGATE. Because under treaty arrangements with Great Britain we are not permitted—

Mr. RANKIN. Great Britain does not have a darn thing to do with it; because no foreign country can do coastwise trade. You are simply punishing the American people who pay to keep up the Canal; who paid to build it. You are simply punishing them when, as a matter of fact, a foreign country cannot do any coastwise trade in this country. This is confined to American-owned vessels and no foreign country has a right to come in and shut off our coastwise trade and penalize the people who pay the taxes, who built the Canal, and now pay to operate and keep it up. I am going to offer an amendment, if I cannot get the committee to do it, to exempt coastwise trade. Last year the traffic on the Monongahela River was 6,000,000 tons more than that on the Panama Canal. The Canal has just gone out of business, almost. The Ohio River hauled 16,000,000 tons more than did the Panama Canal last year, because of the fact that the American people who paid for the construction of the Canal, and who operate it, and pay for its operation, are denied its use.

Mr. FUGATE. Let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the shippers who will use the Canal under this bill will pay for the operation of the Canal.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes. You are penalizing the very people who keep up the Canal, who built the Canal, when, as a matter of fact, a foreign government cannot do a coastwise trade.

Mr. FUGATE. We will be on a pay-as-you-go basis under this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. If we are going to operate the Panama Canal for foreign countries and deny its use to our own people, we might as well close it.

Mr. FUGATE. We built it and we are operating it.

Mr. RANKIN. We have been robbed and plundered this way for the last 30 years.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUGATE. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. In response to the gentleman from Mississippi, I would like

to know how you can help foreign commerce unless there were foreign countries.

Mr. RANKIN. In reply to the gentleman, I thought everybody could answer that question. We are not trying to keep other people from using it if they want to go through. But they cannot do a coastwise trade. We are entitled to this exemption for our coastwise trade which has been paralyzed over the last 25 or 30 years as a result of our being denied the use of the very canal that they were taxed to build and are now taxed to maintain.

Mr. FUGATE. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that those engaged in the intercoastal trade are not objecting to this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. You are speaking now of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, I presume.

Mr. FUGATE. No.

Mr. RANKIN. They are the ones who raised up about the toll exemptions. It was pointed out on the floor at that time that neither Great Britain nor any other foreign country could do a coastwise trade. Yet they repealed that canal toll exemption, and have punished our people for the last 30 years. The canal might just as well not be there, so far as we are concerned, from a commercial standpoint.

Mr. FUGATE. I must differ with the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

Mr. FUGATE. I yield.

Mr. HART. Is it not a fact that if the intercoastal trade were to be exempted from the payment of tolls, it would result in a higher burden of tolls being placed on all other ships that transit the canal and would therefore violate the treaty between Great Britain and the United States?

Mr. FUGATE. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. No, sir. It would not have the slightest effect on the trade going between foreign countries, or going from foreign countries to points in this country. It would not have the slightest effect on them. But this movement was started by the Canadian Pacific Railroad, and today you people in the Middle West are being robbed with a one-way freight rate, and you people on the Atlantic seaboard and the Gulf coast and the Pacific seaboard, and up and down our navigable streams are being robbed and plundered as a result of this discrimination against our coastwise trade.

Mr. FUGATE. The Corporation must charge tolls and prices for services that will produce revenue sufficient to cover interest, depreciation, and for the net cost of an appropriate share of the Canal Zone Government, above the cost of operation of the Panama Canal Company.

Vessels operated by the United States may, in the discretion of the President, be required to pay tolls. In the event that such vessels are not required to pay tolls, the tolls thereon shall nevertheless be computed and the amounts thereof treated as revenues of the Panama Canal Company for the purpose of prescribing the tolls and shall be used as offsets.

The bill provides for the establishment of a capitalization for the Panama Canal Company, which will reflect the investment of the United States, with allowances for depreciation. It does not, however, include interest on the investment for the period during construction.

Interest on the capital investment shall be at the going rate. That is, at the rate which the Treasury is paying. That rate is currently about 2.3 percent.

It is sincerely believed, in view of the work done by the committee, that this is good legislation. A special committee was appointed pursuant to authority granted under House Resolution No. 44, in March 1949. The special committee believes this legislation is essential for a more logical grouping of the functions of the Panama Canal. Both the subcommittee on the Panama Canal and the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries unanimously approved this bill.

I hope that the Membership of the House gives their approval.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the distinguished chairman and author of the bill if Governor Newcomer appeared before the committee and approved this legislation?

Mr. HART. The Governor appeared personally and approved all of the provisions of the bill. He also had certain other provisions which he personally would have liked to see incorporated in the bill but which the committee thought it was wise not to take up at this time. But, in answer to the gentleman's question, the Governor has approved of everything in the present bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the distinguished chairman for the information.

I note in examining the bill that the number of directors is not given. Is there a basic law which sets forth the number of directors in this corporation?

Mr. HART. There is no basic law.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Then, how many directors will be in this corporation?

Mr. HART. All of the agencies of Government that are interested in the conduct of the affairs of the Canal, such as the Budget Bureau, the Army, the Navy, and so forth.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I appreciate the reply of the distinguished chairman, who has always been very fair. I visited Panama and I have some definite knowledge of the splendid work that Governor Newcomer, Lieutenant Governor Vogel, Colonel Jacobs, and others have been doing. I recognize that much stress has been laid upon the fact that the Bureau of the Budget is in accord with this legislation. Although sometimes the Bureau of the Budget is a little wrong, the fact that Governor Newcomer and his staff favor it should certainly convince us that the bill is meritorious and merits our favorable consideration.

Mr. HART. I am glad to hear the commendation of the Governor by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and am glad to join in the tribute deservedly paid to him.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 16 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Ohio 19.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am preparing an amendment to restore the Canal toll exemption that was included in the law that was passed when the Canal was first put into operation. Under the present set-up the Panama Canal might as well be closed so far as the American people are concerned, viewing it from a commercial standpoint. No foreign vessel can do a coastwise trade or an intercoastal trade in this country; remember that. No foreign vessel can even pick up traffic in New Jersey or Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, or Mississippi, and take it around the lower tip of South America and deliver it in California. A foreign vessel cannot do a coastwise trade. This canal was built for the American people; they were taxed to pay for it; they are being taxed to operate it, and yet under a Senate bill that was engineered by a few transcontinental railroads we were denied the use of it.

There was more traffic—listen to this. There was 6,000,000 tons more traffic on the Monongahela River last year than there was on the Panama Canal; there was 16,000,000 tons more traffic on the Ohio River last year than there was on the Panama Canal. As far as the commercial traffic of the United States is concerned, the Panama Canal might as well be in Timbuktu; it is an absolute nullity as far as our intercoastal trade is concerned; yet that is what it was built for, to benefit the American people.

What I propose to do is to exempt coastwise vessels of the United States that go from one coast to the other, that do a coastwise trade, exempt them from canal tolls. When you do that you will bring the Panama Canal to life. You people in the Middle West who are paying a one-way freight rate, you people on the Pacific coast who are paying a one-way freight rate, you people up and down the Atlantic seaboard without coal, without gas, without oil, without water power, without raw materials, you are facing the most critical period of your existence; and it is necessary if all sections of the United States are going to prosper, it is necessary that we restore the canal-toll exemptions and permit you to use it.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does the gentleman know that without exception, every single chamber of commerce on the west coast favored this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. The chambers of commerce can make more blunders than any other set of people I know. Of all people who ought to be for this exemption, it is the gentleman from New York. New York has no coal, no gas, no oil, very little water power, and no raw materials. You

could not feed half the people out of your own soil, and yet here you are maintaining this obstruction to keep you from trading with the rest of the country. Of all places, of all places that ought to be for the restoration of the canal-toll exemption it is the States along the Atlantic Seaboard that are facing, if you please, the hardest period of their existence, because of their lack of fuel and raw materials, particularly those who cannot feed their own people out of their own soil.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I disagree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. O'TOOLE. As for saying there is no gas in New York, the State of New York, like Mississippi, sends its gas down to the House here.

Mr. RANKIN. Then in the case of water if you try to wash your face in the State of New York, you have a water shortage and have to observe dry Fridays.

But, seriously, I am telling you the actual conditions that face every State that touches the Atlantic seaboard. It applies to every State of the Nation; it applies to every State on the Gulf or Pacific seaboard; it applies to every State bordering a navigable stream.

I shall offer an amendment in a few minutes to restore this Canal toll exemption. I am tired of seeing my people taxed to maintain the Panama Canal and then being denied its use.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this is a very worthwhile bill, in my opinion. The committee and the subcommittee that brought it out have worked on it faithfully, and I want to extend my appreciation to the chairman and the subcommittee chairman. But the fact that it is a worthwhile bill and the fact that as has been pointed out it was approved without a dissenting vote does not mean that in all respects all members of the committee thought it was a perfect bill by any manner of means, and I am going to ask your indulgence for a few minutes while I point out certain things about the bill. Members of the committee and my colleagues here have said, and I think very sincerely, that there is no chance that this bill will cost the country any money. I trust they are right about that. There is just one feature in the bill about which I am a little apprehensive and to which I wish to call the attention of the House, the section placing a limitation of \$1 per net vessel ton. It is found on page 21. I think it was only as recently as about 1936 that the maximum figure was reduced from \$1.25, which it had been under the original legislation, to \$1 which it is at the present time. With the rapid rise in cost prices and added expenses, it is highly possible, in my opinion, that

ere long, a rate of less than \$1 will require running at a loss. At the present time, 95 cents, we are told, would about cover the costs of operation in accordance with the terms of the bill.

I think that is a pretty tight jacket to be in. If costs go up, only a little, they may not be able to make both ends meet under that \$1 figure.

Another point that is in the bill changing the set-up, as it has been in the past, appears on page 22, line 8, section (e) which says:

Capital investment for interest purposes shall not include any interest during construction.

We are advised that that represents a difference of about 14 cents per ton and if that were taken into consideration as it has been in the past you could not make both ends meet with a limit of less than \$1.10. I mention that to point out it may be that the country might lose money under this bill if things do not go too well. Personally, I would like to have seen it more flexible as to rate limits.

Mr. Chairman, I have a good deal of sympathy for the point of view of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I would like to see the Canal run with the greatest consideration for our own merchant marine. It is a fact that the American people are not getting quite as much for their money back out of the Canal operation as they do on certain other things because over the years about 60 percent of the commercial travel through the Canal has been under foreign flags.

I would like to see our coastwise shipping allowed to use the Canal free of charge. There are, however, difficulties with the State Department on that score, not to mention the railroads. To keep the record clear, as I understand it, this Congress has never admitted that there was a treaty obligation which would prevent us from so doing, although the State Department has held to the conviction that it would be a breach of faith in connection with our Hay-Pauncefote treaty with Great Britain.

During the administration of Woodrow Wilson there was a very hot fight about that and it was settled by the Congress agreeing to tolls being charged coastwise shipping, but at the same time and in the same legislation, as I recollect it, the Congress held to its position that it had a right to let such American shipping go free if it so desired. There has never been a final showdown between the views of the State Department in regard to interpretation of that treaty and the views of the Congress as expressed shortly before World War I.

Be that as it may, this is a good measure, in spite of the weaknesses above mentioned. It might be said to do for the Panama Canal what the Hoover Commission recommendations seek to accomplish for the Federal Government. I hope it is adopted.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the

fact that intercoastal shipping desires this type of legislation and an effort has been made to get it a better break for the intercoastal trade even than the bill gives it. I would, however, like to see the bill passed as it comes from the committee.

The bill was prepared, as has been said, under the supervision of General Newcomer. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and others in the Government. The Pacific Coast has a very great interest in the bill. Some 64 percent of the water-borne commerce of the Pacific coast goes through the Canal.

We used to enjoy a very fine intercoastal trade. There are at the present time about 64 ships in that trade, whereas before the war there were something between 150 and 300 ships. There has been a tremendous loss in that shipping. It is rather interesting to note that approximately 65 percent of the ships that went into African action at the outset of World War II when we went into it, came from the intercoastal and domestic trade. Largely those ships are lost to us.

The Panama Canal has a dual purpose. It is a military installation and it is an installation for use in the carrying of merchant commerce. There is no way that has been demonstrated of establishing the portion of the investment which is for either purpose. The best that can be done is to make an arbitrary division as to certain items. Therefore, I am very much in favor of the provision which eliminates the interest paid on capital during the construction period from the base upon which interest to be reflected in the tolls is figured, because that reduction, at least, is substantial recognition of the fact that a portion of the capital involved is a portion that should be allocated to the national defense.

This bill will accomplish a number of rather good purposes. There will be a business corporation as the operating agency to carry on all the business transactions in the Canal. The operation of the Canal is such a business. The Canal Zone Government will carry on the governmental activities, including health and sanitation activities. The rates that will be fixed coming out of the operation of this bill under the formula involved will reflect rather fairly the proportion of the costs which the transit of merchant ships should bear.

I think it is a good bill. I hope the Congress gives approval to it and inasmuch as I have been in touch with most of the West Coast operators who are so desirous of reestablishing their businesses on a good basis, and inasmuch as they are satisfied with the bill as it is, I would suggest that it is a good bill with which to start leaving for future development any improvements that should be made.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to add these remarks to what has been said. It is evident that this bill is not a perfect bill, by any means. From the study

that has been made of this very important matter of getting a definite and basic plan for the economic and proper operation of the Panama Canal it is evident that this has been quite a controversial question. I think this is as near as we can get to a solution. I think that this bill contains provisions which are the products of good sound thinking based on investigations and experience, and I most heartily endorse it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to detain the committee further. May I make this observation, that the members of the committee, I believe, unanimously are most sympathetic with the views expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and the desire he has to do something for our intercoastal shipping. But, may I say to the Members that if you mess up this bill with the consideration of that feature, you are taking on one of the most controversial and hardest to decide problems with reference to the Panama Canal. This legislation should be passed regardless of the ultimate outcome of the intercoastal shipping and the tolls finally assessed against it. This legislation is very badly needed, and I do hope it will not be messed up.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This amendment only contains two lines. It merely restores the Canal toll exemption; it will not mess up the bill. It will be one of the greatest boons that ever came to the American people.

Mr. THOMPSON. Regardless of the merits of the gentleman's proposed amendment, I must repeat that this is not the time nor place in which to consider it.

Those of you who have had occasion to consider the affairs of the Panama Canal learned very early in your deliberations that you were faced with a complicated and often difficult problem.

I recall very vividly my own experience with it in the past 2 years. The late chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the gentleman from Virginia, Judge Bland, appointed me as chairman of a special subcommittee to investigate the matter of Panama Canal tolls and the various related business aspects.

I was an accountant by early training, and I approached this subject with the mistaken idea that my committee and I could sit down and consider a balance sheet or two, some cost accounts, and some related history, and come up with a comparatively simply answer.

In place of this very simple procedure we found ourselves involved in the mon-

umental engineering problem, international relations, and a curious local government which had grown up through the days and the perils of construction. We encountered the jealousies and squabbles known all too well by those who come in contact with Federal bureaus and agencies.

We were hampered by the reluctance on the part of many individuals to consider a change of any sort. We wrestled with the questions of the allocation to the Defense Department of the cost of maintaining the military forces which guard the Canal.

The point has frequently been made all through the history of the Canal that it was constructed as a part of our system of national defense and that, therefore, the Defense Department should bear the cost of building the Canal and that those who used it for commerce should be relieved of all, or a major portion, of the tolls.

When our deliberations started we found that the Army was still clinging tenaciously to the management of the Canal. During the war a military government had been superimposed on the Canal Zone government and the Governor reported to the military commander.

The committee finally managed to shake the Canal operation loose from the military. The committee finally concluded that it should consider that the Panama Canal was conceived as an artery of marine transportation and that the defense aspects were incidental.

True, the Spanish-American War and the discovery that it took a long time to move a fleet or any part of it around Cape Horn gave great impetus to the early construction of the Canal. However, for my own part, I believe it would have come to pass eventually even had the war with Spain never taken place.

Delving into the history of the Canal, we find the names of many famous men. None is more outstanding than George W. Goethals. His thinking was fundamental and sound and his views are still referred to as doctrine by the able men who today control the destinies of the Canal. One of Goethals' greatest contributions came in the December 1911 congressional hearings on the subject. At that time, he voiced one of his great and fundamental statements: "The construction of the Canal is not a military proposition; it is a civil and commercial proposition. The fact that I am in the Army does not alter that situation at all. I look upon the operation and maintenance of the Canal as a distinctly civil and commercial function, and that the reason for our being here is for the operation and maintenance of the Canal, and after its construction this should be a civil function. But we should create such an entity here that in time of war the military necessities of the situation would predominate, and the operation and maintenance of the Canal will be subordinate to those military features." This is the fundamental philosophy that now pervades the Panama Canal Act.

With this statement of principle to guide us the committee now brings before the Congress a proposal to reorganize the operating procedure of the

Panama Canal and to set it up as the great public utility which it is.

We have proposed certain accounting changes which are generally along the lines recommended by the Hoover Commission. Through the plan which we submit today, the Congress will receive the same kind of reports and statements as are periodically submitted to business enterprises. Congressional management of the entire undertaking will not be lessened in the slightest. As a matter of fact closer supervision may be accomplished if it is desirable. The measure involves no outlay of money whatever. It does not change the relationship to the project of the Army engineers who have played such a magnificent part through all of its long history. It is a measure which has been arrived at through long and painstaking study and effort.

In closing, may I extend my compliments to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Particularly, I wish to extend my personal thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FUGATE] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER], who served with me on a special subcommittee which considered the early phases of this problem.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that we should help our own merchant marine and I agree with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] that this bill is far from perfect. There are many things that should be corrected with reference to the Panama Canal, but I do believe that this is an earnest beginning to straighten out the difficulties in the operation of the Panama Canal, the inefficiency in operation and the many abuses that I believe have occurred in the operation of the Canal. While this bill is far from perfect, I believe that if it is adopted as reported by the committee it is a beginning step toward the efficient operation of the Panama Canal.

We have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), is amended to read as follows:

"5. Establishment, administration, and functions of Canal Zone Government: The independent agency of the United States heretofore known as the Panama Canal shall hereafter—

"(1) be known as the Canal Zone Government;

"(2) be administered, under the supervision of the President or such officer of the United States as may be designated by him, by a Governor of the Canal Zone; and

"(3) be charged, except as otherwise provided by law, with the performance of the various duties connected with the civil government, including health, sanitation and protection, of the Canal Zone.

"Cross Reference

"Appointment of other necessary persons, see section 81 of this title, as amended."

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in, or where inconsistent with, the provisions of this act, the terms "the Panama Canal", "the Canal", and "the Canal authorities", wherever appearing in the statutes of the United States and having reference, prospectively, to the agency heretofore known by those names, are amended to read "the Canal Zone Government."

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the title "the Governor of the Panama Canal", wherever appearing in the statutes of the United States, is amended to read "the Governor of the Canal Zone."

SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in, or where inconsistent with, the provisions of this act, the term "the Panama Railroad Company", wherever appearing in the statutes of the United States and having reference, prospectively, to the corporation heretofore known by that name, is amended to read "the Panama Canal Company."

SEC. 5. The headline and introductory clause of section 7 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code are amended to read as follows:

"7. Control and jurisdiction of the Governor over Canal Zone: The Governor of the Canal Zone shall: * * *"

SEC. 6. Section 82 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended to read as follows:

"82. Compensation of persons in military, naval, or public health service: (a) If any of the persons appointed or employed as provided in section 6, or section 81, as amended, of this title are in the military, naval, or Public Health Service of the United States, the amount of the official salary paid to any such person shall be deducted from the amount of salary or compensation provided by or which shall be fixed under the terms of those sections, but this section shall not be construed as requiring the deduction from the amount of such salary or compensation of—

"(1) the retired pay or allowance of any retired warrant officer or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; or

"(2) the training pay, retainer pay or allowances of any warrant officer or enlisted man of the Reserve forces of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

"(b) The Canal Zone government shall annually pay to each of the aforesaid services an amount sufficient to reimburse the said service for the official salary paid to any person in such service for the period of appointment or employment by the Canal Zone government."

SEC. 7. The headline and first sentence of section 245 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as added by the act of June 29, 1948 (ch. 706, 62 Stat. 1075), are amended to read as follows:

"245. Creation, purposes, offices, and residence of Panama Canal Company: For the purposes of maintaining and operating the Panama Canal and of conducting business operations incident to such maintenance and operation and incident to the civil government of the Canal Zone, there is hereby created, as an agency and instrumentality of the United States, a body corporate to be known as the Panama Canal Company, hereinafter referred to as the 'corporation.' * * *"

SEC. 8. Paragraph (c) of section 246 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, as added by the act of June 29, 1948, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In order to reimburse the Treasury, as nearly as possible, for the interest cost of the funds or other assets directly invested in the corporation, the corporation shall pay interest to the Treasury on the net direct investment of the Government in the corporation as defined in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, and shown by the receipt described therein, at a rate or rates

determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as required to reimburse the Treasury for its cost. Payments of such interest charges shall be made annually to the extent earned, and if not earned shall be made from subsequent earnings unless the Congress shall otherwise direct."

SEC. 9. Section 246 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, as added by the act of June 29, 1948, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph lettered (e) and reading as follows:

"(e) The corporation is further obligated to pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts amounts sufficient to reimburse the Treasury, as nearly as possible, (1) for the annuity payments under article XIV of the convention of November 18, 1903, between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, as modified by article VII of the treaty of March 2, 1936, between the said Governments, and (2) for the net costs of operation of the agency known as the Canal Zone Government. The net costs of operation of the Canal Zone Government, which are deemed to form an integral part of the costs of operation of the Panama Canal enterprise as a whole, shall not include interest but shall include depreciation and the reimbursement of other Government agencies for expenditures made on behalf of the Canal Zone Government. The payments into the Treasury, referred to in this paragraph, shall be made annually to the extent earned, and if not earned shall be made from subsequent earnings unless the Congress shall otherwise direct."

SEC. 10. Subparagraph (e) of section 248 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, as added by the act of June 29, 1948, is amended by adding at the end thereof a sentence reading as follows: "The provisions of section 82 of this title, as amended, shall apply to the corporation and to its officers and employees."

SEC. 11. Section 249 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as added by the act of June 29, 1948, is amended by relettering subparagraphs (a) to (f) thereof as subparagraphs (b) to (g), respectively, and by inserting after the introductory clause of said section a new subparagraph reading as follows:

"(a) May maintain and operate the Panama Canal."

SEC. 12. Article 3 of chapter 12 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, as added by the act of June 29, 1948, is amended by renumbering sections 255 and 256 of said title 2 as sections 257 and 258, respectively, and by adding, in said article 3, two new sections numbered 255 and 256 and reading as follows:

"255. Appropriations to cover losses: Appropriations are hereby authorized for payment to the corporation of such amounts as may be shown in the annual budget program of the corporation as necessary to cover losses sustained in the conduct of its activities. Amounts appropriated to the corporation under authority of this section shall not be added to the amount of the receipt referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 246 of this title, and shall not require payment of interest under paragraph (c) of said section 246: *Provided, however,* That repayments by the corporation to the Treasury shall in no case be treated as dividends under sections 246 (d) and 253 of this title until all amounts appropriated to the corporation under authority of this section shall have been repaid to the Treasury."

"256. Authorization for transfer of Panama Canal to corporation: The President is hereby authorized to transfer to the corporation the Panama Canal, together with the facilities and appurtenances related thereto, and any or all of the facilities and appurtenances heretofore maintained and operated by the Panama Canal under authority of section 51 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended by section 2 of the act of August 12, 1949 (ch. 422, 63 Stat. 601), and all or so much as he may determine to be necessary of the

personnel, property, records, related assets, contracts, obligations, and liabilities of or appertaining to the said Canal and the aforesaid facilities or appurtenances, and such transfer shall be deemed to have been accepted and assumed by the corporation without the necessity of any act or acts on the part of the corporation except as otherwise stipulated in the provisions of section 246 of this title."

SEC. 13. Section 411 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code is amended to read as follows:

"411. Authority to prescribe measurement rules and tolls: The Panama Canal Co. is authorized to prescribe and from time to time change (1) the rules for the measurement of vessels for the Panama Canal, and (2), subject to the provisions of the section next following, the tolls that shall be levied for the use of the Panama Canal: *Provided, however,* That the rules of measurement, and the rates of tolls, prevailing on the effective date of this amended section shall continue in effect until changed as provided in this section: *Provided further,* That the said corporation shall give 6 months' notice, by publication in the Federal Register, of any and all proposed changes in basic rules of measurement and of any and all proposed changes in rates of tolls, during which period a public hearing shall be conducted: *And provided further,* That changes in basic rules of measurement and changes in rates of tolls shall be subject to, and shall take effect upon, the approval of the President of the United States, whose action in such matter shall be final and conclusive."

SEC. 14. Section 412 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended by the Act of August 24, 1937 (ch. 752, 50 Stat. 750), is amended to read as follows:

"412. Bases of tolls: (a) Tolls on merchant vessels, Army and Navy transports, colliers, tankers, hospital ships, supply ships, and yachts shall be based on net vessel-tons of 100 cubic feet each of actual earning capacity determined in accordance with the rules for the measurement of vessels for the Panama Canal, and tolls on other floating craft shall be based on displacement tonnage. The rate of tolls on vessels in ballast without passengers or cargo may be less than the rate of tolls for vessel with passengers or cargo.

"(b) Tolls shall be prescribed at a rate or rates calculated to cover, as nearly as practicable, all costs of maintaining and operating the Panama Canal, together with the facilities and appurtenances related thereto, including interest and depreciation, and an appropriate share of the net costs of operation of the agency known as the Canal Zone Government. In the determination of such appropriate share, substantial weight shall be given to the ratio of the estimated gross revenues from tolls to the estimated total gross revenues of the said corporation exclusive of the cost of commodities resold, and exclusive of revenues arising from transactions within the said corporation or from transactions with the Canal Zone Government. The rate of tolls on laden vessels shall not exceed \$1 per net vessel-ton.

"(c) Vessels operated by the United States, including warships, naval tenders, colliers, tankers, transports, hospital ships, and other vessels owned or chartered by the United States for transporting troops or supplies, may in the discretion of the President of the United States be required to pay tolls. In the event, however, that such vessels are not required to pay tolls, the tolls thereon shall nevertheless be computed and the amounts thereof shall be treated as revenues of the Panama Canal Co. for the purpose of prescribing the rates of tolls, and shall be offset against the obligations of the said corporation under paragraphs (c) and (e) of section 246 of this title, as amended.

"(d) The levy of tolls is subject to the provisions of section 1 of article III of the treaty

between the United States of America and Great Britain concluded on November 18, 1901, of articles XVII and XIX of the convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama concluded on November 18, 1903, and of article I of the treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Colombia proclaimed on March 30, 1922.

"(e) Capital investment for interest purposes shall not include any interest during construction."

SEC. 15. Sections 982, 987, and 1024 of title 4, and section 833 of title 5, of the Canal Zone Code, are amended by deleting the term "the Panama Canal", appearing in each of said sections, and inserting in lieu thereof the term "the Panama Canal Company."

SEC. 16. Section 836 of title 5 of the Canal Zone Code is amended by deleting the term "the Government of the Canal Zone", which appears in paragraph b of said section and inserting in lieu thereof the term "the Panama Canal Company."

SEC. 17. The following statutes and parts of statutes are repealed:

- (1) Canal Zone Code, title 2, sections 32 and 33;
 - (2) Canal Zone Code, title 2, sections 51 to 54, as amended by section 2 of the act of August 12, 1949 (ch. 422, 63 Stat. 601);
 - (3) Canal Zone Code, title 2, section 414;
 - (4) The paragraph entitled "Housing of officer serving in the Canal Zone" of the act of July 9, 1918 (ch. 143, 40 Stat. 855; 10 U. S. C., sec. 721);
 - (5) Subparagraph (g) of section 2680 of title 28, United States Code;
 - (6) Section 6 of the act of August 1, 1914 (ch. 223, 38 Stat. 679; 31 U. S. C., sec. 621);
 - (7) Section 1 of the act of June 29, 1943 (ch. 706, 62 Stat. 1075; 48 U. S. C., sec. 1361); and
 - (8) All statutes and parts of statutes inconsistent with this act, to the extent of such inconsistency.
- SEC. 18. Except for section 256 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as added by section 22 of this act, this act shall take effect upon the effective date of the transfer to the corporation, pursuant to the provisions of said section 256, of the Panama Canal together with the facilities and appurtenances related thereto.

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MILLS, having assumed the chair, Mr. SULLIVAN, 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. 8677) to authorize and provide for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal by the present corporate adjunct of the Panama Canal, as renamed; to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone; and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL,
1951

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 9526) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2987), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF
PANAMA CANAL

Mr. HART. 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. 8677) to authorize and provide for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal by the present corporate adjunct of the Panama Canal, as renamed; to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8677, with Mr. SULLIVAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 12, strike out all of the bill starting with "Sec. 6", including the sections which follow in numerical sequence, up to and including "Sec. 15", which ends on line 19, page 13; page 13, line 20, strike out "16" and insert "8"; page 14, line 21, strike out "17" and insert "7"; page 15, line 10, strike out "18" and insert "8"; page 16, line 1, strike out "19" and insert "9"; page 16, line 24, strike out "20" and insert "10"; page 17, line 5, strike out "21" and insert "11"; page 17, line 12, strike out "22" and insert "12"; page 19, line 1, strike out Section 23, down to and including line 13; page 19, line 14, strike out "24" and insert "13"; page 20, line 11, strike out "25" and insert "14"; page 21, line 11, after the word "Government" insert the sentence: "The rate of tolls on laden vessels shall not exceed \$1 per net vessel-ton."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer my amendment at this point, although I am willing to wait until these other amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. RANKIN. Then it is agreed that we will turn back to this point so that I may offer my amendment at page 21, after line 12, when these other amendments are disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the remainder of the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 7, strike out the period and the quote, and insert: "(e) Capital investment for interest purposes shall not include any interest during construction."

Page 22, line 10, strike out "26" and insert "15."

Page 22, line 15, strike out "27" and insert "16."

Page 22, line 20, strike out "28" and insert "17."

Page 23, line 13, strike out "29" and insert "18."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HART: On page 22, line 3, strike out Roman numeral "XVII" and insert in lieu thereof Roman numeral "XVIII."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 22, after the period in line 12, insert the following new sentence: "No toll shall be levied upon vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment in the interest of the American people, from Maine to California, to Washington and Oregon.

No foreign vessel can do a coastwise trade. Now, remember that. Today a man who ships goods from Florida to California, or from Pennsylvania to California, from New York to California, or vice versa, has to pay the same toll as though his goods were being shipped from China to some other foreign country through the Panama Canal. This amendment merely gives us the same canal-toll exemption we enjoyed originally.

I believe in developing our own resources. I have not been sectional in my fight for the development of the water power of the Nation; I have not been sectional in my fight for the development of transportation on our navigable streams. Here is something that means more than any other amendment of its kind that will be proposed while you and I are Members of this House.

What does it mean? It simply means that it opens up the Panama Canal for trade between the various sections of the country. I was utterly surprised when I went into it and found that the traffic on the Monongahela River exceeded the traffic on the Panama Canal last year by 6,000,000 tons. It was so astounding to me that I called the Army engineers and got them to check up on it. I found not only that those figures were correct, but that traffic on the Ohio River alone exceeds traffic on the Panama Canal by 16,000,000 tons a year.

You ship material from the Great Lakes to the Gulf coast down the Mississippi River, but when you get there you find yourself shut out of the Panama Canal, on which we have spent on its construction alone more than \$400,000,000, to say nothing of the cost of its operation.

I am asking that this amendment be adopted in order that the Panama Canal may be used by the people along the Gulf coast along the Atlantic seaboard,

from Maine to New York, and along the Pacific coast, from Mexico to Oregon, Washington, and Alaska, if you please, and along our navigable streams, the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Columbia, the Monongahela, the Potomac, and every other stream that bears traffic. They would be permitted to use the Panama Canal for coastwise trade.

We did not build the Panama Canal for foreign countries; that was not the understanding at the time; yet we have been shut out from its use until today it is almost a dead proposition and will continue so unless these canal-toll exemptions for coastwise trade are restored.

As I said, this may not mean much particular relief to the people I directly represent, but it does mean a great deal to the people of every State that touches the Gulf coast, the Atlantic seaboard, or the Pacific Ocean, all the way, if you please, from the coast of Maine, to Nome, Alaska, and to the people who live on our navigable streams or along the Great Lakes. I cannot understand why any man would oppose it. I sincerely trust that it will be as unanimously adopted as was the bill on which you called the roll for our veterans a short time ago.

Let me say to my distinguished friend from New Jersey that it will mean more to his own State than the Panama Canal will ever mean to it unless this amendment, or a similar amendment, is adopted.

Let me say to the gentleman from Texas and to the gentleman from New York that it will mean more to their States than the Panama Canal will ever mean unless an amendment of this kind is adopted, restoring to the American people their right to use the Panama Canal for coastwise trade, which cannot be engaged in by foreign vessels. You are shutting out your own trade, your own commerce, for foreign countries to use the Canal at your expense; that is what is going on.

I am now offering this amendment. This is not new with me; I have contended for it ever since I have been a Member of Congress. You people in the Middle West are being penalized in a manner that is really inhuman. This will mean more to people in every section of the country than the rest of the entire bill.

I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who have studied Panama Canal affairs recognize the many conflicts and problems involved, questions of engineering, questions of tolls, questions of management. Many controversies have become very heated, and frequently involve, as would the present amendment, were it placed in the bill, international relations that are far-reaching and the results of which are very hard to reckon with.

To my distinguished friend from Mississippi I wish to say that the committee very carefully considered for the period of a year and a half an amendment of this character. We have considered most carefully the question of tolls and the elimination of tolls on ships that operate

in the intercoastal traffic of the United States.

If you were to try on this floor to resolve that question, and if you would give it the consideration that we have given it, you would be here for days, weeks, and months; then I think you would come out, exactly as we did, at the point where you would agree that this bill should be passed regardless of the question of tolls on ships operating between the coasts. The amendment has no business in here and it should not complicate our consideration today.

So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee will not adopt the amendment.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the hearings on this bill the committee received hundreds of telegrams from the heads of municipalities, States, and chambers of commerce all over this country. They recognized that this bill principally is for the purpose of placing the Panama Canal on a business basis.

We could not, as the gentleman from Texas said, take up this question of intercoastal shipping because it is entirely too involved and would necessitate an interval of time which we did not have at our disposal.

I do hope that the members of the committee will not be confused by this bilateral issue and will vote for the bill as it has been reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 40, noes 36.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HART and Mr. RANKIN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 37, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MILLS, having resumed the chair, Mr. SULLIVAN, 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. 8677) to authorize and provide for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal by the present corporate adjunct of the Panama Canal, as renamed; to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone, and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 820, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 21, after the period in line 12, insert the following sentence: "No tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in coastwise trade of the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 10, noes 54.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 20, noes 330, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll Call No. 252]

YEAS—20

Albert Angell	Feighan	Mack, Wash.
Baring	Gathings	Marcantonio
Carlyle	Holmes	Mills
Christopher	Horan	Rankin
Cunningham	Huber	Stockman
Ellsworth	Hull	White, Idaho
	Kelley, Pa.	

NAYS—330

Abbutt	Brown, Ohio	Dague
Abernethy	Bryson	Davenport
Addonizio	Buchanan	Davies, N. Y.
Allen, Calif.	Buckley, Ill.	Davis, Ga.
Allen, Ill.	Buckley, N. Y.	Davis, Wis.
Allen, La.	Burdick	Deane
Andersen,	Burke	DeGraffenried
H. Carl	Burleson	Delaney
Anderson, Calif.	Burnside	Denton
Andresen,	Burton	D'Ewart
August H.	Byrne, N. Y.	Dollinger
Andrews	Byrnes, Wis.	Dolliver
Arends	Camp	Donohue
Aspinall	Canfield	Doughton
Auchincloss	Cannon	Douglas
Barden	Carnahan	Doyie
Barrett, Pa.	Case, N. J.	Eaton
Bates, Ky.	Case, S. Dak.	Eberharter
Bates, Mass.	Cavalcante	Elliott
Battle	Celler	Elston
Beall	Chatham	Engle, Calif.
Beckworth	Chelf	Ewins
Bennett, Fla.	Chesney	Fallon
Bennett, Mich.	Clemente	Fenton
Bentsen	Clevenger	Fernandez
Bishop	Cole, Kans.	Fisher
Blatnik	Cole, N. Y.	Flood
Boggs, Del.	Colmer	Fogarty
Bolling	Combs	Forand
Bolton, Md.	Cooper	Ford
Bolton, Ohio	Corbett	Frazier
Bonner	Cotton	Fugate
Bosone	Coudert	Fulton
Bramblett	Cox	Gamble
Breen	Crook	Garmatz
Brooks	Crosser	Gary
Brown, Ga.	Curtis	Garvin

Gilmer	Linehan	Rees
Golden	Lovre	Rhodes
Goodwin	Lucas	Ribicoff
Gordon	Lyle	Richards
Gorski	Lynch	Riehlman
Gossett	McCarthy	Robeson
Graham	McConnell	Rodino
Granahan	McCormack	Rogers, Fla.
Granger	McCulloch	Rogers, Mass.
Grant	McDonough	Rooney
Green	McGrath	Roosevelt
Gross	McGregor	Sadlak
Gull	McGuire	Sanborn
Gwinn	McKinnon	Sasser
Hale	McMillan, S. C.	Saylor
Harden	McSweeney	Scott, Hardie
Hardy	Mack, Ill.	Scrivner
Harris	Madden	Scudder
Harrison	Magee	Secrest
Hart	Mahon	Shafer
Harvey	Mansfield	Shelley
Havener	Marsalis	Sheppard
Hays, Ark.	Marshall	Sikes
Hays, Ohio	Martin, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Hedrick	Merrow	Sims
Heffernan	Meyer	Smathers
Heller	Michener	Smith, Va.
Herlong	Miller, Md.	Smith, Wis.
Herter	Miller, Nebr.	Spence
Heselton	Mitchell	Stanley
Hill	Monroney	Steed
Hobbs	Morgan	Stefan
Hoeven	Morris	Stigler
Hoffman, Ill.	Morton	Sullivan
Hoffman, Mich.	Moulder	Taber
Hollifield	Multer	Talle
Hope	Murdock	Tauriello
Howell	Murphy	Teague
Irving	Murray, Tenn.	Thomas
Jackson, Calif.	Nelson	Thompson
Jackson, Wash.	Nicholson	Thornberry
James	Nixon	Towe
Javits	Noland	Trimble
Jenison	Norrell	Underwood
Jenkins	O'Brien, Ill.	Van Zandt
Jennings	O'Brien, Mich.	Velde
Jensen	O'Hara, Ill.	Vinson
Jonas	O'Hara, Minn.	Vorys
Jones, Ala.	O'Konski	Vursell
Jones, Mo.	O'Sullivan	Wadsworth
Jones, N. C.	O'Toole	Wagner
Judd	Passman	Walsh
Karst	Patman	Walter
Karsten	Patten	Welch
Kean	Patterson	Welch
Keating	Perkins	Wheeler
Kee	Peterson	White, Calif.
Kelly, N. Y.	Philbin	Whitten
Kennedy	Phillips, Calif.	Whittington
Keogh	Phillips, Tenn.	Wickersham
Kerr	Pickett	Widnall
Kilburn	Plumley	Wier
Kilday	Polk	Wigglesworth
King	Potter	Willis
Kirwan	Poulson	Wilson, Okla.
Kruse	Preston	Wolcott
Kunkel	Price	Wolverton
Lane	Priest	Wood
Lanham	Rabaut	Woodhouse
Larcade	Rains	Woodruff
LeCompte	Ramsay	Yates
LeFevre	Redden	Young
Lichtenwalter	Reed, Ill.	Zablocki
Lind	Reed, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—80

Balley	Halleck	Poage
Barrett, Wyo.	Hand	Powell
Biemiller	Hare	Quinn
Blackney	Hébert	Regan
Boggs, La.	Hinshaw	Rich
Boykin	Jacobs	Rivers
Brehm	Johnson	Sabath
Bulwinkle	Kearney	Sadowski
Carroll	Kearns	St. George
Chiperfield	Keefe	Scott,
Chudoff	Klein	Hugh D., Jr.
Cooley	Latham	Short
Crawford	Lodge	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Dawson	Macy	Smith, Ohio
Dingell	Martin, Iowa	Staggers
Dondero	Mason	Sutton
Durham	Miles	Tackett
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	Taylor
Fellows	Morrison	Tollefson
Furcolo	Murray, Wis.	Wardel
Gillette	Norblad	Whitaker
Gore	Norton	Williams
Gregory	O'Neill	Wilson, Ind.
Hagen	Pace	Wilson, Tex.
Hall,	Pfeifer,	Winstead
Edwin Arthur	Joseph L.	Withrow
Hall,	Pfeiffer,	
Leonard W.	William L.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Williams with Mr. Rich.
 Mr. Winstead with Mrs. St. George.
 Mr. Wilson of Texas with Mr. Hand.
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
 Mr. Carroll with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
 Mr. Bailey with Mr. Mason.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Withrow.
 Mr. Biemiller with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Latham.
 Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Klein with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Brehm.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Chiperfield.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Crawford.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Wardel.
 Mr. Quinn with Mr. Kearney.
 Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Fellows.
 Mr. Regan with Mr. Norblad.
 Mr. Gregory with Mr. Macy.
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
 Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Dondero.
 Mr. Jacobs with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Gillette.
 Mr. Durham with Mr. Hagen.
 Mr. Tackett with Mr. Blackney.
 Mr. Sutton with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
 Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Tollefson.
 Mr. Pace with Mr. Johnson.
 Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Hinshaw.
 Mr. Gore with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
 Mr. Miles with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
 Mr. Dawson with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
 Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and Mr. MILLER of Maryland changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CARLYLE and Mr. ELLSWORTH changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL,
1951

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 825, Rept. No. 2989), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9526) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, all points of order against said bill or any provision contained in said bill are hereby waived.

UN-AMERICAN AND SUBVERSIVE
ACTIVITIES

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 826, Rept. No. 2990),

which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9490) to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL
FACILITIES

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2317) to authorize grants to the States for surveying their need for elementary and secondary school facilities and for planning State-wide programs of school construction; and to authorize grants for emergency school construction to school districts overburdened with enrollments resulting from defense and other Federal activities, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the amendments of the House, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. BARDEN, BAILEY, BURKE, McCONNELL, and KEARNS.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONVEY CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 3, line 2, after "therefore" insert: "Provided, That, in the event any mineral interests covered by this act are not sold as provided herein pursuant to application filed within 7 years from the effective date of this act or within 7 years from the date of acquisition of the mineral interests of the United States, whichever date is later, the Secretary shall forthwith transfer title to such mineral interests, with the exception of those which were a part of or derived from the assets transferred pursuant to transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, to the Secretary of the Interior to be administered under the minerals laws of the United States."

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

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman explain briefly the purport of the amendment?

Mr. GRANGER. The purport of the amendment is that in case property has been acquired by a farmer or landowner and mineral rights have been reserved by the Federal Government, the owner of the property will have 7 years in which to make application to purchase those mineral rights.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah? There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on the bill H. R. 1188.

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

There was no objection.

GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3409) to establish a new Grand Teton National Park in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. PETERSON. This is the bill, I will say to the distinguished minority leader, that I spoke to him about earlier in the day and which was on the Consent Calendar and which was passed over without prejudice. It works out the old Jackson Hole problem; part of it goes to the forest and part of it goes to the Elk refuge. We would have taken it up sooner in the week, but it was asked to go over without prejudice for a special reason. I have cleared it with the objectors on both the majority and the minority sides.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of including in one national park, for public benefit and enjoyment, the lands within the present Grand Teton National Park and a portion of the lands within the Jackson Hole National Monument, there is hereby established a new "Grand Teton National Park." The park shall comprise, subject to valid existing rights, all of the present Grand Teton National Park and all lands of the Jackson Hole National Monument that are not otherwise expressly provided for in this

act, and an order setting forth the boundaries of the park shall be prepared by the Secretary of the Interior and published in the Federal Register. The national park so established shall, so far as consistent with the provisions of this act, be administered in accordance with the general statutes governing national parks, and shall supersede the present Grand Teton National Park and the Jackson Hole National Monument. The act of February 26, 1929 (45 Stat. 1314), and any other provisions of law heretofore specifically applicable to such present park or monument, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That no further extension or establishment of national parks or monuments in Wyoming may be undertaken except by express authorization of the Congress.

Sec. 2. The following-described lands of the Jackson Hole National Monument are hereby made a part of the National Elk Refuge and shall be administered hereafter in accordance with the laws applicable to said refuge:

SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 42 north, range 116 west: Those portions of sections 24, 25, 26, and 35 lying east of the east right-of-way line of United States Highway No. 187, and lying south and east of the north and west bank of the Gros Ventre River.

Township 42 north, range 115 west: Those portions of sections 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, and 19 lying south and east of the north and west bank of the Gros Ventre River; section 20; section 29, northwest quarter; section 30, north half.

Township 41 north, range 116 west: Entire portion now in Jackson Hole National Monument except that portion in section 2 lying west of the east right-of-way line of United States Highway No. 187.

Containing in all six thousand three hundred and seventy-six acres, more or less.

Sec. 3. The following-described lands of the Jackson Hole National Monument are hereby made a part of the Teton National Forest and shall be administered hereafter in accordance with the laws applicable to said forest:

SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 45 north, range 113 west: Section 21, lot 5; section 22, lots 2 and 6; section 23, lot 3; section 26, lots 2, 3, 6, 7, southwest quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter and southwest quarter southeast quarter; section 27, lots 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, southeast quarter northeast quarter and south half; section 28, lot 1, southeast quarter northeast quarter and east half southeast quarter; section 29, lots 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, southwest quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and north half southwest quarter; section 30, lot 7, south half northeast quarter, north half southeast quarter and southeast quarter southeast quarter; section 31, lots 1 and 2; section 32, lots 2 and 5; section 33, east half northeast quarter and northeast quarter southeast quarter; section 34, north half and north half south half; section 35, north half, containing in all two thousand eight hundred six and thirty-four one-hundredths acres, more or less.

Sec. 4. With respect to those lands that are included by this act within the Grand Teton National Park—

(a) The Secretary of the Interior shall designate and open rights-of-way, including stock driveways, over and across Federal lands within the exterior boundary of the park for the movement of persons and property to or from State and private lands within the exterior boundary of the park and to or from national forest, State, and private lands adjacent to the park. The location and use of such rights-of-way shall be subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior;

(b) all leases, permits, and licenses issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States with respect to the Federal lands within the exterior boundary of the park which are in effect on the date of approval of this act shall continue in effect, subject to compliance with the terms and conditions therein set forth, until terminated in accordance with the provisions thereof;

(c) where any Federal lands included within the park by this act were legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this act for residence or grazing purposes, or for other purposes not inconsistent with the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), pursuant to a lease, permit, or license issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the person so occupying or utilizing such lands, and the heirs, successors, or assigns of such person, shall, upon the termination of such lease, permit, or license, be entitled to have the privileges so possessed or enjoyed by him renewed from time to time, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe, for a period of 25 years from the date of approval of this act, and thereafter during the lifetime of such person and the lifetime of his heirs, successors, or assigns, but only if they were members of his immediate family on such date, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That grazing privileges appurtenant to privately owned lands located within the Grand Teton National Park established by this act shall not be withdrawn until title to lands to which such privileges are appurtenant shall have vested in the United States, except for failure to comply with the regulations applicable thereto after reasonable notice of default: *Provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall apply to any lease, permit, or license for mining purposes or for public accommodations and services or to any occupancy or utilization of lands for purely temporary purposes. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as creating any vested right, title, interest, or estate in or to any Federal lands.

Sec. 5. (a) In order to provide compensation for tax losses sustained as a result of any acquisition by the United States, subsequent to March 15, 1943, of privately owned lands, together with any improvements thereon, located within the exterior boundary of the Grand Teton National Park established by this act, payments shall be made to the State of Wyoming for distribution to the county in which such lands are located in accordance with the following schedule of payments: For the fiscal year in which the land has been or may be acquired and 4 years thereafter there shall be paid an amount equal to the full amount of annual taxes last assessed and levied on the land by public taxing units in such county, less any amount, to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, which may have been paid on account of taxes for any period falling within such fiscal year. For each succeeding fiscal year, until 20 years elapse, there shall be paid on account of such land an amount equal to the full amount of taxes referred to in the preceding sentence, less 5 percent of such full amount for each fiscal year, including the year for which the payment is to be made: *Provided*, That the amount payable under the foregoing schedule for any fiscal year preceding the first full fiscal year following the approval of this act shall not become payable until the end of such first full fiscal year.

(b) As soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year, the amount then due for such fiscal year shall be computed and certified by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That such amount shall not exceed 25 percent of the fees collected during such

fiscal year from visitors to the Grand Teton National Park established by this act and the Yellowstone National Park. Payments made to the State of Wyoming under this section shall be distributed to the county where the lands acquired from private land-owners are located and in such manner as the State of Wyoming may prescribe.

SEC. 6. (a) The Wyoming Game and Fish Commission and the National Park Service shall devise, from technical information and other pertinent data assembled or produced by necessary field studies or investigations conducted jointly by the technical and administrative personnel of the agencies involved, and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Wyoming for their joint approval, a program to insure the permanent conservation of the elk within the Grand Teton National Park established by this act. Such program shall include the controlled reduction of elk in such park, by hunters licensed by the State of Wyoming and deputized as rangers by the Secretary of the Interior, when it is found necessary for the purpose of proper management and protection of the elk.

(b) At least once a year between February 1 and April 1, the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission and the National Park Service shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Governor of Wyoming, for their joint approval, their joint recommendations for the management, protection, and control of the elk for that year. The yearly plan recommended by the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission and the National Park Service shall become effective when approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Wyoming, and thereupon the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission and the Secretary of the Interior shall issue separately, but simultaneously such appropriate orders and regulations as are necessary to carry out those portions of the approved plan that fall within their respective jurisdictions. Such orders and regulations, to be issued by the Secretary of the Interior and the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, shall include provision for controlled and managed reduction by qualified and experienced hunters licensed by the State of Wyoming and deputized as rangers by the Secretary of the Interior, if and when a reduction in the number of elk by this method within the Grand Teton National Park established by this act is required as a part of the approved plan for the year, provided that one elk only may be killed by each such licensed and deputized ranger. Such orders and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior for controlled reduction shall apply only to the lands within the park which lie east of the Snake River and those lands west of Jackson Lake and the Snake River which lie north of the present north boundaries of Grand Teton National Park, but shall not be applicable to lands within the Jackson Hole Wildlife Park. After the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission and the National Park Service shall have recommended to the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Wyoming in any specified year a plan, which has received the joint approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Wyoming, calling for the controlled and managed reduction by the method prescribed herein of the number of elk within the Grand Teton National Park established by this act, and after the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission shall have transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior a list of persons who have elk hunting licenses issued by the State of Wyoming and who are qualified and experienced hunters, on or before July 1 of that year the Secretary of the Interior, without charge, shall cause to be issued orders deputizing the persons whose names appear on such list, in the number specified by the plan, as rangers for the purpose of entering the park and assisting in the controlled re-

duction plan. Each such qualified hunter, deputized as a ranger, participating in the controlled reduction plan shall be permitted to remove from the park the carcass of the elk he has killed as a part of the plan.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept the donation of the following-described lands, which lands, upon acceptance by the United States, shall become a part of the national park:

SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 41 north, range 116 west: Section 3, lots 1 and 2.

Containing seventy-eight and ninety-three one-hundredths acres, more or less.

SEC. 8. All temporary withdrawals of public lands made by Executive order in aid of legislation pertaining to parks, monuments, or recreational areas, adjacent to the Grand Teton National Park as established by this act are hereby revoked.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall affect the use for reclamation purposes, in accordance with the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, of the lands within the exterior boundary of the park as prescribed by this act which have been withdrawn or acquired for reclamation purposes, or the operation, maintenance, rehabilitation, and improvement of the reservoir and other reclamation facilities located on such withdrawn or acquired lands. All provisions of law inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency. The remaining unexpended balance of any funds appropriated for the present Grand Teton National Park and the Jackson Hole National Monument shall be available for expenditure in connection with the administration of the Grand Teton National Park established by this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, line 21, strike out "four" and insert "nine."

Page 6, line 23, after the word "land" insert ", together with any improvements thereon."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC AIRPORT IN OR NEAR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 821) providing for the consideration of S. 456, a bill to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 456) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the

Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 821 makes in order the consideration of the bill, S. 456, to authorize the erection and construction of a new airport in or in the immediate vicinity of the District of Columbia.

The bill will be discussed at length. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, and for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it has just been called to my attention that the Portland Journal, published in my congressional district, in its issue of August 21 carried the following news item:

Portland is not getting a single pound of military cargo for the Korean front and apparently Representative HOMER D. ANGELL, of the Third Congressional District, isn't doing anything about it, Carl C. Donaugh, his Democratic opponent, declared today.

Donaugh said the fact that Puget Sound and San Francisco Bay area ports are being used to capacity "clearly indicates that ANGELL is asleep on the job and totally ineffective."

He pointed out as "strange and absurd" the fact that Victory ships taken from the mothball fleet at Astoria and reconditioned here in record time have sailed empty to other west-coast ports to load. Donaugh said no general cargo dock in Portland is filled or is being used to more than 10 percent of capacity, leaving the way wide open for Portland to handle military cargo.

On the other hand, he said, Puget Sound and bay area facilities are being used beyond facilities, with the result that commercial ships are suffering costly delays.

"If the load becomes too heavy, the Army then will consider Portland," Donaugh said. "In other words, the Columbia River and the port of Portland are last on the list."

Donaugh called attention to the fact that local dock officials have made presentations to military transport authorities in an effort to get cargo but have been unsuccessful. He said he plans to fight to place the State, region, and port on the map.

Mr. Donaugh is a reputable citizen of Portland and has been for many years active in the work of the Democratic Party in my State and for some 8 years was United States district attorney. I do not believe, as intimated in this news release, attributed to Mr. Donaugh, that the Democratic administration in control of the military affairs of our Nation, for ulterior or political reasons is discriminating against the port of Portland in the Columbia River area.

I am not concerned with Mr. Donough's charge that I have been derelict in my duty as the record of my extended activities speaks for itself in demanding from the military authorities that so far as possible the full use of the port of Portland facilities in the Columbia River be utilized. Both Senator MORSE and Senator CORDON have been particularly active also in urging upon the military authorities the use of the Columbia River port facilities and they and I have left nothing undone in our efforts to secure use of these facilities for all cargo available for shipment.

As for my own activities, as soon as the problem was brought to my attention, I took it up with Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation; Hon. Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force; Hon. Francis P. Matthews, Secretary of the Navy; Hon. Frank Pace, Jr., Secretary of the Army; and Rear Admiral W. M. Callaghan, commander of Military Sea Transportation Service, and I received from these officials the following replies:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, August 8, 1950.
The Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANGELL: In your letter of July 26, 1950, you point out to me the ship-repair facilities and manpower available in the Portland, Oreg., area and advise me that the people in your district and the whole Columbia River area are most anxious to assist in the war effort.

You are no doubt aware that a number of merchant ships from the Maritime Administration's reserve fleets have already been reconditioned in the Portland area and that there are presently ships in this area undergoing reconditioning. The number of ships that will be assigned in the future will largely depend on the areas from which the ships will come and the types to be withdrawn.

In carrying forward the work of reconditioning of these ships every effort is being made to disperse the work as widely as possible to areas and to companies having adequate facilities to prosecute the work promptly. To date the work performed in the Portland area has been very satisfactory and that area will continue to receive every consideration in future allocations of this work.

Sincerely yours,
PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Under Secretary for Transportation.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, August 2, 1950.
Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: May we acknowledge your letter of July 31 concerning use of the Columbia River port facilities.

We will look into this problem and will be pleased to furnish you with any available information. You may expect to hear further in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
M. A. MOORE,
Lieutenant Colonel,
United States Air Force,
Assistant Executive.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, August 18, 1950.
Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: I refer again to your letter of July 31, 1950, concerning use of the Columbia River port facilities.

Current directives have placed the responsibility for ocean shipping with the Department of the Navy and the operation of continental ports of embarkation with the Department of the Army. Therefore, the Department of the Air Force does not have any direct jurisdiction in the selection of port facilities to be used.

I appreciate your interest in this matter.
Sincerely yours,
EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, August 10, 1950.
Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANGELL: This is in reply to your letter of July 31, 1950, urging that the facilities and manpower of Portland and the Columbia River area be utilized to the greatest extent during the present Korean conflict.

A recent survey of the improved port facilities made by the Navy Department disclosed that, in respect to such items as wharfage, warehouse space, crane facilities, controlling depth of water, availability of manpower, etc., the port facilities at Portland are indeed in very good condition. You and your constituents may be assured that if the United States Navy has not in recent months made extensive use of the port, it is not because of any deficiencies in either equipment or morale in that area.

The substance of the freight situation at Portland, with respect to the Korean operations, is that the large bulk of the overseas shipments made by the Navy have been in fulfillment of Army and Air Force requirements. Apparently the tonnages generated by these shipments have originated from Army and Air Force sources in local areas near ports other than those of the Oregon coast. When acting as the overseas carrier for Army and Air Force freight, it is our general policy to spot the shipping at the places requested by those services.

With respect to Navy freight, we do not at this time have any great quantity of outbound tonnage which is generated in or near your area. You may be sure we shall not overlook Portland and the Columbia River area in our general shipping planning.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN T. KOEHLER,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
LEGISLATIVE LIAISON,
Washington, D. C., August 11, 1950.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: Further reference is made to your letter of July 31, 1950, regarding the availability for military use of the facilities of the port of Portland, Oreg.

I have looked into this matter and find that on the basis of anticipated Army cargo loads that a requirement for the continued use of facilities in the Portland area is not anticipated at this time. However, I am glad to inform you that the Department of Army has in the past and is still using the port of Portland for the shipment overseas of Army responsible cargo. The records of the Department indicate that 69,000 tons of Army responsible cargo were moved over the terminals in Portland during the past 3 months.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated and you may be assured that every consideration will be given to the use of additional facilities at Portland in the event that an increase in outloading capacity in that geographic area is required in connection with the movement of Army cargo.

Sincerely yours,
T. A. YOUNG,
Assistant to the Chief of Legislative Liaison.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1950.
Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANGELL: Your letter of July 26, 1950, in which you enclosed a copy of a resolution entered into by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Local 8, Portland, is acknowledged with great appreciation. It is gratifying to note the interest of these parties in the problems faced by the military services under the present unusual circumstances.

However, it may be of interest to you to know that the military sea transportation service has, as a carrier, little or no voice in the matter in which ports and longshoremen services will be utilized by the military services. Such decisions are made by the shipper services—Army, Navy, and Air Force—and such other governmental agencies as are authorized to utilize the military sea transportation service.

I trust this will satisfactorily inform you of my position in the matters of port utilization and longshoremen employment. Should you desire any further information I shall be only too glad to serve you.

Sincerely yours,
W. M. CALLAGHAN,
Rear Admiral, U. S. N., Commander,
Military Sea Transportation Service.

Mr. Donough apparently does not read the Portland Journal and Oregonian. The following articles with reference to my activities on behalf of the utilization of the port of Portland appeared in these publications July 27 and 28, respectively:

[From the Portland Journal of July 27, 1950]

PORTLAND SHIPYARD USE URGED BY ANGELL
WASHINGTON, July 27.—Use of port and shipyard facilities in the Portland area in the war effort was urged by Representative HOMER D. ANGELL.

ANGELL, in letters to Defense and Commerce Department officials, said he spoke "in behalf of the people in my district and the whole Columbia River area who are most anxious to assist in the war effort."

ANGELL told Rear Adm. W. M. Callaghan, Commander of the Military Sea Transportation Service, that ports at Portland and along the Columbia "are equipped and available for service" in shipment of military supplies, and there is an ample supply of longshoremen available for the work.

In a letter to Under Secretary of Commerce Philip B. Fleming, who heads the Department's Transportation Division, ANGELL said the port of Portland not only was available for shipping services, but "has many facilities for reconditioning of laid-up ships, many of which are in that area, including those mothballed at Astoria."

The Congressman told Fleming, Portland shipyards performed outstanding service in World War II and "our ship-construction industry stands ready again to perform a like service."

[From the Portland Oregonian of July 28, 1950]

USE OF PORTLAND URGED BY ANGELL
WASHINGTON, July 28.—Representative HOMER ANGELL, Republican, Oregon, urged Government officials Thursday to use the port of Portland, Oreg., in shipping war supplies to Korea and in reconditioning ships of the laid-up fleet.

He wrote Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, and Rear Adm. W. M. Callaghan, Chief of the Military Sea Transportation Service,

that there is an ample force of longshoremen available in Portland to load the ships.

He also said the port is equipped to recon-dition ships such as those laid up at Astoria.

Harold Say, representative of the Port-land Chamber of Commerce here in the Capital, has been doing an excellent job in bringing to the attention of all officials the available port facilities in the Columbia River area and urging upon Government agencies involved the use of these facilities to the fullest extent possible. In conjunction with Sen-ators CORDON and MORSE I have cooper-ated with Mr. Say in this and other Oregon problems. The information we all get from the military authorities is that for many years military depots have been established at Seattle, San Francisco, and San Diego and not at Portland and most of the cargo having to do with military operations is stored in or is being sent to those military depots and is shipped from those depots over-seas as needed. That is the major rea-son why the port of Portland does not participate more fully in the shipment of war cargo. Military authorities utilize port and shipping facilities available at the nearest port to the cargo to be shipped. It naturally follows as a result that the port of Portland received only a small percentage of military shipments going from Pacific coast ports, not being adjacent to a military depot.

As the correspondence I have set forth shows, together with the personal assur-ances to me and the other Members of the Oregon delegation from military au-thorities, the port of Portland is not being discriminated against for political reasons but will be used to the fullest extent possible when cargo is available.

EXPANDED MEDICAL RESEARCH IS ESSENTIAL TO THE PROTECTION OF THE NATION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-marks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that public health is one of our foremost instruments of national defense. With the threat of war hovering over our heads, it is foolhardy even to consider the slightest curtailment of any service or project which is directed toward preventing disease and promoting health. More than ever, in a period of national emergency, it is essential that we press forward to more gains against the ravages of sickness. More than ever, it is mandatory that we intensify our efforts to learn more about the causes and the treatments of those disabling conditions which sap our national en-ergy.

No international upheaval can obscure the grim fact that cancer is as great a killer as war. We cannot hide from the fact that we have in this country today, nearly 9,000,000 people who are mentally sick. We have got to recognize the fact that a significant part of our population today suffers from rheumatism, arthri-tis, cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, and other crippling conditions which make the victims a burden to themselves and

their families and which either seriously limit or, indeed, completely eliminate their productivity to society.

We have made great strides in recent years toward improving health. Are we now—because we are confronted with a national emergency—going to let up on our efforts? Are we going to move back-ward in our fight against illness, to sacri-fice the gains we have made? Are we, for example, to let go by the board the work with ACTH and cortisone right on the eve of what may well be the most important medical discovery of our gen-eration? Are we to go on having these wonder drugs reserved entirely for those who can afford to pay \$90 for less than a 10-day supply? Are we going to let down the barriers which have been built—and built effectively over the years—to assure pure food and pure drugs to our people? Are we going to turn our backs and shut our eyes to the threats and ravages of venereal disease now that we have complete control of these diseases almost within our grasp?

These are only a few of the considera-tions which any conscientious Repre-sentative of the people should ponder when the suggestion is made to reduce our expenditures for health by 10 per-cent or more. Thoughtful consideration of these facts leads only to the conclu-sion that far from curtailing health ex-penditures, we should be extending them to keep our country strong against the enemies within, and strong to fight communism—our enemy outside.

I am convinced that we should expand our basic medical research. I believe that we should concentrate on the devel-opment and training of medical research scientists. I am convinced that we should spend a great deal more Federal money on the construction of medical research facilities.

Do some of you think that this is not the time for this country to spend more money on such activities? Medical re-search is the only means we have for re-ducing the growing Federal burden of medical care costs which now exceed \$1,-000,000,000 a year. Think of what re-search might accomplish in even a 10-per-cent reduction in Federal and State medical health expenditures—a savings of \$45,000,000 per year in taxes.

There is no question but that medical research on a vast scale is now neces-sary as a precaution against the possi-bility of war. We will need it to protect us against bacteriological warfare, to provide treatment for burns and radia-tion illnesses, to combat tropical dis-eases, to deal with such physical prob-lems as high-speed, high-altitude flight, to name only a few.

We cannot build the medical research force required for our national defense, and build it in time, before the emergen-cy hits, unless we establish many more research facilities, and unless we train many more medical scientists than we have at present. Our situation at the moment is not good. Our medical re-search plants are inadequate. We have far too few medical scientists. Our med-ical research structure is too concen-trated—as witness the fact that half of all medical school research is done in 10 institutions.

We talk constantly today about na-tional defense—and, indeed, we must. A fact that seems to escape some of us, however, is that medical research is de-fense research. Cancer radiation re-search, for example, is atomic bomb cas-ualty research. Heart research on fluid balance in the body is burn casualty re-search. Basic research on the endocrine system is research on stress in battle. Mental health research on mass hysteria is research on war panic. Basic research on microbes and viruses is research on bacteriological warfare protection. Training medical research scientists pro-vides a backlog of trained people for war research.

The proposals that have been made to reduce expenditures for medical re-search and for health services completely overlook the enormous price that illness exacts from our economy. Indeed, these proposals can well give aid and comfort to the enemy. They ignore the fact, for example, that one out of every two peo-ple who die from natural causes die from heart disease—that 9,000,000 in this country today are suffering from heart disease. They ignore the awful truth that unless great advances are made in research and treatment, 1,000,000 people will die from cancer in the next 5 years. They likewise ignore the fact that more than half of all complaints seen by doc-tors are due to emotional disorders.

These are but a few examples of the cost of illness. Let us take a quick look at the financial side of the picture. Each year, diseases of the heart and the circ-ulatory system cost this country \$846,000,-000. The costs of cancer run into the billions. The cost of patient care in mental hospitals exceeds \$500,000,000 an-nually. Alcoholism costs the Nation a total of \$726,000,000 a year. The Ameri-can Dental Association has estimated that the American people spend a total of nearly \$1,000,000,000 a year for dental care and treatment—much of it pre-ventable.

Frankly, I am convinced it is our re-sponsibility at this time to accelerate the fight against disease. In my opinion, it is vital that we bear down and bear down hard on the three greatest cripplers of our age—cancer, mental illness, and heart disease. And to that list, I would add dental care.

Do we dare shirk our obligation to save those lives that can be saved if can-cer were discovered early enough to per-mit treatment; if new methods of treat-ment were developed; if the basic cause of cancer were discovered; if more prac-ticing physicians were better trained in cancer diagnosis and treatment? I know it is a responsibility to which I cannot close my eyes.

But the curse of cancer will never be lifted until we have expanded our sci-entific research, until we bring into can-cer research more scientists with new slants, until we have developed efficient diagnostic tests for cancer which can be applied to the whole population in mass screenings, until we have more labora-tories, and well-equipped laboratories.

In short, what we need is more—not less—money for research. To win the battle over cancer we must increase grants for research projects, we must in-

crease grants for research construction, and we must augment the training and fellowship program.

Now, what about heart disease? Everyone here knows that heart disease causes more deaths than any other form of illness. And the number of deaths from heart disease is constantly moving upward. I ask you, Is it rational to cut back our expenditures for the one thing—the only thing to which we can look for relief from this scourge? Again, we need to spend more, not less, money for more research into the basic causes of heart disease, for better methods of treatment and for new cures. We need more laboratories to carry out heart-disease research, and we need more scientists to conduct those investigations.

Does anyone believe that we can afford the expenditure of life and productivity that we are assessed by these diseases? Faced as we are with a national emergency, dare we waste the productivity of millions of our people? Each year, cancer and heart disease alone literally rape our economy of the unpurchasable and invaluable contributions of leaders in every vital field.

There is no question that even with the limited knowledge now at hand, unnumbered lives could be spared if teaching of cardiovascular subjects could be improved in medical schools and colleges, if we had more heart specialists, and if our control activities were expanded sufficiently to apply what is already known for the benefit of heart-disease sufferers.

The gravity of the mental-health problem speaks for itself. One is appalled, first by the extent of mental illness, and second, by the paucity of our efforts to learn the causes and the cure of mental illness, or, even indeed, to apply the treatment methods we already know. Today, we are spending less than \$3,000,000 a year for research into the mental diseases. We have only a third of the needed number of psychiatrists, and only a small fraction of the psychiatric nurses. The 600 community mental health clinics in the country should, at the very least, be tripled.

Let us take a look at what the Federal Government spends on mental illness alone in veterans' hospitals. In 1947 veterans' neuropsychiatric hospitals cost some \$96,000,000 to operate. In 1949 they cost nearly \$125,000,000—mostly because of the increase in patients. An actuarial study by the Metropolitan Insurance Co., made for the Hoover Commission task force on medical services, states that whereas in 1948 there were about 100,000 veteran hospital beds—about one-half for the mentally ill—that by 1975, even though non-service-connected veterans would be cared for only in case of chronic illness, 250,000 beds would be required, and that three-fourths of these would be for mental illness.

True, these are astounding figures. But we must remember, they are estimates made before the present emergency. Now, with the need for larger and larger Armed Forces, I would venture the number of needed veterans' beds for mental illness will go up by hundreds of thousands.

It is a truism that we cannot hope to get even a toehold on the problem of mental disorder until we have strengthened research into mental disease, until we have strengthened our mental health training program, and until we have established adequate control activities and services. And all of this takes money.

I want to call your attention to the statement of the Hoover Commission whose purpose, you will remember, was to cut governmental expenditures. The Commission stated—and I quote:

Transcending in importance any of our other recommendations, is the need to outflank disease by giving the highest priority to research, preventive medicine, public health, and education.

Federal medicine has, to a large extent, developed negatively with patient care as its principal function.

First it is the need for maximum employment of present scientific knowledge to control disease (training of personnel). But beyond application of present knowledge lies research to find new weapons.

It is (also) imperative to maintain constantly a high level of medical research activity as a protection to us in war. Such research must be stimulated and supported to the extent which may prove necessary, to the maximum potential of the skilled manpower available to conduct it.

Only a faint start has been made toward solving the fundamental causes and problems of dental disease. As I said earlier, the Nation's dental bill is approximately \$1,000,000,000 a year. Expenditures for dental research are rather less than \$1,000,000 annually, and this despite the fact that dental diseases and defects are almost universal. If we will but give thoughtful attention to the problem of dental disease, we will see the need for and the advantage to be gained by building our dental research program. Moreover, by building such a program we will equip ourselves to overcome the record of the last war when dental defects were found to be one of the greatest causes of rejection for military service.

I cannot plead too earnestly for an understanding of the vital importance of strengthened research in these areas I have mentioned. With the threat of war hovering over our heads, our attention cannot fail to turn to the shocking surprises which confronted us in the selective service rejections of the last war. That almost 5,000,000 young men were found to be unsuited for military service seemed, at the time, to be unbelievable. Yet, that was the case, and we certainly have no reason to believe the situation has changed.

I feel strongly that medical and related research bears upon medical problems of national defense, whether civilian or military. I ask that our medical scientists be used fully to permit the most productive division of effort between the solution of specific problems and the pursuit of the broader unknowns. And I likewise urge a reasonable expansion of the presently limited number of highly trained research scientists, and a reasonable expansion of the facilities in which they must work. I urge this consideration for the research program of the Public Health Service, and, no less, for the essential medical research undertakings of such other or-

ganizations as the Food and Drug Administration, the Armed Forces, the Veterans' Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

World War II gave us a dramatic demonstration of the role basic and applied investigations play in saving the lives of fighting men, in protecting the health of soldiers in camps, and in lifting the productivity of the defense production labor force. Dr. Vannevar Bush, renowned director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, has this to say concerning medical research in wartime:

For all its horror, there were bright spots in the last war, and the brightest was the record of medical men and those in the Allied sciences who supported them. With sulfa drugs, penicillin, blood plasma, and advanced surgery, the mortality among the wounded was brought so low that the chances of survival of the wounded men who reached a front-line dressing station were extraordinarily high.

As one can well realize, these applications of medical research to the urgent needs of a nation at war did not spring full grown from the minds of the scientists who went to work intensively upon specific problems in 1941. It was in 1929 that penicillin was discovered in the course of systematic studies of molds. Plasma and other blood fractions and substitutes grew out of basic physiological studies and of explorations in the areas of biophysics and biochemistry. Sulfa drugs were an offshoot of chemical research in the dye industry.

Fresh in the memory of everyone of us is that time—only a few years ago—when even a small supply of penicillin and aureomycin were worth a king's ransom. I remember so well the case of a young doctor who, although he lost his wife, faced a drug bill of \$10,000 in efforts to save her. While these drugs even today cost more than they should, mass production has brought down the cost considerably.

What has happened to penicillin and aureomycin must happen also to such other drug products as cortisone and ACTH. Some way must be found to make all drugs that are useful in the treatment of disease available to all the people of this Nation. Penicillin is now fully available because Government assisted industry—in making mass quantities available quickly—first for the Armed Forces and then for the civilian population. It may be that Government will have to again assist industry to produce the new wonder drugs cheaply and in mass quantity. As a final resort, it may be that the Government will have to assume responsibility for their production or for their synthesis. But, I repeat, we must develop and develop rapidly the means to put all of the health restoring products of research within every reach, unqualified by the presence or the lack of wealth.

A few days ago there came to my attention an article, which appeared in the British Medical Journal (July 29) on the use of cortisone in the treatment of burns. Three Canadian scientists have reported that the number of deaths from burns can be cut in half if cortisone is given along with treatment for shock during the first critical days after

the burns. But of what value is this tremendously important discovery if cortisone continues to be so scarce and so expensive? What good would this knowledge be, for example, if just five average American cities were bombed and the conservative estimate of 100,000 persons were seriously burned?

If we are to obtain the best possible results of medical research, we must plan that research with the same care to short-run and long-run factors that is given to weapons development, to economic preparedness and control and to manpower mobilization.

In making for increased Federal support of medical research, I do not for a moment propose that private sources of support should be neglected. It is, however, vitally important that the support for research be diversified. The major private health organizations of the Nation support expanded Federal aid to medical research. Their goals—prevention and control of specific diseases and groups of diseases—are aided by Federal support for research in non-Federal institutions.

Let me summarize quickly. Expanded medical research is essential to the protection of the Nation. Expanded medical research is the means of cutting Federal expenditures.

Over the last few years we have heard more and more about prepaid medical care. Methods of making care available to our people, of course, differ just as do opinions on the various methods, both existent and proposed. No one wants more than I to get ever better medical care to every American. More and more I am convinced, however, that research takes precedence over care. And I believe it because, in a way, research is affirmative, care—negative. Research can lead us to the prevention of disease. Medical care is locking the barn after the horse is stolen.

In the early years of every recent war, we have been faced with depressing examples of critical shortages. Please, let us not make that mistake again. Why should we, when logic is so clear and when advice from the best qualified sources is unanimous, make a mistake by failing to expand medical research? Need we, with our eyes open, invite a scientific Pearl Harbor when the other course of action is clear?

If we are to have peace, failure to expand medical research now will prove to be wasteful and cruel. If we have war, failure to expand medical research now will prove to be a blunder that will weigh heavily upon the conscience of all of us, and heavily upon our national budget.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 456) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and

maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 456, with Mr. MURDOCK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], is entitled to recognition for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], for 30 minutes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate bill which is before us, S. 456, provides for the construction of a new airport for the area of the District of Columbia. Hearings were held on the bill in our committee. This bill has passed the Senate; it passed unanimously. It passed the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as I recall, unanimously. Certainly I do not recall that any of our members opposed it. It is a question that has been looked into with considerable care.

In the opinion of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce there is a very definite need for another airport in addition to the one we already have for the city of Washington and the District of Columbia. Let me say at this juncture that the House bill was introduced by our colleague, one of the ranking members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], who also has had many years experience as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. The fact that he feels it is needed, in my opinion, adds much weight to the evidence that this is a meritorious airport.

The present airport was placed in operation in 1941. There has been a very great growth in aviation in this particular area; as a matter of fact, the Washington National Airport, next to two others, accommodates the most traffic of any airport in the United States. The other two are LaGuardia Field, New York, and the Chicago Municipal Airport. It does have a tremendous amount of traffic at this time.

The limiting factor as to the amount of traffic an airport can handle is the amount it can accommodate in bad weather. It is our understanding that today one flight about every 2 minutes can be accommodated in bad weather or instrument flying weather, in other words, about 30 flights an hour. The airport is already overburdened in bad weather, the committee was told. I believe the record shows in the last year more than 600 hours were lost by airlines having to fly over the city of Washington in bad weather while waiting to land. This cost the airlines some \$2,500,000.

I know the contention is made that we should use other airports in this area, Bolling Field and Anacostia, but it has been represented to the committee that

because of the peculiar situation here in the Washington area the neck, so to speak, that space within which planes must fly to and from the Washington Airport, that because of the smallness of this neck, its narrowness, even though Bolling and Anacostia were not used there would still be need for another airport. I am happy to say that Mr. Rentzel of the CAA, and officials of the Air Corps, including the Secretary of the Air Corps, Mr. Finletter, have been working together trying to decrease the amount of training flying that takes place in this area and the amount of military flying that takes place in the area with the thought that safe conditions thereby can be provided. As a matter of fact I have a letter written August 14, 1950, by Secretary Finletter to Mr. Rentzel which bears directly on this subject, and I am convinced that already progress is being made along this line. I include the letter here:

AUGUST 14, 1950.

Mr. D. W. RENTZEL,

Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RENTZEL: The problem of air traffic in the Washington area is a matter of great concern to the Civil Aeronautics Administration and to the Air Force. We are in agreement that the best solution to this problem must await the completion of a new civil airport. Meanwhile, the Air Force has cooperated with your Administration to the end that civil air operations may proceed with minimum interruption and maximum safety. With this in mind, I thought it would be helpful if I would enumerate a few of the things which we have done in this direction.

The Air Force intends that only the minimum essential military air operations be conducted in the Washington area and that this activity be concentrated at Andrews Field to the maximum practicable extent. Flying activities which must be performed in this area will be accomplished under conditions which provide maximum safety of flight to all aircraft. Within the limitations of facilities available to the Air Force, our operations are performed in accordance with procedures designed to prevent interference or delay to civil aircraft.

In order to increase the dispersion of air traffic in this area, the Air Force has moved as much of its flying activities from Bolling Field to Andrews Field as facilities at that station permit. Forty percent of the individual pilot training formerly done at Bolling Field is now accomplished at Andrews Field. Local flying has been prohibited when weather conditions are less than 2,000 feet ceiling with 6 miles visibility. The Air Traffic Controller for the Washington area has been authorized to direct incoming Bolling Field traffic to Andrews Field when flying conditions in the area require. Modern radar traffic control and instrument approach equipment is available at Andrews Field. Instrument landings are not permitted at Bolling Field. Except for radar-controlled approaches at Andrews Field, no instrument flying practice is permitted by Air Force personnel within 25 miles of Washington.

On July 22, 1949, the Washington Air Traffic Control Committee, on which the Air Force has representation, was formally established for the purpose of insuring continuing coordination of air traffic control in the Washington area. Effective coordination of traffic control has been facilitated by the installation of an interphone system between the control towers at Bolling, Andrews, Anacostia, and Washington National Airport.

Since our recent conversation on this subject, I have required a thorough examination to be sure that we are taking all practicable measures to aid in this problem. As a result, we have now prohibited all transient Air Force flights into the Washington area except those participating in essential Air Force business. Unit training will not be conducted at Bolling Field and has been reduced to a minimum at Andrews. All Reserve flying training has been eliminated at Bolling Field. Air representatives of foreign countries stationed in Washington who have, in the past, been permitted to fly from Bolling Field have now been changed to Andrews Field. It is our intention to move more of our operations to Andrews Field as rapidly as additional housing and other facilities can be acquired. Any suggestions you may have of additional steps the Air Force could take to be of assistance will be welcome.

Greater dispersion of air traffic in the area is desirable. It is my hope that this letter will assure you that the Air Force is cooperating fully in that direction. The long-range answer to the air traffic problem in this area lies in the program of your Administration to provide a new civil airport for the national Capitol.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS K. FINLETTER.

It is my information definite progress can be expected to be made as between the civil aviation authorities and the military and naval authorities of our Government to the end fewer military flights will take place in close proximity to the National Airport. This will be conducive to more safety especially if training flights are decreased.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. In view of the fact that the gentleman has talked with both Mr. Rentzel, of the CAA, and Mr. Finletter, I should like to ask the gentleman why they are closing such a large number of small airports in small towns throughout the United States. There is a policy on of closing them. In view of the fact the gentleman insists they are not going to train men in this area, why are they closing these small airports? Can the gentleman give us any information on that?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No, I cannot give the gentleman any information on that. That was not discussed before our committee. I am speaking of the Washington area. The reason we have insisted that flying of a training nature and of a military nature on Bolling Field and Anacostia be removed to the degree possible is because we feel it is a hazard in connection with the safety of those civilians that are flying—many in the same plane—in and out of the National Airport.

Mr. EVINS. Does the gentleman consider this legislation as defense legislation?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I think all persons know that with the emergency such as we now have, flying into the general area of Washington will doubtless increase. As it increases it will continue to burden the facilities that we now have, and, in my opinion, it is conducive to the welfare at least indirectly of our defense efforts.

Mr. EVINS. Therefore, it is considered very essential at this time?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It certainly is my opinion it is essential at this time.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of loss of flying time due to bad weather at the National Airport. Can the gentleman tell us how much flying time is lost at other comparable airports in the country, how the loss of time at other airports compares with this airport?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do not have any figures on that, but I may say that cities like New York, instead of having one single airport, have two airports. Idlewild was brought into being for the purpose, I assume, of preventing that kind of situation. There are more cities than New York that have what might be considered a system of airports rather than just one airport. Aside from the flying time that is lost, the important thing for the committee to keep in mind is that this additional airport is badly needed from the standpoint of assuring safety for flying in this particular area. Any person knows when you have planes flying around, stacked, in bad weather, you definitely are jeopardizing at least to some extent the lives of people who happen to be in those planes. Already we have a situation here in the District of Columbia area that at times is overcrowded. We all know that aviation in this area is growing rapidly. As I recall, it is anticipated that within the next 4 or 5 years there may be expected as much as a 40- to 60-percent growth in the number of flights into this area.

May I say further under the present situation at National Airport, very little freight can be brought into the airport. It is expected if aviation continues to develop there will be a lot more traffic in air freight in this area and with the condition as it is, the airport cannot accommodate a great expansion.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. The gentleman from Texas stated that it is his opinion the proposed airfield will lend itself to the national defense.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Certainly indirectly.

Mr. SASSCER. I think that is the crux of the issue today, the extent to which it lends itself to the national defense. The question I would like to ask the gentleman is this: Insofar as the national defense is concerned, would not be an airfield of the continental type be sufficient for national defense in contrast with the proposed vast international airfield? The reason I ask that is defense fighters and interceptors that go from land and fly from a field could use what in the trade is known as a field of the continental type.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do not pretend to be an authority on how Washington would be defended during a period of

serious trouble. When I say it will be conducive to the national defense I say that because unquestionably flying into this area will increase, particularly if we get into more trouble than we are already in. We already have facilities that are overburdened. Our civil aviation facilities are overburdened. To the extent it would relieve that burden the building of this additional airport would help, generally speaking, in our effort to take care of all aviation in this area.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact this proposal is brought to the Congress in an effort to increase the facilities for commercial aviation which have grown beyond the point that the National Airport can at this time take care of?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Exactly right.

Mr. HARRIS. This is not a matter of national defense, only the fact there will be some indirect advantages should it be used or needed at some time because our commercial aviation in one way or another does have a relationship with the national defense. But this is primarily to relieve the congested conditions which have resulted at the National Airport, in order that flights may come in and go out in accordance with schedule and serve the area involved?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is exactly right. With reference to the fact there is some military aviation carried on at the National Airport, each of you is aware of the fact it does even at this time accommodate some military flights and some military planes.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. Can the gentleman tell us about what the approximate cost of this legislation is?

Mr. BECKWORTH. This bill authorizes an appropriation of \$14,000,000.

Mr. REES. That is to buy the land?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is to buy the land and to build what might be termed "runways"—the airport itself. It is thought that thereafter, of course, buildings will be built and leased, or arrangements made concerning those buildings, and it was felt and so testified that the airport would be self-sustaining from there on. Of course, nobody can guarantee that. I am not standing here guaranteeing that, but that will be the purpose of the Director of Civil Aviation, Mr. Rentzel.

Mr. REES. Is that the general policy of the Government with respect to the larger airports throughout the country, to buy the land and equipment?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Of course, when the gentleman says general policy, I want to comment that the airport in Washington is not what might be termed a "general airport" situation. For example, if you build an airport in Kansas, doubtless the municipality or the county will contribute some money or land or both up to a given percentage of the

total value of the airport. That particular airport will be run by the given municipality or by the given county unit. That is not true with reference to an airport here for the District of Columbia, because it is a Federal undertaking in its entirety. It is the policy, I might say, for the CAA to undertake to make these airports just as self-sustaining as possible. As a matter of fact, it was testified before our committee that the National Airport itself is about self-sustaining at this time.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the area is already now overcrowded with planes?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I said that the bottleneck situation, or the neck situation is such that the area that relates to the National Airport can accommodate little, if any, additional traffic particularly in bad weather which is the real test of the adequacy of an airport. That is as I understand the testimony to be. That would not be true, I might say, with reference to the several areas, and I think there are about five of them that are being considered, as likely and possible places for construction or the placement of the airport.

Mr. FALLON. Have you selected a new site for the airport?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No; that has not been done.

Mr. FALLON. Will it be in the same area?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do not think anybody knows exactly. Certainly, if it is a known fact, I am not aware of it, as to exactly where the airport will be. I will answer that the committee was invited by the CAA to fly over five sites, and all of them doubtless will be considered. That will be something for the CAA, along with the people concerned, to work out finally and ultimately.

Mr. FALLON. Did the committee discuss just what distance would be a safe distance to locate this airport from the present airport?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It would be assumed, as a matter of fact, that the CAA definitely would consider safety first. That is the prime consideration.

Mr. FALLON. Has distance been discussed as to the safety feature?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No particular distance was cited as being the unsafe distance or the safe distance, but it would be inconceivable, I might say that the CAA, with the unusual amount of knowledge and information they should possess, would place it at a location that would be unsafe. That would be a prime requisite that would be taken into consideration by the CAA, in my opinion, and it was the testimony of Mr. Rentzell that that would be the important consideration—safety.

Mr. FALLON. Does the gentleman know whether or not the new International Friendship Airport in Maryland has been taken into consideration as an alternate to the Washington Airport?

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman will state this about that airport, that very definitely we had testimony from the

officials of the State of Maryland and from the officials of the city of Baltimore with reference to the Friendship Airport. It was discussed and we considered it fully; it was finally felt that that is not the answer to the problem of Washington at this time. It is hoped that the airport will be used to the fullest degree possible, but it is not an answer to the problem confronting us here at this time.

Mr. FALLON. Does not the gentleman feel that if another airport was put close to the Washington Airport that it would further crowd the area and make flying more dangerous?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I repeat what I said a moment ago that I would assume the CAA definitely—and they say that can be done—will place the airport in such a location that it would not be conducive to unsafety.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. In the presentation before the gentleman's committee with regard to the location of the airport, was there any testimony concerning the Maryland fog?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I believe I recall one of the witnesses in discussing the Friendship Airport said that studies had been made with reference to fog at that airport and that it is an unusually clear area. I recall that kind of testimony, I feel sure.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke about a network of airports around the larger centers of population. Is there a network of airports around the city of Chicago, which is much larger than Washington?

Mr. BECKWORTH. As I understand, Chicago does have a municipal airport, and I think I have heard, though I am not aware of it personally, but I think I am aware that Chicago has built or is building another airport.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. They do have another airport under construction. They found that the present airport there, which is larger than this one here, accommodates more flights in and out, but is not sufficient to properly handle the traffic in and out, and they have another one under construction. They found it was necessary to have an alternate airport.

Mr. GROSS. That is a city four times as large, and how much is the Government spending there?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman give the committee any information as to the percentage of the flights at the National Airport which are military, and if they were all moved out to Andrews Field, would that be of material benefit?

Mr. BECKWORTH. The percentage is very small, as I recall—not more than about 5 percent. I might say to the gentleman from Nebraska that is exactly what the committee has been insisting with all its might be done, to reduce the number of military flights into this particular area where there is so much activity in civil aviation; and, if I may say so, I have personally taken an interest in that very thing.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman indicated that it is not necessary for national defense? Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I did not say it was not necessary for national defense. I said at least indirectly it will help this area, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman used some figures. What was the over-all cost?

Mr. BECKWORTH. This bill provides \$14,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that the over-all cost? Does that include administration costs?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No. I think that is just for the purchase of land and for the runways.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the gentleman give us any figures on the maintenance?

Mr. BECKWORTH. As I stated a moment ago, it is hoped that after the airport is built from then on the buildings and facilities can be built in such a way that they can be amortized and paid. But, as I said, that cannot be guaranteed. I think the gentleman knows that as well as anybody.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman ought to study that question. There is no airport in the entire United States, except one or two, that is self-sustaining. This airport will be purchased by the Government and it will be operated by the Government.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Texas, in order that he may answer the questions.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that the Government does not operate airports, except the National Washington Airport, which is the only one.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I pointed that out.

Mr. STEFAN. They operate it at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States. The CAA Administrator himself is not so favorable to the Government going into the airport business. They hope that at some time some Government corporation can take over the operation of the airport. There are some airports in Alaska that the Government is presently building and will operate. If you continue to authorize and appropriate money for the construction of airports to be operated at the sole expense of the taxpayers, you are going a long way toward breaking up the orderly Federal airport program through which we give the States a grant of 50 percent on the land and 25 percent on the buildings. I think this matter should be given

serious study before coming to a definite conclusion.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can emphasize too strongly the splendid service that has been rendered by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], in the preparation of this legislation. He has been patient and indulgent in directing the work of the committee to obtain all worthwhile and necessary facts. The bill comes before the House after very careful consideration by the subcommittee and by the full committee. It is my recollection it was reported unanimously. There is no phase of the situation, which I know of, which was not gone into very carefully and fully by the subcommittee. As has been explained by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], and his explanation has certainly been full and complete, this bill comes before you because of the necessity for increased air facilities in the National Capital. As he said, the Capital City now stands third among the airports of the country in the volume of business and traffic it handles. In determining the necessity for an additional airport in the vicinity of Washington, the Civil Aeronautics Association made two careful studies or checks, and they came to the conclusion that by 1955, at the latest, and maybe a much shorter time, conditions would be such that it would be impossible to carry on the aircraft traffic in and out of the city of Washington without new and additional facilities. The location of a site for these new facilities was given very careful consideration by the committee. It explored the possibility of the use of military airfields now in existence in this vicinity.

It was only after the most careful consideration that the committee came to the conclusion that it would be necessary to have another national airport in this locality. I think we must look at the question not merely from the standpoint of an airport with no different elements than those which would be taken into consideration if it were intended to locate an airport elsewhere in this country; this is not only the National Capital of our own country, but it has been well spoken of as the capital of the world. The traffic coming into this city is tremendous; it has already reached the saturation point. I would not want to have it upon my conscience not to make provision at this time for increasing the air facilities of this city, for I would be fearful that if there were neglect in that respect we might have those catastrophes as a result of our failure that would bring a feeling of shame and regret to us, as we now have the opportunity to increase the facilities.

The new airport would be built under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce. Under the provisions of the bill he has the power to delegate that authority to the CAA, which he undoubtedly would do. The Department of Com-

merce and the Civil Aeronautics Administration have given the administration of this new airport very careful consideration. They are of the opinion, perhaps some may think it optimistic, but certainly it seemed realistic by the committee from the testimony that was given to it setting forth how the use of this airport could be so administered that it would carry its own expense within a very short time after it went into operation. It is recognized by the committee that the thought of Congress at this time would be not to go to any unnecessary expenditure of Government funds because of the great additional expense that has come upon us as a result of the Korean war. In this connection careful consideration was given by the committee and evidence was presented that leaves no doubt that while initially this may be considered a commercial airport, yet it would be adaptable to military use and in the event of war would undoubtedly be used in the war effort; and we were definitely informed that there were certain contingencies that could happen that would make it very helpful in the defense of this city of Washington.

So far as I know there was no disapproval of this legislation upon the part of your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is true, however, there was some consideration given at the suggestion of the city authorities of Baltimore as to whether the airport at Friendship could be used in place of a new airport in the vicinity of Washington, but after a most careful consideration, and I will say a very sympathetic consideration, we came to the conclusion that it would not meet the requirements that seem to be necessary to be provided at this time.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask the membership of this House, recognizing the great amount of study that has gone into this matter and the effort that has been made by the committee to be well informed on the subject, and only came to a decision when it was really satisfied that it was necessary, that the House give this bill its support.

The committee report sets forth in detail the reasons that justify the enactment of this legislation. From the report it will be seen that the need for the proposed airport is shown by the fact that all carriers serving Washington now operate into and out of one airport, the Washington National Airport. Plans for that airport were made in 1938 and construction begun in 1939. It was completed and opened to traffic in June 1941. At the time Washington National Airport was conceived, it was anticipated that the airport would be able to meet the needs of the Washington metropolitan area for air traffic for many years. However, two factors have operated to affect the ability of Washington National Airport to meet the air traffic needs of the Washington metropolitan area, with the net result that as of today, the airport is saturated, and is unable to accommodate additional increases in air traffic. One of the major factors preventing any increase in the capacity of the airport is its physical location. It is situated immediately op-

posite Bolling and Anacostia Airports. At the time this site was selected for Washington National Airport, the speeds of aircraft were slow in comparison to those in use today. Consequently, the relatively close proximity of the three airports did not at that time create the problems of congestion which now exist. Secondly, at the time the site was selected, Bolling and Anacostia Airports were used by the Military Establishment primarily for flights to and from headquarters in Washington. No training was conducted from such airports, and there were no operational units based on such airports. This is no longer true, and in part the increased congestion in the area is the result of the increased utilization of Bolling and Anacostia Airports by the Armed Forces. The net effect of these conditions is to make it virtually impossible to increase the capacity of the Washington National Airport.

In the calendar year 1949 Washington National Airport handled a total of 173,057 aircraft movements. In fact, Washington National Airport was the third ranking airport in the country in total numbers of aircraft movements resulting from scheduled air-carrier operations, being exceeded only by the Chicago Municipal Airport and LaGuardia Airport in New York. This volume of traffic is at or near the maximum capacity of the airport. Therefore, any increases in the needs of air traffic in the Washington metropolitan area cannot be met by the present airport.

To obtain some idea of the airport facilities which will be required in 1955 to handle the passengers, air mail, and cargo estimated for that year, it is necessary to translate the figures for various classes of traffic into numbers of aircraft movements. In the past 6 years, aircraft movements have increased almost in direct proportion to the increase in the number of passengers enplaned and deplaned at the Washington National Airport. On the basis of this past record, it is reasonable to assume that the number of aircraft movements which will be required to handle the traffic estimated for Washington, D. C., in 1955 will be 60 percent greater than the number of aircraft movements required to handle all classes of air traffic generated by Washington, D. C., in 1948.

The CAA is of the opinion that by 1955 there will be an increase in the total number of aircraft movements of between 40 and 60 percent, dependent upon whether traffic development in Washington follows the national average or follows its own past history. In our opinion the latter is more likely. This increase will require that there be in the Washington metropolitan area by 1955 airport facilities capable of handling an increase of somewhere between 60,000 and 100,000 aircraft movements per annum over that which existed in the calendar year 1948. This represents a major increase in aircraft movements. It cannot be handled by Washington National Airport, which is already operating at capacity. To provide the airport facilities for this traffic, an additional terminal airport is required,

I hope that the House will give its approval to this important and necessary legislation.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to oppose this bill because I am rather inclined to think from what I have heard about it that it is desirable and perhaps necessary to avoid some disasters or accidents.

I want to bring one matter to the attention of the House, and I am going to offer an amendment to take care of it, and I appeal to the Members of the House because the same thing may happen to you: It is an open secret that what the authorities propose doing is to put this airport somewhere out in Virginia within the metropolitan area. That is a thickly settled area. Many people from Washington and elsewhere have gone there and built their homes—invested everything they had in their homes there. If you plop a big airport down at a man's front door, you immediately destroy the value of his home.

We took this matter up with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but the committee failed to include the desired amendment. The chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County came before that committee and told them just what the situation was and that we did not feel that a big airport like that ought to be put in a heavily settled area without consulting the authorities of the locality involved. But the committee reported the bill and that consideration was denied to the authorities of the county where it was proposed to put this airport. I say it is not fair and it is not right. I think the House ought in the interest of protecting local self-government to adopt an amendment, which I shall offer, providing that the authority must consult with the authorities of the local community before they place this great airport there that will destroy the value of many people's homes and all that they have.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my very good and able friend for giving me this opportunity to talk momentarily on appointees to the Naval Academy. You all understand that we were permitted to have five appointees in the Naval Academy at one time. Recently we received official notification that we would only have four appointees in the Academy at any one time.

I have been very much interested in this matter and today I am advised by the Bureau of Naval Personnel that the number of appointments to the Academy has been restored to its former level. I know that all Members will be anxious

to receive that information. You will be duly notified officially by the Bureau of Naval Personnel of the restoration of the ruling that permits having five appointees for each Member in the Academy at one time.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Why does not the Navy increase the opportunity for young enlisted men in the fleet to go to the Academy rather than giving those appointments back to us?

Mr. GAVIN. If the gentleman has an interested enlisted man in the fleet who desires an appointment and if he has an opportunity to make the appointment he may do so if he so desires. I cannot answer the gentleman's question as to why the Bureau of Naval Personnel does not have more fleet appointments. However, I believe there are a number of appointments from the fleet along with the congressional appointments.

Mr. MORTON. There are. Also it would be a great source of morale building in the fleet if there was more opportunity for worthy young men in the fleet to go to the Academy.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the gentleman's point is well taken. I presume most of his appointments will come now from those who are already in the service.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Federal Government has contributed \$3,000,000 to the construction of an airport just 20 miles away, together with \$12,000,000 appropriated by the city of Baltimore. This airport that has been built just 20 miles from the city of Washington is located on a highway coming into Washington, a distance of about 25 miles. It will be an up-to-date, safe, high-speed highway. It is estimated that from the airport to the center of Washington will take about 30 minutes.

This airport is one of the safest, one of the most up-to-date airports that has been constructed for commercial use in this country. It has a 200-foot runway 9,500 feet long, which will accommodate the heaviest and most modern airplanes that are now being constructed or even on the drawing boards.

The Federal Government is now being asked to construct another airport about the same distance from the city of Washington and pay for it in its entirety. What we might run into is the Federal Government with money appropriated having an airport doing from 30 to 40 percent of its maximum load on one side of the Washington Airport and another federally constructed airport on the other side that perhaps will not reach 50 percent of its maximum. So that we are going into dual facilities and spending twice the amount of money that is absolutely necessary.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement. That will be accessible to this new express highway that is to be built out to the military reservation?

Mr. FALLON. This spur is being constructed now into the airport and will be finished in October.

Mr. GROSS. How far is it from old Highway No. 1?

Mr. FALLON. It is several miles from old No. 1. This is a situation where the Government is paying for dual facilities when one could do the job.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Has the gentleman's proposal been considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. FALLON. I am told it has been considered thoroughly. I do not know whether it has or not.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It seems to me there is much merit in what the gentleman has said. Certainly if we can accomplish the end by using the gentleman's facility I would like to see that done.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, it is with a good deal of reluctance that I rise to express opposition to this proposal. I am not accustomed to being in conflict with the leadership of my own committee on either side. I generally find it possible to agree with them on matters of major legislation such as this is.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation was considered by a subcommittee on transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and there were rather extensive hearings.

I participated in a number of those hearings, not as a member of the subcommittee, but as an auditor. In addition I had the benefit of a survey of the various sites which are possible for the proposed airport. My participation in the hearings in the survey has left me in the position of not being convinced. There are strong reasons, perhaps, for this airport, but there are reasons of even greater magnitude for not doing it at this time.

I would like to recount just briefly what those reasons in opposition are. One has already been alluded to by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. The State of Maryland, with some Federal assistance and from the city of Baltimore, has just completed a new \$15,000,000 airport which is within and will be, when the new road is constructed for which provision has been made, within easy driving range of the city of Washington. It will be and is now one of the most modern airports in the world and is capable of handling an enormous amount of traffic. It thus seems to me that the gentleman from Maryland has made a very good point in saying that the erection of a new airport in the immediate vicinity of Washington, although not in the District of Columbia, is surely a duplication of facilities for which the need so far has not been proven.

Now, one of the rather controversial and perhaps highly technical aspects of this problem is presented by the relationship between the military airports in this area and the Washington National Airport. It is true, according to the testimony, that only a very small portion of the military air traffic goes out of the Washington National Airport.

But those of you who know, and most of you do, the geography of Washington, realize that right across the Potomac River from the Washington National Airport are two airports, one used by the Army and one by the Navy, Anacostia and Bolling Field, separated from National Airport only by a narrow strip of water.

Unfortunately, the hearings on this bill are not available for our perusal, but as I recall the testimony on that point it was said that if the military operations on those two airports in bad weather could be eliminated, that would increase enormously the capacity of the Washington National Airport to meet the needs of bad-weather traffic in that port. But because of the proximity of the National Airport to the two military establishments across on the other side of the river, the operations of all three have to be combined with the result that the capacity of the Washington National Airport in bad weather was seriously curtailed. That, Mr. Chairman, is the reason and the whole background of the reason for putting in an additional airport in the Washington vicinity. Not because in good weather there is a shortage of capacity in the National Airport, but because in bad weather the capacity is cut down on account of the proximity of the two military installations.

Not only that, but just out at the edge of the District Andrews Field is in existence, a very fine military airport, and one of the finest military airport installations in the country.

It has seemed to me that undeniably there is a lack of coordination between the various agencies of the Government, the military, the defense agencies, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the executive departments in general, with reference to this particular thing.

This is the real crux of this problem: There is a complete lack of coordination between the various agencies of the Government who desire air facilities in the immediate vicinity of Washington. Instead of these executive agencies coordinating their efforts and trying to resolve their difficulties, they have come to Congress now with a demand for another and additional airport in this immediate vicinity.

In my honest opinion, they have not proved the necessity for this additional facility in the immediately surrounding area. Especially is this true in view of what has already been so well emphasized by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. The Friendship Airport within the immediate future will be readily accessible to Washington. It is even within the range of probability that all the foreign traffic coming into the Washington vicinity will be handled at the Friendship Airport.

I hope that other Members will join me in voting against the bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I know the Committee on Armed Services, when it passed the Career Compensation Act of 1949, did not wish to debar the disabled men in hospitals from securing their mustering-out pay. I have been working for some weeks at the request of various disabled veterans with the War Department and with the Air and Navy Departments, to see if some regulations could not be issued that will allow the men their mustering-out pay. The War Department decided it could be adjusted by regulation. The Air Force and Navy decided against it. So, today at their request, I have introduced a bill to provide certain enlisted men shall not be denied mustering-out pay. The bill is as follows:

That notwithstanding any other provision of law and notwithstanding the expiration of the Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944, no enlisted man of any of the uniformed services shall be denied mustering-out pay in such amount as he would otherwise be entitled but for the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949: *Provided*, That such enlisted man served for a period of not less than 90 days as an enlisted man in any of the uniformed services on or after December 7, 1944, and before January 1, 1946. No enlisted man of any of the uniformed services retired for physical disability shall be denied mustering-out pay, if such enlisted man served for a period of not less than 90 days during such period.

Mr. Chairman, these men who have suffered so much and who have devoted so much of their time to the cause of peace should be given their mustering-out pay. The Armed Services Committee may not adopt my bill but they will pass some measure for the protection of these men I am sure. It worked a great hardship upon the enlisted disabled already retired who have lost their mustering-out pay and this must be rectified immediately.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. Regardless of how we might feel about trying to provide something here or there to take care of the general public, the fact remains that the Washington area, in order to take care of commercial air traffic, must have some other place to go. I am somewhat surprised to see my distinguished and beloved friend and colleague on the committee tell you that he is not convinced there has been sufficient testimony before the committee to show there is a need. The fact remains that the facilities in the Washington National Airport are strained beyond their capacity today.

When you look at the traffic which came in and out of this airport in 1949, you will find there is no more facility, and no more aircraft can get in and out

today than at that time. We know what happened. After two tragic experiences at this airport in the last year, I myself, and some other Members I know, have stayed up over this airport for as long as 1 hour and 40 minutes trying to get in. The record reveals that there are over 2,500 aircraft that have been held up in the air while they were trying to get in, because there were no facilities to land them.

You talk about the two airports across the river. Even if the Army and Navy moved out altogether, there would be no greater facilities to bring the airplanes in. Therefore, that would not take care of any additional aircraft.

This is for the purpose of taking care of the additional and necessary air traffic in the city of Washington. This is the third largest and busiest airport in the United States. New York found it necessary to build a series of airports to take care of the tremendous air traffic they have. Chicago found it necessary to do something to take care of the air traffic going into that city; and they have a much larger airport than this one. But this airport takes care of as many aircraft each day as the large airport in Chicago.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. In the Committee on Rules when this was being discussed, there was some intimation that President Roosevelt and the others who selected this site had not used sufficient foresight to anticipate conditions 15 or 20 years from that time.

Mr. HARRIS. I will go into that, if time permits, may I say to the gentleman. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Does not the gentleman feel that that is unjust to our former President, because even today we may not be planning well enough so as to take care of whatever the situation may be in 15 or 20 years.

Mr. HARRIS. That is correct. No one can contemplate what is going to happen in 10 or 15 or 20 years from now. In 1938 when this airport was established here, we had no idea of the tremendous need that has developed during the last 10 years.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Furthermore, the Anacostia airport for the Navy and Bolling Field were placed there not for training purposes, but those two airports were used for administrative necessities in connection with our armed services. Consequently you could not expect the conditions to develop which have developed today. The Friendship Airport is a good airport, and it is going to be utilized I am sure to the full extent, but Baltimore is going to use that airport. I will say to the gentleman from Maryland in time you will find that the Baltimore airport will be filled up and there will be no chance or facility to take care of additional traffic coming into the city of Washington.

I am not in favor of spending money. I am not for spending money any more than the rest of you are. But I will say to my friends on the committee, I believe if we do not do something to relieve the congestion at the Washington National Airport, you are going to find one of the most difficult situations that you have ever seen in connection with commercial air traffic right here in your own city of Washington.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, no one can argue the need for additional facilities to relieve the traffic congestion and hazards now existing at the Washington National Airport. However, I do not believe that the construction of an additional airport in the Washington area would relieve the traffic hazard, nor the congestion, as too many airports located in one area would make the air lanes more congested and more dangerous.

Before the sum of \$14,000,000 requested in S. 456 is appropriated by Congress, I would strongly urge that the facilities at the new Friendship International Airport be utilized.

With the present need for elimination of all unnecessary expenditures, is it fair to the taxpayers to impose this additional burden on them for the Washington traffic, when the Government has already invested about \$3,000,000 in the Friendship Airport? This investment in that airport can only be justified on the use of it as a regional facility. Furthermore, the \$14,000,000 would, in all probability, cover only the purchase of the property and some leveling of the site to make it suitable for airport purposes.

Federal expenditures to date for the 685-acre Washington National Airport are \$25,000,000. Therefore, the request for \$14,000,000 for the proposed new airport, to comprise approximately 2,400 acres, will hardly be more than the beginning of a tremendously large outlay.

In testifying before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on this airport as late as June 30, 1950, the spokesman for the Department of Defense stated:

The Department contemplates no foreseeable military requirement for the utilization of the proposed new public airport. It is conceivable, however, that a future national emergency may require utilization of the airport by military aircraft operating in the interest of the national security. In view of this defense value in time of emergency, the Department of Defense recommends that the land acquisition and planning for the layout of the airfield facilities and the airport be such that it can readily be expanded in accordance with military standards and criteria.

A considerable length of time would be required for the construction of the airport to permit its use for defense or security purposes. Friendship Airport was planned and constructed to serve not only the growing Baltimore air traffic, but the overflow from the Washington National Airport as well. It has been estimated that Friendship, with the present National Airport, will be adequate to serve the needs of the capital area for at least 10 years. Should de-

fense needs require additional facilities, Friendship would provide that need, having been so constructed that it can be increased quickly to two to three times its present capacity at a cost of only 5 or 6 million dollars.

Furthermore, the physical location and the equipment at Friendship offer efficient and safe handling of aircraft during inclement weather conditions. The site was chosen because, from a meteorological standpoint, it is the best in the entire area. And with the completion of the Baltimore-Washington Expressway, already authorized by Congress, rapid transportation to Washington will be provided.

Therefore, I urge the Members to oppose S. 456 as the outlay of money for the additional airport is entirely unnecessary at this time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the questions that have been propounded, during the debate. I do not recognize a single question that has not been considered in the committee before it reported the bill favorably. Let me say that there was no one, not even the distinguished gentlemen from the State of Maryland who have spoken, who was more interested in exploring the possibilities of the use of the Baltimore-Friendship Airport than myself. It was only after a great deal of thought and study and effort upon my part that I finally relinquished the idea and came to the conclusion that it would not take care of the need in the broad sense, from the standpoint of the present and future need, that seemed necessary to be done in the way of planning for additional air facilities for the future in this immediate vicinity—

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that everyone who has given the matter consideration has come to the conclusion that something must be done to relieve the air traffic congestion in the Washington National Airport including the gentleman from Maryland who is interested in the Friendship Airport?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I do not want to obligate anybody from Maryland to agreeing with what the committee did; it might not be just the thing to expect of them.

Mr. HARRIS. I am talking about the need for additional facilities to serve the general area.

Mr. WOLVERTON. If that is the gentleman's question, then I can say that everybody, including the gentlemen from Maryland, recognizes the need. The only question was how the need was to be met, and it seemed to me that every consideration was given to the use of the Friendship Airport. There was a great deal of sympathy and interest in Friendship Airport on the part of some of us as individuals. But unfortunately when all the chips were down and all the information was in, it was impossible for the committee to agree that the location of the Friendship site would meet the need which we recognized had to be met.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. FALLON. Mention was made, I believe, by the gentleman from New York, with regard to what he called Maryland fog. I want the record to be clear that after a 20-year meteorological study of the Friendship site it has been considered the best in the entire area.

Mr. WOLVERTON. It is one of the finest airports I have ever seen. I participated in its opening just a month or two ago.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say in regard to the Friendship Airport that Washington city traffic itself would practically exclude its use in the rush-hour period, around 8:30 in the morning and 4:30 in the afternoon. Imagine the time it would take to get across the city to and from the airport. Anyone who understands the perplexing traffic situation of Washington, I think, would be able to understand that it would probably amount finally to slowing down in a very costly way the flying in this entire area and also cost many citizens much time whose time is not at all plentiful, time they badly need.

The committee did consider in a very sincere and careful way the use of the Friendship Airport. It was the overwhelming opinion of the majority finally that it is not the solution to the airport problem in the District of Columbia area.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is hereby authorized and directed to construct, protect, operate, improve, and maintain within or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, a public airport (including all buildings and other structures necessary or desirable therefor).

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out this act, the Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise (including transfer with or without compensation from Federal agencies or the District of Columbia, or any State or political subdivision thereof), such lands and interests in lands and appurtenances thereto, including aviation easements or airspace rights, as may be necessary or desirable for the construction, maintenance, improvement, operation, and protection of the airport: *Provided,* That before making commitments for the acquisition of land, or the transfer of any lands, the Administrator shall consult and advise with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as to the conformity of the proposed location with the Commission's comprehensive plan for the National Capital and its environs, and said Commission shall, upon request, submit a report and recommendations thereon within 30 days.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act, the Administrator is empowered to acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise (including transfer with or without compensation from Federal agencies or the District of Columbia, or any State or political subdivision thereof), rights-of-way or easements for roads, trails, pipelines, power lines, railroad spurs, and other similar facilities necessary or desirable for the construction or proper operation of the airport.

The Administrator is authorized to construct any streets, highways, or roadways

(including bridges) as may be necessary to provide access to the airport from existing streets, highways, or roadways. Upon completion of construction of any street, highway, or roadway within the District of Columbia, such street, highway, or roadway shall be transferred to the District of Columbia without charge, and thereafter shall be maintained by the District of Columbia. Upon construction of any street, highway, or roadway within a State or political subdivision thereof, such street, highway, or roadway may be transferred to such State or political subdivision thereof, without charge, on the condition that such street, highway, or roadway thereafter be maintained as a public street, highway, or roadway by such State or political subdivision thereof.

Sec. 4. The Administrator shall have control over and responsibility for the care, operation, maintenance, improvement, and protection of the airport, together with the power to make and amend such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to the proper exercise thereof: *Provided*, That the authority herein contained may be delegated by the Administrator to such official or officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration as the Administrator may designate.

Sec. 5. The Administrator is empowered to lease under such conditions as he may deem proper and for such periods as may be desirable space or property within or upon the airport for purposes essential or appropriate to the operation of the airport: *Provided*, That no lease for the use of any hangar or space therein shall extend for a period exceeding 3 years.

Sec. 6. The Administrator is authorized to contract with any person for the furnishing of supplies or performance of services at or upon the airport necessary or desirable for the proper operation of the airport, including but not limited to, contracts for furnishing food and lodging, sale of aviation fuels, furnishing of aircraft repairs and other aeronautical services, and such other services and supplies as may be necessary or desirable for the traveling public. No such contract, not including contracts involving the construction of permanent buildings or facilities, shall extend for a period of longer than 5 years, except the restaurant. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to contracts authorized under this section, to leases authorized under section 5 hereof, or to contracts for architectural or engineering services necessary for the design and planning of the airport.

Sec. 7. Any executive department, independent establishment, or agency of the Federal Government or the District of Columbia, for the purposes of carrying out this act, is authorized to transfer to the Administrator, without compensation, upon his request, any lands, interests in lands (including aviation easements or air-space rights), buildings, property, or equipment under its control and in excess of its own requirements, which the Administrator may consider necessary or desirable for the construction, care, operation, maintenance, improvement, or protection of the airport.

Sec. 8. (a) The Administrator, and any Civil Aeronautics Administration employee appointed to protect life and property on the airport, when designated by the Administrator is hereby authorized and empowered (1) to arrest under a warrant within the limits of the airport any person accused of having committed within the boundaries of the airport any offense against the laws of the United States, or against any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant to this act; (2) to arrest without warrant any person committing any such offense within the limits of the airport, in his presence; or (3) to arrest without warrant within the limits of the airport any person whom he has reasonable grounds to believe has committed a felony within the limits of the airport.

(b) Any individual having the power of arrest as provided in subsection (a) of this section may carry firearms or other weapons as the Administrator may direct or by regulation may prescribe.

(c) The United States Park Police may, at the request of the Administrator, be assigned by the Director of the National Park Service, in his discretion, subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to patrol any area of the airport, and any members of the United States Park Police so assigned are hereby authorized and empowered to make arrests within the limits of the airport for the same offenses, and in the same manner and circumstances, as is provided in this section with respect to employees designated by the Administrator.

(d) The officer on duty in command of those employees designated by the Administrator as provided in subsection (a) of this section may accept deposit of collateral from any person charged with the violation of any rule or regulation prescribed under this act, for appearance in court or before the appropriate United States Commissioner; and such collateral shall be deposited with such United States Commissioner.

Sec. 9. The Administrator may enter into agreements with the State, or any political subdivision thereof, in which the airport or any portion thereof is situated, for such State or municipal services as the Administrator shall deem necessary to the proper and efficient operation and protection of the airport, and he may, from time to time, agree to modifications in any such agreement: *Provided, however*, That where the charge for any such service is established by the laws of the State, the Administrator may not pay for such service in excess of the charge so established.

Sec. 10. Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any rule, regulation, or order issued by the Administrator under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$500 or to imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 11. Unless the context otherwise requires, the definitions of the words and phrases used in this act shall be the definitions assigned to such words and phrases by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

Sec. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$14,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, said appropriation to remain available until expended. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from year to year such sums as may be necessary for the proper development, improvement, maintenance, protection, control, and operation of said airport or as may be otherwise necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Administrator of Civil Aeronautics (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') and insert in lieu "Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')".

Strike out "Administrator" wherever the word appears in the bill and insert in lieu "Secretary".

Page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Civil Aeronautics Administration" and insert in lieu "Department of Commerce".

Page 5, lines 6 and 7, strike out "Civil Aeronautics Administration" and insert in lieu "Department of Commerce".

Page 5, line 25, and page 6, lines 1 and 2, strike out "Director of the National Park Service, in his discretion, subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior", and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the subcommittee handling this particular bill but I did have the privilege of going with the committee on an aerial survey and have had quite an extensive briefing on the necessity for this legislation from a number of points of view. In the terms of what has been said here this afternoon with reference to utilization of the Friendship Airport, I want to say that I know something about the potential development of that excellent airport although I have not been there personally.

I have a transcript in which is contained some vital testimony I think will interest all of you and I hope may be helpful to you in arriving at a decision. This is the testimony of Brig. Gen. Martin W. Arnold, vice president in charge of operations and engineering, Air Transport Association of America. As you know, he is a graduate of West Point, served 16 years in the United States Air Force, being engaged in both combat and transport in World War II and occupying his present position since January 1946. If anyone is qualified to advise us upon this matter, I think you will agree that he is.

He discussed specifically and definitely the possibility of using Friendship Airport rather than creating this new airport. There are certain points he made that are not only significant but, I believe, are absolutely convincing.

He said:

It is true it is possible to operate shuttle flights between Friendship and Washington; however, it is obvious that such flights will not relieve the traffic burden on Washington National. As a matter of fact, they will aggravate that condition.

I repeat for emphasis, "they will aggravate that condition."

Let me give you this testimony from him. After discussing the actual studies made at the National Airport as to flight conditions, he told the subcommittee:

I believe it is safe to say that Washington National Airport is now operating at its peak capacity.

He went on to say:

Moreover, as air traffic continues to grow, whatever improvements have been made will inevitably be more than counterbalanced by this increase. Despite all of the Government's and industry's efforts, Washington is still the major bottleneck of the 26 major air traffic centers in the United States. In my opinion, it is destined to become a more serious bottleneck unless we act quickly to provide an additional airport. I am informed that Washington National itself cannot be expanded because further construction would encroach on the channels of the Potomac River. This prevents the installation of addition runways, and it limits the amount of gate space and aircraft parking space which can be provided. An additional airport is the only answer to this situation.

Later General Arnold pointed out that within these limitations, National just cannot now or ever provide the runways essential to accommodate aircraft of the future including larger and heavier transports and jet transports, which

Great Britain and Canada already have in existence.

Further, he pointed out the experience in New York which indicated they could not possibly handle this problem through Friendship. Then in connection with questioning by the committee he pointed out that the situation involved the problem of national security and said:

Finally, from a national security point of view, I believe that the additional airport for Washington must be closer to the Washington metropolitan area than is Friendship Church. During the last war the commercial carriers and the military transport services used Washington National, Andrews Field and Bolling Field Air Force bases, and the Naval Air Station at Anacostia. These fields were completely saturated with traffic, and, as a matter of fact, traffic was so heavy that the efficiency of the operation nowhere approached that required by the military services and the commercial carriers.

Let me point out to my friends from Maryland, whose fine airport is now in operation, that Maryland taxpayers contributed heavily to its construction and that it is fair and just that the Baltimore area should receive priority in the use of their airport. It may seem wise to urge defeat of this measure today with the thought that thereby Friendship's activity may be increased. But it should be remembered that in 5 years it is expected that Friendship will reach its full use. And, if it has then to cancel its legitimate local use to accommodate Washington's excess, it may not be so happy a long-range solution.

General Arnold also urged that consideration of the fact that while Friendship could be used and probably will be used for the period of the next 5 years to accommodate Washington's excess traffic, at that time it was estimated that Friendship itself would have so much traffic that it could not possibly be used as an alternate airport. Consequently we are confronted with the simple proposition, as I see it, that if we do not have an adequate facility here in metropolitan Washington, we will not have one in 1955 in Maryland and the only alternative is either to provide for adequate space somewhere close to metropolitan Washington from both a commercial point of view and from a national security point of view or else take our chances in terms of what may happen. For my part I prefer to follow the advice of a gentleman who is qualified, as the general is, and the judgment of the members of the subcommittee which heard this testimony and, as I understand, reported this bill unanimously to us.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I think the gentleman's statement here has been very helpful. However, it bothers me, in view of the statement in the report that it is proposed by the CAA to locate this new airport within approximately 25 minutes ground transportation time of downtown Washington. As I understand, the Friendship Airport itself is about 30 minutes from downtown Washington.

Mr. HESELTON. I do not so understand, because you have to come into Washington from the east and travel clear through the congested area. I think General Arnold told the subcommittee that it was estimated after, and I repeat "after" the completion of the construction of the contemplated express highway, the time required for express ground transportation would be between 55 minutes and 1 hour and 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Naturally, when people are undertaking to make a favorable picture with reference to time or distance, there is a variance between the given estimates of time and space, and so forth. But the CAA has some direct testimony on that. I want to read just a very brief statement that bears on how many minutes it takes to get from the Friendship Airport to the other. It says:

The CAA has made extensive studies of the ground transportation involved between the center of the metropolitan district of Washington and the two airports in question. Copies of these studies are attached for the committee's information. The significant fact is that the average elapsed ground transportation time to Washington National Airport is 13.7 minutes while the average elapsed time to Friendship Church Airport is 56 minutes.

That is the official statement of the CAA.

Mr. HESELTON. And General Arnold reports an estimate of 55 minutes to an hour and 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. I think the time is under the old facility. The estimated time under the new facility will be less than 30 minutes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I would doubt very seriously that this 56 minutes would refer to a congested period such as we all know takes place in Washington from about 8 or 9 o'clock each morning and from about 3:30 to 5 each afternoon, and that is the kind of a situation that the committee certainly should keep in mind as it considers this type of legislation.

Mr. KEATING. When the gentleman from Texas mentions 13 and a fraction minutes, am I to understand that they have already selected a specific site?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No. Thirteen minutes refers to the National Airport from downtown Washington.

Mr. KEATING. Has the proposed airport envisioned in this legislation been selected, that is, the site?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It has not, so far as I know.

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

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know how long it is going to take to get to Washington from the new airport here proposed?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No one knows because the site has not been selected. It is hoped to be much shorter than 56 minutes.

Mr. HESELTON. I am confident all of us realize the necessity of approaching this problem from a reasonable point of view. I had the privilege of flying over the whole area and seeing the possible sites. All of us recognize what would be involved in describing exactly those sites. But, without revealing that information publicly, and I am sure the members of the committee would feel free to discuss it privately with any of our colleagues, I think I should say that any potential site meets the criteria set by those who have studied this matter carefully and conscientiously for many months. No one admires more than I do the forthright efforts made by some of our colleagues to place first things first and to postpone anything which is not a matter of urgent necessity in these days which lie ahead of us. Even before Korea they and I and a majority in this House sought as best we could to resist the demands of those who think of the Federal Treasury as an inexhaustible source of more and better raids for any and every glittering program irrespective of its merits.

But here we have a great metropolitan area served by one airport, with its facilities reaching the saturation point, with every indication that it will get out of hand in a few short years unless we face the facts and act realistically. The CAA says, and it is in the committee report, that if it could start in 1950 it could not complete this airport until 1954. Clearly it cannot start in 1950. That brings any such airport in reality not before 1955. By that date everyone who knows anything about this problem and who has studied it says both National and Friendship will be saturated.

Let me conclude by again quoting General Arnold. He said:

As I have stated above, in the event of another world conflict, additional facilities will be sorely needed, and it seems clear they must be so located as to be readily accessible in ground time from downtown Washington.

In recent weeks we have all heard the counsel of false prophets in high places. I do not urge that this is a matter of the utmost military urgency. But I do urge that we give serious consideration to the advice of a man who knows the needs of effective air transportation in both peace and war. Tomorrow we will have an appropriation bill filled with non-essential dollars. In this case I hope Congress will not deny the authorization to get on with the development of the facts for presentation to our Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 2, line 16, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and add the following: "And provided further, That the choice of site by the Secretary shall be made only after consultation with the governing body in the county in which the airport is to be located and with respect to the suitability of the site to be selected, and the possible impact on the vicinity."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that I discussed in the consideration of the rule, and I have since discussed it with the members of the committee. I hope it is adopted.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, within the next 2 days this Congress will be asked to pass upon an appropriation of over \$50,000,000,000 to pay the costs of operating the Federal Government during the coming year. There will shortly be received from the Senate a tax bill increasing taxes, both individual and corporate taxes to an extent comparable to what existed during the height of World War II; also within the next week there will be reported to this House a conference report on the Defense Production Act which will entail authority to allocate critical materials, control credit, and impose price controls and wage controls on the people of this country. All of these measures recognizing the serious situation in which this country finds itself, graphically demonstrating that we are not living in a time when we can have business as usual and activities as usual and bills as usual in this Congress. It worries me considerably that we should hasten today to authorize the expenditure of \$14,000,000 more for a new airport for the District of Columbia.

I do not question the fact that the facilities to accommodate air travel into the District of Columbia will eventually have to be expanded. If these were normal times I would approve of providing these expanded facilities now.

But the question I would ask today is: Is it necessary right now in view of the tremendous strain that is going to be put on the fiscal operations of this Government, and also at a time when the needs for materials are going to be under such terrific pressure? I just wonder whether it would not be much more sane for us to say, "Well, at least until the present situation adjusts itself and we know what the future has in store for us, let us wait; when that future is bright enough to permit business as usual, then bring up this matter for further consideration."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin on his cold and realistic analysis of the situation we are now facing. It was only a few months ago that we first noticed anything in the press about this great need for another airport. Certainly it would do no harm to recommit this bill and let it go over for further study until approximately next January or February when we can know whether or not it is absolutely necessary.

As the gentleman says, we are in a critical situation here in regard to our financial condition.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's kind words, but I do not want him to take all of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that this bill was just reported out of the committee, if I understand correctly, on August 7. By the way, there have been no hearings printed. Why do we have to rush this thing? It would seem to me that in times like these we might take matters like this just a little slower and more cautiously.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Let us assume that back in 1938 or 1939 when there was talk about saving money, that we had not undertaken to build a national airport.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But the gentleman has not tied this up with the national defense. The gentleman, when he was speaking on his own time, admitted that there was no direct connection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Assume that we had not built the National Airport. When the war came on in 1941 we had great use for the National Airport. I know the gentleman would not assume for one moment that the National Airport did not help the war effort, would he?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No.

Mr. BECKWORTH. How can the gentleman assume, then, that this airport will not perchance—if we get into serious trouble—help us in the same way?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I admire the gentleman and certainly want to get his point of view, but if I understood him correctly, and I have listened to every minute of the debate on this bill, he admitted during the time that he was addressing the Committee that there was no direct connection between this bill and the national defense.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is right, there is no more connection here than there was a connection between the national airport which we built in 1938 and 1939, and World War II, which connection was quite significant.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But the difference today is that we have the national airport and we also have the new International Airport which was completed only a few months ago. The facts brought out by the various gentlemen from Maryland clearly demonstrate that the present needs of this area can be taken care of by these two airports.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this bill will be recommitted and that action will be deferred until a more appropriate time.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SASSCER: On page 1, line 8, after the word "a" and before the word "public", insert "continental class".

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I will not go into the merits or demerits of the bill particularly, other than to attempt to

correct one or two things that have arisen. The estimates of time that have been mentioned here are on the basis of the old roads. There is now being built a dual highway—a nonaccess highway to Friendship Airport which is one of the largest international airports in the United States. The amendment I offer presents a very simple issue and permits the House to express its will on the question of whether or not if the airport is to be built, it is to be a duplication of the international type of airport or a continental type of airport. The bill provides for the building of a public airport. The amendment inserts the words "continental class." I understand in the trade the words "continental class" distinguish the airport from the international type of airport. Friendship is of the international type. It has been built at vast expense with State, city, and Federal moneys. This amendment permits the House to definitely classify this airport as to whether it is to be for defense or for nondefense purposes. If it is non-defense legislation, and the matter of safety may be worked out, as was indicated by one of the previous speakers by moving some of the military planes out of Bolling Field and the Naval Air Station, and when we realize also that when it comes to defending the Capital, it will not be the long-range bombers that will be used for defense, but the defense fighters and interceptor planes, and when we realize the fact that the defense fighters and interceptor planes can go to and from a continental type of airfield without difficulty, you realize why it is well to settle that question by the adoption of this amendment.

At this hour when Members are constantly coming into the well of the House and saying they are going to defer non-essential and nondefense items, we can, by adopting my amendment, meet the arguments that have been advanced in that respect.

We can save a vast amount of money because the amount of land necessary to purchase the width of the runways and the length of the runways is vastly different between the international type and the continental type of airfield.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] briefly.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman answered the question I was going to ask him as to the difference of cost between the two types of construction.

Mr. SASSCER. It would make a vast difference.

Mr. FALLON. I had one further observation, if the gentleman will permit, with regard to the time element of traveling between the Friendship Airport and the city of Washington. I think the gentleman from Texas had in mind the old road rather than the new road, for when the new highway is constructed it will greatly facilitate travel.

Mr. SASSCER. And in that same connection I call attention to the afternoon traffic going across the bridges into Virginia. If to accommodate my friend from Virginia you locate the airport beyond the metropolitan area think of the difficulty to be encountered in bucking the traffic across the bridges into Washington.

I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand the gentleman to tell us that the amendment would restrict the type and class of airport that the CAA could construct to take care of the additional traffic into the metropolitan Washington area?

Mr. SASSCER. That is in substance correct. It would authorize the building of a continental type airport rather than international airport.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman explain the difference between the continental type and the international type?

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland may proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. I can cover the subject in one minute without taking three. As I understand, the continental type airport is the type of field adequate for traffic between various cities within the continental limits of the United States. The international type of airport such as the one in Baltimore with its long runways is geared to international traffic.

I think there is probably little justification for the international type airport here. I can readily see in a flight from New York or Pittsburgh to Washington a person might not want to lose the 5- or 10-minute differential between an airport in this area and the one at Friendship; but a person coming from London, Paris, Singapore, or some great distance would find that the added 10 minutes would make relatively no difference.

Mr. HARRIS. Could the gentleman tell the committee what the length of the runways in the airport at Friendship is?

Mr. SASSCER. Yes; I think they are a little under 10,000 feet.

Mr. HARRIS. About 9,000 feet, I understand.

Mr. SASSCER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. And the runways here at Washington and in New York are something like seven thousand feet.

Mr. SASSCER. I think that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the international airport takes care of the same size and type of traffic that flies in from San Francisco, or continental flights in here coming from London and other places overseas?

Mr. SASSCER. As I understand, the national airport is sort of betwixt and between, that it is probably more adequate for intercity flying, but a little less than good for continental flying.

Mr. HARRIS. But it is a fact that flights from across the water come into the Washington National Airport almost daily. Is not that right?

Mr. SASSCER. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. It would be necessary for a municipal airport which might be constructed within the area of Friendship Airport to take care of traffic that might come in from overseas as well as

traffic that might come from San Francisco.

Mr. SASSCER. I think that is about the limitation. This field is either necessary or not necessary. If it is restricted to international traffic then there is no justification for building a duplication of the international field at Friendship which can be reached in a few minutes longer. Personally I see no justification, with the National Airport adequate for continental flying, for building it. They can move out some of this military air traffic.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if we are really trying to solve the problem as far as air transportation is concerned as it relates to the District of Columbia area, I certainly feel the House would be making a great mistake to put a limiting amendment like this into the legislation.

What the gentleman from Maryland has said might be true today but certainly not true tomorrow or 2 years from now, or 3 years hence, or 5 years hence.

Our purpose is to undertake to give some degree of security to aviation in this area as it grows in the future. We all know that it is going to grow rapidly. In my opinion there would be certain conflicts that would occur and probably prove very costly. For example, a company such as American Airlines or TWA which operates both continental and international flights might want to have the headquarters division at a given city in order that it might more economically carry on its operation. It is possible that this kind of amendment would compel them to have a part of their maintenance building, equipment, and crews in one airport area and a part in another, and perhaps to maintain two sets of each. I think it is unworkable and in the long run would not enable Congress to meet this problem but will make it more complex. We do have one international airport at Baltimore. Who here can say that we may not in 3 or 5 years from now need two airports to take care of international transportation? No one at the present time is in position to say that 10 years hence we may not need in this area two airports to accommodate international transportation.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not true also that this country does not now have in operation jet-transport planes, while Great Britain and Canada are making fast progress in that field? Would it not be rather unwise for us to put a limitation on the development of that kind of an airport when in all probability we will need long runways to accommodate jet transports?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Certainly, if you want to solve the problem the way to solve it is not to limit the bill as the amendment would do.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that in the development of various types of aircraft there is required longer runways? For instance, the B-36's and the C-97's require approximately 8,000- or 9,000-foot runways. Who knows but what it might become necessary to use these transport facilities, both at Friendship and any other airport developed around here? With the restrictive language you may very likely prohibit the construction of something that will be very badly needed.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It would be contrary to the very ill we seek to cure. One of the things that has been emphasized about the National Airport is that it has some 600 acres only, yet is not subject to being enlarged. Why do you want to enlarge it? In order to accommodate additional traffic and perhaps larger and faster planes. In order to have long runways to meet this problem it is contemplated perhaps 4,000 acres of land where the site is to be located will be sought, certainly if not sought immediately, to have the kind of option that will assure that much acreage if needed. This sort of amendment would, in a sense, be contrary to the idea of seeking adequate land for the necessary enlargements from time to time.

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

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This new airport, I believe the gentleman said a while ago, is to be self-sustaining?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is hoped it will be, but no one can guarantee that.

Mr. GROSS. What are we going to do with the present facilities at the National Airport?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is contemplated they will be in full use all along.

Mr. GROSS. With a \$14,000,000 airport located close by?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is certainly contemplated it will be needed and needed badly. It is needed now.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be more advisable for the House today to vote on authorization of funds to provide bomb shelters here in the District of Columbia rather than to authorize funds for a commercial airport which may not be completed for some years?

Here is the reason I emphasize that: We are about to perpetrate a devastating job on civilian defense here in the District of Columbia if we approve tomorrow or next day the recommendations of the House Appropriations Committee in a bill reported out today carrying \$17,000,000 supplemental funds, all but \$1,000,000,000 of which are for national defense.

There is an item in that bill under the caption "Office of Civilian Defense for the District of Columbia." The District of Columbia Commissioners, with the backing of W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, charged with preparing national plans for civilian defense, asked for the

meager sum of \$290,000. This request was cut to \$30,000—\$30,000 for the Office of Civilian Defense for the fiscal year 1951. This is the Nation's Capital. Oh, I wonder if it is realized how damaging such action, if approved by the House, will be in the various States in the Union, the 48 States now looking to our National Government for advice and counsel in this matter of civilian defense against atomic bombs and poison gas attack?

Think of it—\$30,000 for our Nation's Capital. It is most unfortunate, and I hope that the House tomorrow or the next day, acting on this bill, will see to it that the full amount is restored. It is most necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair [Mr. MURDOCK], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 456) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, pursuant to House Resolution 821, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study and investigation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of this bill be postponed until tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 a. m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CHOCTAW NATION OF INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6209) to authorize the commutation of the annual appropriation for fulfilling various treaties with the Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, after line 13, insert:

"Sec. 5. The approval of the commutation as provided in section 2 and the deposit to the credit of the Choctaw Nation of the amount specified in section 1 shall constitute a full and complete discharge of all rights, claims, and demands of any nature whatsoever, whether tangible or intangible and whether or not cognizable in law or in equity, against the United States arising out of any of the annuity provisions of the treaties referred to in section 1."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MILITARY RESERVATION AT FORT SCHUYLER, N. Y.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 210) to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States Military Reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after "direction", insert "together with such easements for highway or other purposes, over that portion of such reservation which is not herein authorized to be conveyed to the State of New York, as may be necessary for the proper use and enjoyment of the portion so conveyed and as may be determined by agreement between the Secretary of the Navy and the appropriate officials of the State of New York."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "or" and insert "and."

Page 2, line 16, strike out all after "education" down to and including "park" in line 18.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this has unanimous approval.

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; in accordance with the direction of the committee, of which a quorum was present.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the general appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, we should make clear to Government agencies that the defense-production bill expresses the sense of Congress that small business shall play a full and active part in the production program.

The hundreds of letters I have received since scheduling a small business-Government conference on defense production in Seattle September 7 indicate that in our small manufacturing plants is an untapped defense-production potential.

I am sure the Seattle conference will help businessmen in their efforts to provide steadier employment by participating in the defense program.

In my conception, it is the duty of the Federal procurement agencies not only to utilize idle production facilities, but also to help small firms break through defense-contract red tape.

Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, the chairman of the House Small Business Committee, has assured me his committee will be active in this field in behalf of efficient small business. He is certainly to be commended for his constant efforts and for the work of his committee.

During World War II small businesses were the stepchildren of the war effort. They wrote or came to Washington begging for opportunities to contribute to war production. They were shunted around from door to door and pillar to post. Many who succeeded in getting contracts were at the mercy of the giant firms which controlled, in effect, the allocation of war materials and often of manpower.

I represent a district in which small business is the rule and big business the exception. Our businesses there are entitled to have a rightful share in defense work. But they know from long and bitter experience, as do small-business men elsewhere, that working and pleading are not enough. The Government must take upon itself to promote by bold and vigorous measures, the active participation by small business in the defense program.

The time to plan for this participation is now, at the beginning of the program, when time and opportunities are still with us. By acting now, we will

not be subjected to the familiar brush-off by the military procurement officers who said in World War II that they could have no delays, that they had to depend on the big firms with the know-how and facilities to get the war goods out quickly. And many times, you will recall, big firms were so overloaded with war contracts that they could not begin to do what was asked of them.

There should be a place for all in the defense production effort who have a contribution to make. The small businesses of this Nation, numbering in the hundreds of thousands, are the flesh and blood of the American enterprise system. Let us have a scrupulous regard for their well-being if we are sincere in our efforts to maintain free enterprise.

As a former member of the National Defense Investigating Committee in 1945 and 1946, I saw time and again the dangers of channeling the whole war-production program into the hands of a few giant contractors. Too many war workers crowded in a few centers; too many smaller facilities were idle or unused; too much economic and industrial power concentrated in a few hands.

Many of the problems we face today have their origin in the decisions of big firms which feared postwar competition more than they desired all-out production. Aluminum, for example, is a strategic material in short supply, which Chairman Symington, of the National Security Resources Board, proposed to allocate when we grant the necessary authority. Yet, several aluminum plants are standing idle today because they were built too far from sources of cheap power and transportation. Undoubtedly, many other examples could be cited by the Members.

I insist that the small-business provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 be considered as something more than pious words.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

KICK RED RUSSIA OUT OF UN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, are we going to let Communist Russia wreck the UN, and with it any hopes for collective action to halt aggression anywhere and at any time? That is exactly what the conspirators at the Kremlin have been trying to do ever since the UN organization was established. Better to kick them out and keep them out until they demonstrate by their actions that they have abandoned forever their mad dreams of world conquest.

When we alone possessed the A-bomb, we came forward with a plan for inspection and control, to be administered by the UN, which would protect all nations from this terrible weapon. Why did Russia refuse? Because the fanatics of the Politburo were looking forward to the day when they would also have this weapon in superior quality, which they

would then use to blackmail or crush all other nations into submission.

Why have the Russians taken so many walks?

Why have they used the paralyzing power of the veto more than 40 times?

All the evidence is in, and from it we draw certain, inescapable conclusions.

Russia is a totalitarian state, with a total disregard of the rights of other states.

It is now clear that her purpose in joining the UN was not to cooperate but to sabotage.

The Russians will not play ball in this league, unless they are permitted to win every game.

It is only on rare occasions, such as the time the Russians were absent and the United States took concerted action to condemn and oppose the invasion of South Korea that the UN has been able to take any progress.

All other steps to halt Russian expansionism have been undertaken on the initiative of the United States and with the cooperation of some other nations. These effective measures could not have been put into operation through the instrumentality of the United Nations because the Russians would have vetoed such action.

I say, therefore, that the UN itself is in danger as long as the present regime in Russia is permitted to represent that country in the United Nations.

It is the bull in the china shop of diplomacy, and this metaphor is open to several interpretations.

Foremost is the fact that the UN will degenerate into a sounding board of echoes, incapable of service to the cause of peace until it cleans its house of the wrecker known as Red Russia.

After exercising every forbearance, after giving the Soviet Union every opportunity to mend its ways, we find it openly contemptuous of all those civilized standards of behavior among nations that are honestly trying to stop aggression.

Why are we sacrificing our young men in Korea?

Why are we diverting so much money and effort to defense in a way that will call for sacrifices from all of us?

Everyone knows that the answer is the clear and present danger from Red Russian imperialism.

Why, then, are our leaders so timid in calling this menace by its true name?

Why do they honor with debate, in the Security Council, that nation whose avowed purpose is to destroy us?

Diplomacy has its cherished fictions, but none more tragic than this hope, this illusion, that somehow communism will reform or collapse.

I would like to see the Communists repent sincerely or be cast out by the Russian people, but to anticipate either is beyond the most wishful of thinking.

We are faced with an ugly and perilous fact that must be dealt with courageously.

Russia has walked out of the UN before as a threat to the UN.

This time it must be ejected on the UN's terms.

The motley crew of Communist sympathizers, fellow travelers, confused

idealists, and the faint of heart generally will wring their hands claiming that this will ruin the UN.

I say that such action will save it from ruin.

Without Red Russia we shall have the majority of nations in this world working together to build, not destroy, an international organization genuinely dedicated to peace. There is no place in such a body for any nation that engages in the cynical and deadly practice of undermining the security and the sovereignty of any other nation. Aggression is not limited to direct attack. Russia is employing the devious tactics of arming and encouraging satellites to attack a neighbor or by the expedient of boring from within. Stripped of their deceptions, the world recognizes these evasive maneuvers for what they really are, definite acts of aggression.

I am not advocating a preventive war against Communist Russia.

But I share the rising tide of resentment felt by most people who have observed the deliberate and arrogant sabotage of the UN by a succession of delegates from Moscow, even as the Politburo, with an ill-concealed hand, is stirring up trouble all over the globe.

The UN must be saved from slow strangulation. Free it from the grip of Stalin's agents who would destroy it by every throttling pressure from veto to filibuster, to a twisting of every fact, and deliberate suffocation by lies and propaganda.

The time has come for us to seize the initiative and put an end to such lawlessness.

I believe that this Congress should pass a resolution of censure against the leaders of the Soviet Union.

And I further propose that our delegates to the United Nations be instructed to take action leading to the disqualification of the Soviet Union as a member of the UN because the Soviet Government has forfeited its right to participate in the deliberations of the world assembly by its persistent sabotage of that organization.

The masters of Red Russia are the aggressors against all the people of this earth, including their own.

They must be banished from the United Nations before they ruin it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which were made by the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Dr. A. FERNÓ-ISERN, on July 4, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer estimates the cost to be \$246.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] a speech that he made.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business on September 1, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on the eleventh anniversary of the invasion of Poland.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include appropriate material.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter to the New York Times.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a newspaper article.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1192. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2324. An act for the relief of Maria Balsam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2648. An act for the relief of Carlo Fava; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2922. An act for the relief of Chieko Murata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3018. An act for the relief of W. F. Steiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3037. An act for the relief of Nicholas Yialouris (also known as Nicholas Gialouris or Nicolaos Gialouris or Nick Yialouris); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3121. An act for the relief of Mario Juan Blas Besso-Planetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3136. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the town of Mills, Wyo., a sewage system located in such town; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 3250. An act for the relief of Marne Post No. 28, American Legion, New Martinsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3254. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Buffalo, N. Y., as the Buffalo Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 3321. An act for the relief of Zena (Zenobia) Symeonides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3434. An act for the relief of Mikiko Anzal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3546. An act to extend the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 3672. An act to amend section 3 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make the exclusion from such act of tempo-

rary employees of the Senate and House of Representatives inapplicable to such employees with one or more years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3768. An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 3807. An act to authorize the President to appoint Col. Henry A. Byroade as Director of the Bureau of German Affairs, Department of State, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3910. An act relating to the assignment of surplus clerks in the Postal Transportation Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3917. An act for the relief of Basilio Gorgone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3965. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3966. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3867. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3933. An act to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to provide that the housing developments known as Westview and Southview in the village of Springfield, Vt., shall for the purposes of the seventeenth decennial census be treated as a part of the village of Springfield, Vt.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1585. An act for the relief of Lellah begum Alaoui Mullin;

H. R. 1611. An act for the relief of Walter E. Miller;

H. R. 1616. An act for the relief of S. L. Ayres & Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3132. An act for the relief of Sergio and Mara Lamberti;

H. R. 3278. An act to amend section 22 (d) (6) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to involuntary liquidation and replacement of inventory;

H. R. 3304. An act for the relief of Jose Coto Santiago;

H. R. 3921. An act for the relief of Nicholas C. Hadjipateras, Pipitsa N. Hadjipateras, and Costas N. Hadjipateras;

H. R. 4014. An act for the relief of Maria Hoffman;

H. R. 4142. An act for the relief of Ralph D. Kinney;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of J. R. Fleming & Co.;

H. R. 4775. An act for the relief of Harold L. Corzett, commander, United States Naval Reserve;

H. R. 4954. An act for the relief of Jacob F. Hutt and Anderson E. Humphrey;

H. R. 5523. An act for the relief of Fred I. Massengill;

H. R. 5984. An act to approve Joint Resolution 12 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1949, relating to the granting of land patents in fee simple to certain lessees under homestead leases;

H. R. 6052. An act for the relief of John M. Vick;

H. R. 6217. An act to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6221. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the This-Side-of-Heaven Children's Home for use as a children's home;

H. R. 6223. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of James Ermini;

H. R. 6312. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Joseph Lundborg and others against the United States;

H. R. 6386. An act for the relief of Amos Chen, a native of Jamaica, British West Indies;

H. R. 6417. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frieda Gray (formerly Frieda Putman);

H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Mrs. Martha Reid;

H. R. 6449. An act for the relief of Mrs. L. M. Cox and Mrs. M. R. Nickle;

H. R. 6463. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shikaju Nakashima;

H. R. 6578. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gunnborg Janzon Hamilton;

H. R. 6586. An act for the relief of Stamatic Amersonis;

H. R. 6707. An act for the relief of Sirius Proestopoulos;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Anna Ellero and Clara Ellero;

H. R. 7146. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States," so as to provide that moneys received from the disposal of material from reserved school section lands in Alaska shall be credited to the Territory;

H. R. 7282. An act for relief of Cornelius VerSluis;

H. R. 7297. An act for the relief of Ignas Malcius;

H. R. 7370. An act for the relief of Kiyoko S. Barr and Harue Barr;

H. R. 7613. An act for the relief of Mrs. Miyako Horikoshi Spaulding and Mabel Miya Spaulding;

H. R. 7641. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in the District of Columbia to the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church;

H. R. 7677. An act to provide for perfecting the title of the State of Nebraska to certain property heretofore known as the Genoa Indian School;

H. R. 7814. An act for the relief of Stella Matutina Kazuko Yamazaki;

H. R. 7840. An act to provide for the refund of certain estate taxes;

H. R. 7919. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yukiko Yoshii French and her son;

H. R. 7921. An act for the relief of Eva T. Ross;

H. R. 8009. An act for the relief of Enrica Gianoli;

H. R. 8061. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yuki Sugimoto Murphy and David Murphy;

H. R. 8069. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Kohga Brooks;

H. R. 8073. An act for the relief of Kimiko Iso and her minor daughter, Midori;

H. R. 8134. An act for the relief of Elona Schwietza and her son;

H. R. 8153. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Akashi;

H. R. 8315. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Gallagher;

H. R. 8417. An act to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the regulation of motor carriers engaged in commerce to and from the Territories and possessions of the United States;

H. R. 8423. An act for the relief of Yuriko Mizumoto;

H. R. 8473. An act for the relief of Kimiko Tomita;

H. R. 8477. An act for the relief of Marcel Rene de Romanett;

H. R. 8558. An act for the relief of Kimiko Yamaguchi;

H. R. 8584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tokio Sato Keating, Terry Yoichi Keating, and Betty Jean Keating;

H. R. 8619. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, to provide for the appointment of dental specialists, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8684. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yumiko Kawai Misanin and her daughter, Maria Mari Misanin;

H. R. 8740. An act for the relief of Erika Kuhn;

H. R. 8741. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Yonashiro Martin and Gerald Phillip Martin;

H. R. 8742. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tokiko Amano Roloson;

H. R. 8751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoshiko Ogiso Peterson;

H. R. 8772. An act for the relief of Ah-Kim Wong;

H. R. 8794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elko Yoshizawa Lendrum and Charles Robert Lendrum, Jr.;

H. R. 8795. An act for the relief of Benjamin Paglinaman;

H. R. 8824. An act for the relief of Tokuko Murayama;

H. R. 8826. An act for the relief of Yaeko Nakajima;

H. R. 8918. An act for the relief of Mary Rynik Baran;

H. R. 8935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jaye Kurusu Maddox;

H. R. 8956. An act for the relief of Mrs. Claude Morita and Rodney Morita;

H. J. Res. 497. Joint resolution excluding from gross estate of a nonresident alien works of art on loan to the Trustees of the National Gallery of Art;

H. J. Res. 510. Joint resolution to exempt certain counsel employed by committee from certain Federal laws under Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures, 1950; and

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 25, 1950, at 11 o'clock a. m.

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. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1837. An

act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 2985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report pursuant to House Resolution 5, Eighty-first Congress, first session; (Rept. No. 2986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 9526. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2028. An act to permit the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in the foreign teacher exchange program in cooperation with the United States Office of Education; without amendment (Rept. No. 2988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 825. Resolution for the waiving of points of order against H. R. 9526, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2989). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 826. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9490, a bill to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2990). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 9520. A bill to aid in the promotion and development of coffee production throughout the world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 9521. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 9522. A bill to amend the act of September 16, 1942, as amended, so as to facilitate voting by members of the Armed Forces and certain others absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 9523. A bill to amend the act of September 16, 1942, as amended, so as to facilitate voting by members of the Armed Forces and certain others absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 9524. A bill to supplement the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 9525. A bill to grant certain benefits provided for veterans of World War II to persons on active service with the Armed Forces during the military, naval, and air operations against the forces of North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 9526. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: H. R. 9527. A bill to provide that certain enlisted men shall not be denied mustering-out pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 9528. A bill relating to the prevention of unreasonable and unconscionable speculation and profiteering in coffee, and relating to stabilization of the price of coffee to consumers at a reasonable level; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 9529. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 9530. A bill to amend section 101 of the National Defense Act to provide that, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the National Guard of the United States, both Army and Air, is made available immediately in case of an emergency declared either by the Congress or the President; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9531. A bill to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 194), for the purpose of providing authority to the several States, Territories, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone to organize military forces and to provide for pay and allowances, travel, arms, ammunition, uniforms, equipment, medical, and other military supplies as deemed necessary to enable such forces to execute their internal security missions within or without their respective States and Territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing as a House document of the publication of the Atomic Energy Commission entitled "The Effects of Atomic Weapons"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. Res. 827. Resolution creating a Select Committee on the Detrimental Suppression of Factual Reporting, Disclosure, and Dissemination of Knowledge, Information, and News that is essential to the security and public morality of the United States and its people; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 9532. A bill for the relief of Mother Anna Fasulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 9533. A bill for the relief of Marcus Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACE:

H. J. Res. 524. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain tract or parcel of land in Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2343. Mr. PLUMLEY presented a resolution of St. Johnsbury Unit, No. 58, Department of Vermont, American Legion Auxiliary, protesting the adoption of any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.