

that committee did on August 25, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 210. An act 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;

H. R. 4800. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes; and

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, August 28, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1652. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "To authorize the construction and equipment of a geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5506. A bill to authorize the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, to authorize the north side pumping division and related works, to provide for the disposition of reserved space in American Falls Reservoir, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1297, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. Pursuant to 59 Stat. 434; without amendment (Rept. No. 3003). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Forces. S. 2724. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 8004). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 3005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1188. A bill defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 3006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARNAHAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 9484. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the settle-

ment of claims for losses and damages inflicted upon the Portuguese territory of Macao by United States Armed Forces during World War II in violation of neutral rights; without amendment (Rept. No. 3007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARNAHAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 8546. A bill to amend the Philippine Property Act of 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 3008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9554. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 9555. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 to provide for the deportation of certain citizens of foreign countries relieved from liabilities for training and service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 9556. A bill to strengthen the national defense by affording further relief to persons in the military service of the United States through the suspension of the enforcement of civilian liabilities or obligations secured by home mortgages or by similar security arising out of the ownership of certain residential real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. JARDEN:

H. R. 9557. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increased annuities for retired railroad employees and their widows; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 9558. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 9559. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORD:

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution requesting the President to answer questions relating to our foreign policy, and for the creation of a Select Committee on Foreign Policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 9560. A bill for the relief of Sheppard B. Yates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 9561. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Constance Winslow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 9562. A bill for the relief of Teresa Florence Shimizu and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 9563. A bill for the relief of Peter Szecsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2345. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles H. Nutting, secretary, Fifth Congressional District Conference of Townsend Clubs, Ormond, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that emergency legislative measures be taken in dealing with the vital, social-security problem; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2346. Also, petition of Rev. C. V. Stark, and other citizens of Sanford, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2347. Also, petition of J. Kennedy Carr and other citizens of Daytona Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2348. Also, petition of Mrs. Minnie Newhart and other citizens of Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2349. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition supporting our Government's action in Korea adopted at a forum of Americans of Polish descent in Passaic, N. J., commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the victory of the Polish Army over the Russian Bolshevik forces in Warsaw; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

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

Rev. W. Ralph Ward, Jr., S. T. M., minister, Mount Lebanon Methodist Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, the Father of us all, whose everlasting power and presence sustains us and all creatures, we bow before Thee in awe and humility with minds eager for truth, hearts hungry for wisdom, and souls in need of strength. We thank Thee for the vast resources and abundant wealth of our country, for the people known and unknown whose lives of integrity and moral earnestness form the bedrock of her prosperity and power. To the trust and opportunity committed to us in the administration of her affairs grant us, we pray, courage for the hour and wisdom for the day. Marching under the command of the latest, set before us the compulsion of the lasting. Teach us again the ancient truth that unless the Lord build the temple they labor in vain that build it. Subdue now our personal fears and animosities, calm our fretful souls and anxious hearts, that we may seek Thy peace and pursue Thy righteousness and wrestle victoriously with the tremendous issues of the hour.

Acknowledging our frailty but confident in our likeness unto Thee, we would

ask Thy blessing upon our labor, our country, and the world that Thy will may be done and Thy kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven. This we pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 25, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

On August 25, 1950:

- S. 816. An act to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;
- S. 918. An act for the relief of Clara Sogor; S. 1420. An act for the relief of Antonio Garcia Jimenez;
- S. 1426. An act to authorize the sale of lands allotted to James Brown on the Crow Reservation, Mont.;
- S. 1457. An act to authorize the sale of lands allotted to George C. Estes on the Lower Brule Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;
- S. 1568. An act for the relief of Anna Rajmann;
- S. 2173. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Moschetti and his wife, Dina Bartoli Moschetti;
- S. 2401. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Martha Haug;
- S. 2617. An act for the relief of Ermalinda Mary Pizzuto;
- S. 2780. An act for the relief of Jaime Riel;
- S. 2897. An act for the relief of Hyman D. Langer and Alta Jourard Langer;
- S. 2954. An act for the relief of Agnes Biro and Anna Biro;
- S. 3005. An act for the relief of Olga Haddad;
- S. 3289. An act for the relief of Hisako Okamoto;
- S. 3325. An act for the relief of Isolde Bezner; and
- S. 3614. An act for the relief of John B. Underwood, Jr., TMC, United States Navy.

On August 26, 1950:

- S. 1866. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clayre Louise Forsyth;
- S. 2257. An act for the relief of Hyman Winterman;
- S. 3610. An act for the relief of R. W. Harris, authorized certifying officer, Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department;
- S. 3611. An act for the relief of Dorrance Ulvin, former certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer; and
- S. 3709. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers and former disbursing officers of the naval service, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed 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, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to 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, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8028) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the remaining Government lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla.; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. D'EWART were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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

- H. R. 1586. An act for the relief of Harold E. Trautwein;
- H. R. 3919. An act for the relief of John S. Steber; and
- H. R. 6095. An act for the relief of Universal Corp., James Stewart Corp., and James Stewart & Co., Inc.

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

- H. R. 1874. An act for the relief of John W. Mahoney, Charles Sorenson, Charles A. Stewart, and Stanley Thiffault;
- H. R. 4221. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Patricia Joyce Dunn, a minor;
- 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. 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; and
- H. R. 9134. An act to amend title 46, United States Code, section 251.

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

- H. R. 3463. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher;
- H. R. 3666. An act for the relief of the Lillington Roller Mills, Inc.;
- H. R. 4365. An act for the relief of Fe'R. Dumaguiling;
- H. R. 5022. An act for the relief of Henry Leonard Hoffmann;
- H. R. 6106. An act for the relief of Daniel Kokal;
- H. R. 6528. An act for the relief of the Western Chemical and Manufacturing Co.;
- H. R. 6990. An act for the relief of Christina Karamanos Demas and Antonia Karamanos Demas;
- H. R. 7095. An act for the relief of Rosette Selina Romano, a minor;
- H. R. 8136. An act for the relief of Joseph Umberto Montalban-Troy;
- H. R. 8152. An act for the relief of Guy Thomas and others;
- H. R. 8337. An act for the relief of William A. Hogan;
- H. R. 8362. An act for the relief of Bernard Croft;

- H. R. 8687. An act for the relief of Angelo Messina;
- H. R. 9144. An act for the relief of Mrs. Olga Kowalik and Czeslawa Kowalik;
- H. R. 9434. An act for the relief of Christina Shalfeieff;
- H. R. 9526. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; and
- H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 272) authorizing correction of chapter and section numbers in the enrollment of H. R. 7786, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois withhold the suggestion for a moment?

Mr. LUCAS. I withhold it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand, the conference report on the appropriation bill is to be taken up immediately after obtaining a quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent was given to consider the conference report this morning.

Mr. WHERRY. Therefore, the conference report on the appropriation bill will be taken up immediately after a quorum is obtained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I renew the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Ferguson	Johnson, Colo.
Anderson	Flanders	Johnson, Tex.
Brewster	Frear	Johnston, S. C.
Bricker	Fulbright	Kefauver
Bridges	George	Kem
Butler	Gillette	Kerr
Byrd	Graham	Kilgore
Chapman	Green	Knowland
Chavez	Hendrickson	Langer
Connally	Hickenlooper	Leahy
Cordon	Hill	Lehman
Darby	Hoey	Lodge
Donnell	Holland	Long
Douglas	Humphrey	Lucas
Ecton	Hunt	McCarran
Ellender	Ives	McCarthy

McClellan	Neely	Taylor
McFarland	O'Connor	Thomas, Okla.
McKellar	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
McMahon	Pepper	Thye
Magnuson	Robertson	Tydings
Malone	Russell	Watkins
Maybank	Saltonstall	Wherry
Millikin	Schoeppel	Williams
Morse	Smith, N. J.	Withers
Murray	Sparkman	Young
Myers	Stennis	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate, and without speeches.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 207)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, in the amount of \$134,170,300, fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY (S. Doc. No. 208)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of \$28,500,000, for the Tennessee Valley Authority, fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISED SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 209)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised sup-

plemental estimate of appropriation, General Services Administration, fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FOR PERSONNEL OF NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation facilities to and from their places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by naval establishments, fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Port Orange, Fla., Townsend Club No. 1, favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Citizens-Taxpayers Association of Westerly, R. I., relating to the passage of the amendment to the social-security law; ordered to lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF RAILWAY RETIREMENT ACT—RESOLUTION OF SYSTEM FEDERATION NO. 101, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Clyde A. Brittan, secretary-treasurer of System Federation No. 101, St. Paul, Minn., transmitting a resolution adopted by that federation, in convention assembled in the city of Spokane, Wash., June 28 and 29, 1950, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 3295, to amend the Railway Labor Act to make it possible for railway labor organizations to bargain for some form of union security. I present the letter and resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

SYSTEM FEDERATION No. 101,
St. Paul, Minn., August 24, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Attached is a copy of a resolution endorsed by Great Northern System Federation No. 101, Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., in convention assembled in the city of Spokane, Wash., June 28 and 29, 1950.

This resolution calls for support of Senate bill S. 3295, which has for its purpose the amending of the Railway Labor Act to make it possible for railroad men to secure some form of union shop.

We hope that you will give this bill your favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,

CLYDE A. BRITTAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas the amended Railway Labor Act contains certain prohibitions which deny the railway workers the right to negotiate with their management for any form of union security; and

Whereas the Labor-Management Relations Act (Taft-Hartley Act) permits labor organi-

zations under certain conditions to bargain for some form of union security; and

Whereas the amended Railway Labor Act imposes an obligation upon the collective bargaining agent to represent, negotiate for, and protect the interests of nonunion railway employees without imposing any obligation whatsoever on a nonunion railway employee to pay his fair share of the cost of union representation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That System Federation No. 101 in convention assembled in the city of Spokane, Wash., June 28 and 29, endorse Senate bill S. 3295 and House of Representatives bill H. R. 7789, which have for their purpose the amending of the Railway Labor Act to make it possible for railway labor organizations to bargain for some form of union security, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all United States Senators and Congressmen of the 10 Northwest States through which the Great Northern Railway operates, and to the executive board members of the Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., and to the offices of the presidents of all the affiliated international unions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 163. A bill to authorize Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, Calif.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2447); and

H. R. 1662. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire on behalf of the United States Government all property and facilities of the Rainer National Park Company; without amendment (Rept. No. 2448).

By Mr. HUNT:

From the Committee on Armed Services: S. 4029. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2449).

From the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 8797. A bill to exempt property of the Young Men's Christian Association of the city of Washington (incorporated under the act of Congress of June 28, 1864, 13 Stat. L. 411) from taxation; with amendments (Rept. No. 2451).

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

H. J. Res. 334. Joint resolution to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in certain international organizations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2450).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 4036. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain national park land situated in the District of Columbia for certain lands owned by the New Temple Committee, Inc.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2452);

H. R. 7240. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938, and for other purpose; without amendment (Rept. No. 2453); and

H. R. 8710. A bill to provide for the improvement of stadium facilities at the Eastern Senior High School in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 2454).

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2362. A bill to provide for flight experience for certain students in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2455).

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 1928)

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, heretofore reported from that committee with amendments, which was ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1928.

INTERNAL SECURITY—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 2369)

Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. LANGER), members of the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted, pursuant to authority of the Senate of August 25, 1950, minority views on the bill (S. 4037) to protect the internal security of the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 2369.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 28, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2484. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide war risk and certain marine and liability insurance; and

S. 3724. An act for the relief of Maria Sulkowska Forbes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 4099. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 4100. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4101. A bill for the relief of Alex Abdul Ghane Tassie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 4102. A bill relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PUBLIC LAW 734, THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1950

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 339), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed 25,000 additional copies of Public Law 734, Eighty-first Congress, second session, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the Senate document room and 20,000 copies for the House document room.

REVENUE ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FLANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8920) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 8920, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BUTLER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 8920, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933, RELATING TO FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. FREAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2006) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, with respect to Federal savings and loan associations, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—CHANGE IN CONFERE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has advised me that he will be unable to serve as a conferee on the control bill, and I ask he be excused and that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] be appointed in his place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints as a conferee on the part of the Senate the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] in place of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], on the bill (H. R. 9176) to establish a system of priorities and allocations for materials and facilities, authorize the requisitioning thereof, provide financial assistance for expansion of productive capacity and supply, strengthen controls over credit, regulate speculation on commodity exchanges, and by these measures facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the national security, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 3463. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher;

H. R. 3866. An act for the relief of the Lillington Roller Mills, Inc.;

H. R. 4365. An act for the relief of Fe'R. Dumaguig;

H. R. 5022. An act for the relief of Henry Leonard Hoffmann;

H. R. 6106. An act for the relief of Daniel Kokal;

H. R. 6528. An act for the relief of the Western Chemical & Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 6990. An act for the relief of Christina Karamanos Demas and Antonia Karamanos Demas;

H. R. 7095. An act for the relief of Rosette Selina Romano, a minor;

H. R. 8152. An act for the relief of Guy Thomas and others;

H. R. 8337. An act for the relief of William A. Hogan;

H. R. 8362. An act for the relief of Bernard Croft;

H. R. 8687. An act for the relief of Angelo Messina; and

H. R. 9144. An act for the relief of Mrs. Olga Kowalik and Czeslawa Kowalik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8136. An act for the relief of Joseph Umberto Montalban-Troy; and

H. R. 9434. An act for the relief of Christina Shalfeff; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 9526. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDRESS BY LOUIS JOHNSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION AT CHARLESTON, W. VA.

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, before the American Legion convention, Department of West Virginia, Charleston, W. Va., August 26, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

AVAILABILITY OF ELECTRIC POWER FOR AMERICAN INDUSTRY—STATEMENT BY JAMES W. PARKER

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by James W. Parker, president, Detroit-Edison Co., respecting availability of electric power for American industry, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE MANAGEMENT TO EVERYONE IN THE LA SALLE NATIONAL BANK

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a message to everyone in the La Salle National Bank, of Chicago, from the chairman of the board and president of the bank, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT CAN WE AMERICANS DO TO START A "MARSHALL PLAN OF IDEAS"—TOLEDO BLADE ADVERTISEMENT

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Toledo Blade advertisement entitled "What Can We Americans Do To Start a 'Marshall Plan of Ideas,'" published in the Paris edition of the Herald Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

LET THE CHURCH SPEAK UP FOR CAPITALISM—ARTICLE BY DR. NORMAN VINCENT PEALE

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Let the Church Speak Up for Capitalism," written by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, and published in Reader's Digest for September 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

IS HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF ON SHIPPING LEGISLATION?—ARTICLE FROM THE SHIPPING SURVEY

[Mr. O'CONNOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Is History Repeating Itself on Shipping Legislation?" from Shipping Survey for August 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAR AND WOOL—ARTICLE FROM THE WYOMING WOOL GROWER

[Mr. HUNT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The War and Wool," published in the August 17, 1950, issue of the Wyoming Wool Grower, which appears in the Appendix.]

AS 1960 SEES US—EDITORIAL FROM THE SATURDAY REVIEW OF LITERATURE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "As 1960 Sees Us," published in the Saturday Review of Literature for August 5, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTIONS TO VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANIES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, several months ago a Virginian constituent brought to my attention that the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the examination of income-tax returns was disallowing contributions made to volunteer fire companies, notwithstanding three definite rulings on the point by the Tax Court and one by a circuit court of appeals. On the 22d of August the Secretary of the Treasury sent a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Finance, with whom I had previously discussed the matter. The Secretary said the Bureau of Internal Revenue would recognize the decisions of the Tax Court, and that contributions to voluntary fire companies, without which, of course, they cannot function, would be recognized as gifts to charities, which are deductible under the income-tax law.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I entered directly into the RECORD the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury confirming precisely what the distinguished Senator has said.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance for his fine assistance in this matter, because it is a subject in which every State is interested.

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S MESSAGE ON FORMOSA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the press and over the radio we hear reports of President Truman's order putting a gag on Gen. Douglas MacArthur's message on Formosa to the meeting of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Chicago yesterday. Such action is outrageous and will be resented by every American.

Apparently there are fundamental differences over Far East American policy between Secretary of State Dean Acheson and General MacArthur, but General MacArthur, as a good soldier, is obeying and carrying out the orders of the Commander in Chief as dished up to him by the bungling Acheson.

General MacArthur knows more about what needs to be done in the Far East to correct the mistakes of Secretary Acheson than anyone in the Truman administration. And the American people have complete confidence in General MacArthur's judgment.

For years I have been trying to find a way for General MacArthur to come home and make a report to the Congress and the American people on conditions in the Far East, but always I have been handed a lateral pass by the administration.

The present, in view of the war in Korea, may not be opportune for General MacArthur to return; but a radio address by him from Tokyo to the American people is definitely in order to clarify the present muddled situation.

The vagueness and complete lack of direction to the administration's policies in the Far East are intolerable at a time when our boys are fighting and dying in Korea. Only our faith in the rugged Americanism of General MacArthur buoys our hopes in that conflict. Let us hear from General MacArthur, and woe to him who dares say he shall not speak.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is not in order. Under the unanimous-consent agreement under which we are proceeding at this time, debate is not in order.

Mr. DONNELL. May I have unanimous consent to address one question to the Senator from Nebraska?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. The question I should like to ask is whether or not the Senator from Nebraska knows if a certain declaration by General MacArthur to Clyde A. Lewis, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Chicago, Ill., which appears in United States News and World Report of September 1, 1950, has been incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not believe it has been.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator have any objection to its being incorporated at this point?

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly would not.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that this article, which appears in United States News and World Report for September 1, 1950, be incorporated in the RECORD. Because of its importance, I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD. The headline is "Formosa must be defended."

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

FORMOSA MUST BE DEFENDED

(A declaration by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, supreme commander in Japan for the allied powers)

To: Clyde A. Lewis, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Chicago, Ill.

Your inspiring message of the 17th has moved me deeply and I trust that you will convey to all of my comrades in arms of the Veterans of Foreign Wars assembled on the occasion of our fifty-first annual national encampment my assurance that their confidence and support will give this command much added strength to meet the tests of battle which lie immediately ahead. Tell them that I am happy to report that their successors in arms now engaging the enemy along our battle lines in South Korea are exemplifying that same high standard of devotion, fortitude, and valor which characterized their own march to victory when they themselves engaged in combat in the field. From senior commanders down through all ranks, their tactical skill, their invincible determination, and their fighting qualities against a fanatical foe, well trained, expertly directed and heavily armed, have upheld our country's finest traditions. Toward victory, however difficult the road, they are giving an account of themselves which should make every American heart beat with pride and infinite satisfaction.

In view of misconceptions currently being voiced concerning the relationship of Formosa to our strategic potential in the Pacific, I believe it in the public interest to avail myself of this opportunity to state my views thereon to you, all of whom having fought overseas understand broad strategic concepts.

To begin with, any appraisal of that strategic potential requires an appreciation of the changes wrought in the course of the past war. Prior thereto the western strategic frontier of the United States lay on the littoral line of the Americas with an exposed island salient extending out through Hawaii, Midway, and Guam to the Philippines. That salient was not an outpost of strength but an avenue of weakness along which the enemy could and did attack us. The Pacific was a potential area of advance for any predatory force intent upon striking at the bordering land areas.

All of this was changed by our Pacific victory. Our strategic frontier then shifted to embrace the entire Pacific Ocean, which has become a vast moat to protect us as long as we hold it. Indeed, it acts as a protective shield for all of the Americas and all free lands of the Pacific Ocean area. We control it to the shores of Asia by a chain of islands, extending in an arc from the Aleutians to the Marianas, held by us and our allies.

From this island chain we can dominate with air power every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore, and prevent any hostile movement into the Pacific. Any predatory attack from Asia must be an amphibious effort. No amphibious force can be successful without control of the sea lanes and the air over those lanes in its avenue of advance. With naval and air supremacy and modest ground elements to defend bases, any major attack from continental Asia toward us or our friends of the Pacific would be doomed to failure.

Under such conditions the Pacific no longer represents menacing avenues of approach for a prospective invader—it assumes instead the friendly aspect of a peaceful lake. Our line of defense is a natural one and can be maintained with a minimum of military effort and expense. It envisions no attack against anyone nor does it provide the bastions essential for offensive operations, but properly maintained would be an invincible defense against aggression. If we hold this line we may have peace—lose it and war is inevitable.

The geographic location of Formosa is such that in the hands of a power unfriendly to the United States it constitutes an enemy salient in the very center of this defensive perimeter, 100-150 miles closer to the adjacent friendly segments—Okinawa and the Philippines—than any point in continental Asia.

At the present time there is on Formosa a concentration of operational air and naval bases which is potentially greater than any similar concentration on the Asiatic mainland between the Yellow Sea and the Strait of Malacca. Additional bases can be developed in a relatively short time by an aggressive exploitation of all World War II Japanese facilities.

An enemy force utilizing those installations currently available could increase by 100 percent the air effort which could be directed against Okinawa as compared to operations based on the mainland and at the same time could direct damaging air attacks with fighter-type aircraft against friendly installations in the Philippines, which are currently beyond the range of fighters based on the mainland. Our air supremacy at once would become doubtful.

As a result of its geographic location and base potential, utilization of Formosa by a military power hostile to the United States may either counterbalance or overshadow the strategic importance of the central and

southern flank of the United States front-line position. Formosa in the hands of such a hostile power could be compared to an unsinkable aircraft carrier and submarine tender ideally located to accomplish offensive strategy and at the same time checkmate defensive or counteroffensive operations by friendly forces based on Okinawa and the Philippines.

This unsinkable carrier-tender has the capacity to operate from 10 to 20 air groups of types ranging from jet fighters to B-29 type bombers as well as to provide forward operating facilities for short-range coastal submarines. In acquiring this forward submarine base, the efficacy of the short-range submarine would be so enormously increased by the additional radius of activity as to threaten completely sea traffic from the south and interdict all sea lanes in the western Pacific. Submarine blockade by the enemy with all its destructive ramifications would thereby become a virtual certainty.

Should Formosa fall and bases thereafter come into the hands of a potential enemy of the United States, the latter will have acquired an additional fleet which will have been obtained and can be maintained at an incomparably lower cost than could its equivalent in aircraft carriers and submarine tenders. Current estimates of air and submarine resources in the Far East indicate the capability of such a potential enemy to extend his forces southward and still maintain an imposing degree of military strength for employment elsewhere in the Pacific area.

Historically, Formosa has been used as a springboard for just such military aggression directed against areas to the south. The most notable and recent example was the utilization of it by the Japanese in World War II. At the outbreak of the Pacific war in 1941 it played an important part as a staging area and supporting base for the various Japanese invasion convoys. The supporting air forces of Japan's Army and Navy were based on fields situated along southern Formosa.

From 1942 through 1944 Formosa was a vital link in the transportation and communications chain which stretched from Japan through Okinawa and the Philippines to southeast Asia. As the United States carrier forces advanced into the western Pacific, the bases on Formosa assumed an increasingly greater role in the Japanese defense scheme. Should Formosa fall into the hands of a hostile power, history would repeat itself. Its military potential would again be fully exploited as the means to breach and neutralize our western Pacific defense system and mount a war of conquest against the free nations of the Pacific Basin.

Nothing could be more fallacious than the threadbare argument by those who advocate appeasement and defeatism in the Pacific that if we defend Formosa we alienate continental Asia. Those who speak thus do not understand the Orient. They do not grasp that it is in the pattern of Oriental psychology to respect and follow aggressive, resolute and dynamic leadership—to quickly turn from a leadership characterized by timidity or vacillation—and they underestimate the oriental mentality.

Nothing in the last 5 years has so inspired the Far East as the American determination to preserve the bulwarks of our Pacific Ocean strategic position from future encroachment, for few of its peoples fall accurately to appraise the safeguard such determination brings to their free institutions.

To pursue any other course would be to turn over the fruits of our Pacific victory to a potential enemy. It would shift any future battle area 5,000 miles eastward to the coasts of the American continents, our own home coasts; it would completely expose our friends in the Philippines, our

friends in Australia and New Zealand, our friends in Indonesia, our friends in Japan, and other areas, to the lustful thrusts of those who stand for slavery as against liberty, for atheism as against God.

The decision of President Truman on June 27 lighted into flame a lamp of hope throughout Asia that was burning dimly toward extinction. It marked for the Far East the focal and turning point in this area's struggle for freedom. It swept aside in one great monumental stroke all of the hypocrisy and the sophistry which has confused and deluded so many people distant from the actual scene.

Mr. DONNELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in connection with the letter, being a declaration by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, which I presented a few moments ago for printing in the RECORD, to have appear in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks immediately following what I presented at that time, the statement that the letter I presented is the full text of the message which General MacArthur prepared for presentation to the convention in Chicago of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in response to greetings from that organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the gagging today of General MacArthur is another in the long series of efforts to keep the truth from the American people.

Action by the administration in directing General MacArthur to withdraw his message to the Veterans of Foreign Wars relative to the importance of Formosa strongly indicates that Secretary of State Acheson and Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, are now preparing for another Munich with the Republic of China and the Island of Formosa as the pawns.

Our moral leadership was undermined by the secret deals of Yalta, regarding which neither the Congress of the United States nor the American people had information until years later.

The suppression of the Wedemeyer report on China for 2 years, and the report by General Wedemeyer on Korea, which has now been held in secrecy for 3 years, has allowed the State Department to lose for us in the Far East all that our fighting men had won in World War II at great sacrifice.

For the past several years our responsible military men have been required by the administration to support budget requests before the Congress which their professional training warned them were not adequate to the safety of this Nation. The pushing around we have taken in Korea is one of the results of this gag policy.

Now once again the administration is gagging a patriotic soldier, who sees the danger facing our Nation in the Far East, and wants to warn our people before it is too late.

It now appears that the only way in which the truth will be known is for the

American people to elect a Congress that will make some real investigations without fear or favor, and will be prepared to recommend impeachment proceedings where the facts justify.

It is now obvious that those who have a vested interest in our past mistakes and bankrupt far-eastern policy intend to pursue their way as far as they are allowed to by the Congress and the citizens of this country. A solemn referendum by the American people on our far-eastern policy—past, present, and future—is now an urgent necessity.

A REAFFIRMATION OF LOYALTY TO THE NATION BY THE GRAND MASTERS OF PRINCE HALL MASONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Conference of Grand Masters of Prince Hall Masons presented to President Truman on August 17, 1950, a statement reaffirming the loyalty and devotion of Negro Masons of America, and restating their unadulterated opposition to communism. Thirty-two of the Nation's 39 Prince Hall grand lodges were represented at Boston, participating in the program to commemorate the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Negro Masonry. I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD the reaffirmation of loyalty to our Nation as proposed and adopted at the Conference of Grand Masters of Prince Hall Masons.

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

A REAFFIRMATION OF LOYALTY TO OUR NATION
BOSTON, MASS., August 17, 1950.
From: Conference of Grand Masters of Prince Hall Masons.

To: The President of the United States.

The Conference of Grand Masters of Prince Hall Masons of America, assembled in historic Boston to commemorate the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of Prince Hall Masonry and to receive renewed inspiration through a visit to Prince Hall's grave, located in Copp's Hill Burying Ground, and to strengthen anew our love for liberty and freedom by viewing the original charter issued by the Mother Grand Lodge of England to Prince Hall and 13 other Negroes of Boston in pre-Revolutionary days, hereby reaffirms its loyalty and devotion to all of those principles that were exemplified by America's first Negro Mason, a pioneer patriot, leader and soldier, and that were embodied in the lives, words, and deeds of our founding fathers.

We aver that America is great because she has striven continuously to reach and maintain those high ideals that are our cherished legacy. We submit that perfect adherence to those principles and ideals have not and do not obtain but we have faith and confidence that progress toward their full attainment, wherein all Americans of every color and faith will dwell together and labor together as brothers, is being made with increasing rapidity and convincing certainty.

Once again, our country finds itself embroiled in a conflict wherein our citizens must rally to the principles enunciated by our Chief, the President of the United States, in the matter of our fighting forces being now engaged in mortal combat in Korea.

It is clear to all thinking people that the issue is distinctly drawn and resolves itself to just this: Shall the world be dominated by communism or shall the peoples of the world be free to select the form of government they themselves like best, free from all fear of aggression, a police state, and ultimate slavery?

As Grand Masters of the various States of the Union and as chosen leaders of thousands of Negro Masons, we are ready and willing to do all that we can to enhance the all-out efforts of our Nation to put down tyranny and crush the arch enemies of democracy.

To further crystallize our actions and endeavors, we have designated Sunday, September 10, 1950, that day being the Sunday nearest September 12, which is the birthday of our noble and sainted progenitor, as Prince Hall Day and as an occasion for his legion of followers to assemble in communities throughout the land for the purpose of reaffirming their unyielding loyalty to America and its Government and to strengthen the fight for democratic ideals and practices, the real brotherhood of all free men being our goal. With the help of the Almighty, on whose side we are ever to be found, we shall come forth victorious.

CONFERENCE OF GRAND MASTERS OF
PRINCE HALL MASONS,
AMOS T. HALL,
Chairman, Grand Master of Oklahoma.
WM. MCKINLEY NEWBY,
Secretary, Pennsylvania.

PROTECTION OF INTERNAL SECURITY—
LETTER FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL
MCGRATH

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from the Attorney General, the Honorable Howard McGrath, dealing with Senate bill 4037, known as the McCarran anticommunism bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the body of the RECORD in order that all Senators may have an opportunity to read it.

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

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., August 26, 1950.
Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you concerning S. 4037, known as the McCarran bill, which will shortly be considered by the Senate.

As you know, sections 18, 19, 20, 21, and 23 of that bill generally embody the President's recommendations for strengthening existing laws with respect to national security. Sections 18-21 are derived from S. 595 (the internal security bill proposed by the executive branch) which as H. R. 4703 has already passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote. These sections considerably broaden and tighten up the espionage laws, extend the statute of limitations under the espionage laws from 3 to 10 years, extend the Foreign Agents Registration Act to cover persons with foreign training in espionage or sabotage, and give to the Secretary of Defense broad powers to issue regulations protecting defense installations from sabotage.

The provisions which I have described conform to the President's recommendations except in one important respect. Section 21 of S. 4037 (the McCarran bill) omits a provision of S. 595, as passed by the House, which would have authorized the President, in time of war or national emergency, to extend the antisabotage provisions of that section "to such property and places as the President may designate . . . in the interest of national security." The restoration of this provision would serve the important purpose of enabling the President to provide for the exclusion from any industries or facilities relating to the national security of any persons suspected of a purpose to engage in sabotage or espionage. You will note that H. R. 9490 (another version of the Mundt-Ferguson provisions) as recently re-

ported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, provides for the exclusion from employment in defense plants designated by the Secretary of National Defense of any person who is a member of a Communist-controlled or Communist-front organization registered or required to register under what is section 7 of S. 4037 (the McCarran bill). As I shall point out, these registration provisions will not be operative for a considerable time, if ever. What is needed is authority to take preventive action against the specific danger of sabotage without prolonged legal proceedings. The authority requested by the President, and which I hope will be restored in S. 4037, will provide the tools for this necessary job.

Section 23 of the McCarran bill is derived from H. R. 10 (the Hobbs bill) and deals with the problem arising out of the fact that many aliens under final orders of deportation cannot actually be deported because no other country will receive them. Section 23, in accordance with the President's recommendation, provides the Attorney General with new powers of supervision over such aliens which in my judgment will be sufficient to cope with the problem. As you know, the President in his recent message to the Congress strongly opposed any provision for the indefinite detention of such aliens. I should also like to add that in my opinion the provision for criminal penalties recommended by the President, and set forth in section 7 of S. 4061 will be more enforceable than the corresponding paragraph (c) of section 23 of S. 4037 (the McCarran bill) and I urge that it be substituted for the latter provision.

With these changes, sections 18 through 21 and section 23 of S. 4037 (the McCarran bill) will embody all of the recommendations of the Interdepartmental Intelligence Committee consisting of representatives of the military intelligence services and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. If enacted into law, they will provide the additional weapons which we need to deal with fifth-column tactics, while leaving intact our constitutional liberties.

Sections 1 through 17 of S. 4037 embody the provisions of S. 2311, better known as the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill. Since I am sure that you are familiar with the constitutional problems posed by these provisions, I shall only state that in my judgment they will be completely ineffective to accomplish their purpose. They will be ineffective because the registration provisions, upon which most of the other provisions are hinged, will not apply to any Communist organization until after prolonged administrative and judicial proceedings. When, finally, an organization is required to register, it will in all probability dissolve itself, then reappear with a new name and new officers. Even if this registration process could be made effective, most of the penalties which would be imposed upon registered organizations and their members would be superfluous in that they are already applied under existing law. Communists and fellow travelers are already excluded and removed from Federal employment under the President's loyalty program, the State Department denies passports to Communists, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue withholds tax exemptions and deductions from subversive organizations and their contributors—and all this without going through the cumbersome procedures of the Mundt-Ferguson provisions. Thus, the new result of these procedures will be meager in contrast with the staggering and perhaps futile enforcement burden which would be placed upon the Department of Justice.

Also, I wish to point out that section 22 of the McCarran bill, embodying the objectives of S. 1832, would change the laws governing the exclusion and deportation of aliens in respects that will probably create serious problems in the conduct of our for-

eign relations. I trust that these proposed changes will receive the most careful consideration.

Finally, it must be assumed that these provisions will have the effect of hastening the present tendency of the Communist Party to go underground. In this connection, I wish to call your attention to a paragraph contained in the Department's report to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on an earlier form of this legislation:

"Outlawing of the Communist Party appears to this department to be unwise, even if doubts as to the constitutionality of such a step were removed. Outlawing would materially increase the Department's problem of law enforcement. Whereas the Communist Party, to some extent, now operates on the surface, if this bill becomes law it will be forced underground where surveillance of its activities will become increasingly difficult. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of this Department, in his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee in March 1947, admonished that he would hate to see a group that does not deserve to be in the category of martyrs have the self-pity that they would at once invoke if they were made martyrs by some restrictive legislation that might later be declared unconstitutional."

The present world situation requires the prompt enactment of practical and constitutional legislation which will give to the Department of Justice adequate weapons to deal with the precise dangers which we face, while preserving our traditions of personal liberty. We in the Department favor the general purpose of this type of legislation, but we do not feel that there is time enough remaining for novel experiments in law enforcement over a period of years, with doubtful, meager, and inadequate results.

Yours sincerely,

J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Attorney General.

PROMOTION OF VETERANS IN FIELD
SERVICE OF POST OFFICE DEPART-
MENT—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not see the majority leader in the Chamber at the moment, but I wish to have brought up at the earliest possible opportunity the veto message on House bill 87. That bill has already been passed by the House of Representatives, over the veto, by a vote of 213 to 71. I hope the matter may soon be taken up by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It cannot be brought up at this time, under the agreement in regard to procedure.

GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951—
CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see pages 13458-13472, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 24, 1950, House proceedings.)

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the report be adopted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee wish to be recognized now to speak on the conference report?

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me inquire whether the Senator from New Hampshire has any objection to adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to make a few comments on it, first.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course; but let the report be adopted now.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I wish to speak on it before it is adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the Senator from Tennessee wishes to speak at this time, the Chair will recognize the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this is the conference report on the first overall appropriation bill which the Congress has acted on. It naturally involved a tremendous task on the part of the conference committee. It is entirely conceivable that in such a huge over-all bill, touching so many subjects and relating to items, and containing so many figures, mistakes may be made. However, by and large, I think the conference committee has done an excellent job.

There are two items I wish to comment on, however. One is the so-called 10-percent-cut amendment, which was adopted by the Senate by a very substantial margin. That was the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges], and some 35 other Senators. That amendment was agreed to in the Senate by such an overwhelming vote that certainly the Senate conferees should have given very special attention to the particular approach by which that cut was proposed to be made.

It was not a blank-check cut or a meat-ax cut, but the Bridges-Byrd amendment spelled out specifically how the cut was to be made and the specific exemptions which were to be granted for certain agencies and departments mainly of a defense and security nature. The exemptions exempted agencies which are of vital importance at this particular time.

However, the conference committee saw fit to ignore that approach, and, instead, agreed to an amendment which was proposed by one of the House Members, which is a meat-ax approach, a blank-check, and everything which many Members of the Senate have been speaking against. It is a complete delegation of authority; it grants to the President and to the Bureau of the Budget complete blank-check authority.

I wish to point out that that is exactly contrary to the approach of the Byrd-Bridges amendment, which was supported overwhelmingly in the Senate. I regret very much that the Senate conferees saw fit to yield on a very important matter of principle in that connection. As the ranking Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and as a member of the conference committee, I could not concur in the action taken by the conference committee on that item, and I did not agree to that part of the report.

Let me call attention to another part of the conference report, as agreed to by the conferees. I refer to the elimination of the appropriation for the Children's Fund. I stood on the floor

of the Senate and spoke and voted to cut the appropriation for the Children's Fund 10 percent in line with my general desire to make such cuts. The Senate, in its wisdom, by a record vote, defeated the attempt to cut the Children's Fund appropriation 10 percent; the Senate was not willing to cut that appropriation even 10 percent. Yet the conferees have eliminated the item entirely. If the Senate was not willing to cut the item 10 percent, how can the Senate conceivably agree to cut the item 100 percent—in other words, to eliminate it?

These are some of the inequities of the conference report.

However, by and large, I think the conferees have done a good job. I think the work they undertook on this over-all appropriation bill was most difficult, and I think generally speaking they should be commended. Nevertheless, there are certain inequalities and inequities in the situation of which I think the Senate should be aware when it acts on the report.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator describe briefly what the conferees did with regard to the Bridges-Byrd amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. They eliminated the so-called 10-percent cut proposed by Bridges-Byrd amendment, which was adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming vote, and substituted an instruction to the executive branch of the Government—namely, the President and the Bureau of the Budget—to cut \$550,000,000 from the fund. Under that instruction, they could cut it anywhere; for instance, they could cut the appropriation for the armed services if they wished to do so, and if they deemed that such a cut would not be harmful to the national defense, or they could cut the appropriations for the FBI or for the Bureau of Internal Revenue or for any other agency or function of government. In this respect the action by the conferees proposes a wide delegation of authority, a blank check. That is what I object to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From reading the newspapers, I do not understand that the President or the Bureau of the Budget would have to make the cut; my understanding is that it would be somewhat discretionary on their part.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the cut is mandatory, but if the cut is not mandatory, then the amendment is worse than I have stated. I assume from its wording that it is mandatory that the cut be made.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. From reading the press, I understood that the conferees had specifically cut the ECA appropriation \$200,000,000; or was that left to the discretion of the President?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the conferees cut the ECA appropriation \$200,000,000. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that in the Senate he made a successful

fight to exempt the ECA appropriation from the 10-percent cut; but in the conference the ECA appropriation was cut \$200,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Two hundred million dollars more than the appropriation was as the Senate left it?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In other words, the conferees have cut that appropriation an additional \$200,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to call attention to that fact for the record, because later it may be necessary for the ECA to make a further request for appropriations.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. With respect to the Children's Fund, is it not true that it is the only international cooperation fund for which the local contribution has been far more than our contribution?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When we put up \$25,000,000, for instance, \$100,000,000 has been contributed from other sources, and that fund has taken care of approximately 3,000,000 helpless children.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the Senator is correct.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the event the conference report is agreed to, can the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire tell us what will be the net result in dollars by way of a reduction in the recommendations of the Budget Bureau?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not have the exact figure in mind, but it is over \$2,000,000,000. The specific cuts, I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, total \$1,640,000,000-plus, and in addition thereto a reduction of \$550,000,000 is authorized. So the appropriations would be some \$2,000,000,000 below the budget estimates.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for a question.

Mr. LODGE. What did the conference committee do regarding the amount for technical and economic assistance to economically underdeveloped areas?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is my understanding that the conference agreed upon a sum of \$15,000,000, and, from what I have read in the press, I understand that the House disagreed to that provision of the conference report and so it now restored the original figure of \$26,500,000.

Mr. LODGE. So it has not been cut, then. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. The conference committee cut it to \$15,000,000, and then, as I understand, under the further procedure, when the report was considered by the House, instead of accepting the

amount of \$15,000,000 as recommended by the conferees, the House voted to overturn that item in the conference report and to restore the full figure.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to know about that, if the Senator will yield further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ROBERTSON rose.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Virginia, if he can give the answer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is seeking the floor in his own right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There are two matters connected with the report which I desire to discuss.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is an item that is utterly indispensable to making our foreign commitments effective.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the conference report, but I desire to mention two items in it in which I have had particular interest. One has to do with the appropriation for civil functions. The committee recommended a figure to the Senate which was 10 percent below the Budget estimate. That is point No. 1. Point No. 2 is that the Senate adopted the Bridges-Byrd amendment and cut it another 10 percent. When it went to the conference it was cut \$76,000,000 more. Then, in addition to that, a provision was inserted that no project under that title of the bill should be proceeded with unless the President certified it was a contribution to the national-defense program.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. That provision relates only to new projects, not to projects which are under way at the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It relates to the new projects, then.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then, I wrote to the Chief of the Army and asked him to give me an answer as to what would have been the result of the 50 percent cut proposed by the Douglas amendment, had it been adopted. I voted against it, because I felt there were involved hydroelectric projects which could be brought into operation within the next year, which were highly essential to the war effort, and to stop which now would be poor economy from every standpoint. He wrote me that in his opinion if we had made a 50 percent horizontal cut across the board of all those projects we would have to pay liquidated damages to contractors, and we would have left unfinished construction so exposed to the elements that in his opinion there would have been no saving whatever by that cut.

But, the way we have operated, we do have a saving. We saved 10 percent on the Bridges-Byrd amendment. We saved \$76,000,000, which was further cut,

and we saved on all new projects in the bill, including some of those items about which I frankly had some doubt, which doubt I expressed in the committee. However, I do not have the controlling vote. They cannot be started unless the President certifies that they are essential to the defense effort.

So, Mr. President, I feel that those of us who believed in economy but who did not believe in the approach to it on this particular item advanced by the Douglas amendment, have been fully justified in the stand which we took.

The other item to which I desire to refer is the loan to Spain, which has created quite a bit of discussion. We provided that the Export-Import Bank was to make a loan to Spain of \$100,000,000, and everyone knows that the bank has control over loans of that kind, to see how the funds are expended. The conference committee cut that to \$62,500,000, and left the Senate provisions in the bill rather intact, except to this extent: The ECA is required to exercise the same type of administration and supervision over the use of this fund that is used in any ECA country.

Why did I vote for a loan to Spain? I believe in democracy. I believe in the system of private enterprise. I do not believe anyone more firmly believes in that than I. My colonial ancestors left the Church of England to join with Thomas Jefferson in America in the fight for religious freedom. They joined a Baptist church, and we have been Baptists ever since. We believe in religious freedom of every kind, and in complete separation of church and state. But what was the situation which confronted us? We spent untold billions of dollars and the flower of our youth on foreign battlefields to win a war against aggression. Did we win the peace? We did not. Then, when our constituents said, "Bring the boys home. Bring the boys home" we brought them home. We demobilized the greatest army we had ever had, and the greatest Navy the world has ever seen. Then one of our allies, Russia, would not allow us to have a peace in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, of which she was a member. We set out to buy the peace. We put \$22,000,000,000 into a program and into an effort to buy the peace. Still we did not get the peace.

So what were we then forced to do? We were compelled to add some \$20,000,000,000 to an already burdensome defense program and to add \$4,000,000,000 to the Atlantic Pact nations. We urged Mr. Hoffman to channel ECA funds as far as possible into military preparedness instead of business as usual in western Europe. We did not stop there.

What else did we do? We made our plans to win the peace. We made an Export-Import Bank loan of \$20,000,000 last year to Tito, and we made another Export-Import loan of \$20,000,000 to him this year. Then I called the president of the Export-Import Bank and said, "Did you get any collateral for the loan to Tito?" "Why," he said, "of course not." I said, "You made it on the faith and credit of Yugoslavia?" He said, "Of

course." I said, "Do you think you will get that loan repaid if Russia moves against Tito and overruns and controls Yugoslavia?" "Well," he said, "I do not know." I said, "You ought to know, because you ought to know that one of the first things the Communists did in Russia was to repudiate every obligation of the Czarist government." They never paid a nickel of it that was due. They never paid anything that was due us from Russia in World War I. And, of course, they are not going to pay a nickel of this. Why then was the loan made to Tito? If it had any validity, it was because Tito had said to the Politburo, "If you start to cross my border, I am going to fight—and we have something to fight with."

Is Tito an exponent of representative democracy? He is as much a Communist dictator as anyone who can be named. I visited in Spain last fall. There is a great deal more personal freedom in Spain than there is in Yugoslavia. I could circulate anywhere in Spain. As a matter of fact, I said to the Prime Minister of Spain, "The treatment which you have given my Baptist and Methodist friends over here is a stumbling block to closer unity between Spain and the United States." He said, "You have my permission to visit anywhere in Spain. You may investigate every alleged act of intolerance, and," he said, "when you come back, I will take your word and the word of your Baptist missionaries for what is done over here."

I replied, "Mr. Prime Minister, I do not have an opportunity to make that investigation, but I certainly appreciate your willingness to let me make it." Do Senators think that Tito would let me make an investigation of what was done to Archbishop Stepanic and to the other of the Catholics in Yugoslavia? Of course he would not. Do Senators think there is any comparison between the situation in Spain and what has been done in the way of religious intolerance in Yugoslavia? Of course not.

But we accepted the credit risk of Yugoslavia, because we thought Tito would fight the Russians if they tried to cross his border.

Anyone can draw any distinction he pleases between a dictator in Yugoslavia and a dictator in Spain. I cannot draw such a distinction. I found in Europe that the Communists in Italy and in France—and they total approximately 4,000,000—were so bitter against Franco because he destroyed communism in Spain that they prevailed upon those nations to sponsor a resolution in the United Nations that we would not recognize Spain or have anything to do with that nation, that we would treat her as an outcast. We went along with that program.

Last winter the Secretary of State told me that he was planning to pull away from that agreement. I now understand that he does not plan to pull away from it.

I was recently at the White House, and the President had some remarks to make about those who voted for a loan to Spain. I said, "With all due deference,

Mr. President, we have 92 employees in the Embassy in Madrid, and there is no one to speak over there on the level of a cabinet officer. We have a full staff in Yugoslavia. We recognized Yugoslavia and made a loan to her."

Let those who please draw a distinction. I am for taking steps to meet the Communist aggression. I intend to support the McCarran bill with such appropriate amendments as I think will be adequate, and I hope we shall consider that bill as soon as the other "must" bills are completed. We must combat communism on our home front.

I rejoice in our support of Greece, because Greece fought the Communists and won, and I think, if necessary, she will fight them again. I was very much encouraged when I was in Oslo and found the indomitable, irrefragable spirit of the Norwegians against communism. They will stand up and fight to the last man. When I went to Madrid and asked about Communists, I was told, "If there are any of them here we do not know where they are. They are underground, if they are here."

If Spain will not fight against communism, no one will fight against communism. When we are pouring out billions of dollars to stem the tide of future communistic aggression, let those who will draw the distinction between furnishing funds to the Communists in Yugoslavia to help them make their fight and denying funds to the anti-Communists in Spain, who have more men under arms today and a larger potential of men than Tito ever hoped to have. There are between 300,000 and 400,000 men, well trained and equipped soldiers, in Spain, and a million men could be brought to the colors and trained within 6 months, if they had the support of planes, tanks, and the heavy artillery they need. Certainly the Pyrenees are a barrier that will not be easily crossed.

I heard over the radio that regardless of what we do, the President claims the right to impound any money we appropriate. I do not challenge that right. If, after Congress appropriates funds, he sees fit to decide that he is not going to spend a nickel of the amount, that will be his responsibility. Spain may never get any of this money and we may never receive any help from Spain. Some day we may be on the battle front in western Europe fighting the onrushing tide of communism and wanting allies who have been receiving not \$62,500,000, but hundreds of millions of dollars of ECA money, and they may say "Gentlemen, we prefer to be neutral. We are so sorry, but we can not put our cities in this situation. Please count us out."

If anyone thinks we have bought last-thing friends with ECA money, he should go to Europe and take a quick look at the situation. I have been in favor of voting ECA funds because I felt that if we did not give the western European nations rehabilitation funds, the propaganda put out by the Communists would sway so many poverty-stricken people that they would yield to it. It is not poverty, as someone recently pointed out, that makes Communists. We can go to some of the mountain areas in Virginia

where the people do not know what \$250 cash means, but they would fight, until their gun barrels got hot, for freedom and against communism. We are dealing in Europe with many people who have never known real freedom. We have tried to sell them a conception of democracy and the enterprise system which they do not know anything about. I have been saying that if we tried to sell them the principles of the Christian religion, on which our democracy is founded, they would know something about it. We do not have to tell them the meaning of God or of the ethical principles of the Bible which the Communists seek to destroy.

But the point I make, Mr. President, is that we spent approximately \$2,000,000,000 in a program of trying to buy friends and trying to buy peace, and it did not work. Therefore I exercised the privilege, with other Members of the Senate, to use my best judgment as to how to appropriate future funds in a struggle in which our destiny and our future are vitally concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am in complete agreement with the statement which has been made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in regard to the fact that the Senate conferees apparently made little effort to secure the retention of the amendment adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming vote to reduce nondefense spending by 10 percent. This amendment was very carefully prepared. It was prepared after consultation with the Budget Bureau, with the Comptroller General, and other officials of the Government. It was so prepared that it required a 10-percent reduction in non-defense spending by each department. Instead of that, the Senate conferees have agreed to an amendment suggested by the House which permits the President to cut nondefense expenditures by \$550,000,000, approximately the same reduction which would have resulted from the Bridges-Byrd amendment. Under the provision now contained in the conference report the President can in the case of any department of the Government use a meat ax and cut those things he does not like, or, perhaps, hold the power given him as a threat over the heads of Senators in connection with appropriations in their own States, such as those for rivers, harbors, and other public improvements. He can suspend the construction of public works and say that it is the result of the reduction contemplated by the conference report.

Mr. President, I am very sorry that the Senate has abdicated in this matter. I think Congress should say where its appropriations are to be cut. The amendment which was proposed and adopted by the Senate was effective and workable, and was so declared by the Budget Bureau. It would have accomplished the desired result and we should still have retained control of the purse strings, which is the duty of the Congress.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have

printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in defense of an omnibus appropriation bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD IN DEFENSE OF THE ONE-APPROPRIATION BILL

The Congress today, has completed legislative action on what may be regarded as the complete regular appropriation side of the Federal budget. This was accomplished in the first consolidated appropriation bill of modern history.

The last of the 11 appropriation bills required for the expenditure budget for fiscal year 1950 was not passed until October 29, 1949. The consolidated bill for fiscal year 1951 embracing virtually all of the appropriations for the current year, except those incident to the unanticipated Korean outbreak, is ready for the President's signature two full months ahead of the budget completion date last year. At this date last year less than half of the 1950 appropriations had been enacted.

As an advocate of the consolidated appropriation bill procedure, I cannot refrain at this time from remarking on the record that Congress has made in the first year of its operation. Actually the single appropriation bill this year accomplishes what was done last year in 11 separate and virtually unrelated supply bills. With the exception of the interest on the debt and some other permanent and indefinite appropriation items the single appropriation bill this year embraced the appropriation objects covered by Presidential requests in January totaling \$34,800,000,000 including contract and loan authorizations and reappropriations. As the bill goes back to the President, the total has been reduced by \$2,000,000,000, the largest reduction yet made in an appropriation bill.

In contrast Presidential requests covered by the 11 separate bills last year totaled \$38,800,000,000 and congressional action, spread over 10 months resulted in increasing the aggregate by nearly \$100,000,000.

Last year the actual debate on the 11 bills in the House and the Senate totaled 290 hours in the aggregate. This year actual debate on the single appropriation bill in the two Houses totaled 236 hours; a reduction of 54 hours.

Last year 292 Members of the House and Senate participated in the debates on the 11 bills. This year 308 Members of the 2 Houses participated in the debate on the single appropriation bill; an increase of 16.

From the RECORD there is no way of computing the Members on the floor at all times when a bill is under consideration, but the RECORD does show that the average number of announced absentees on days during which the 11 appropriation bills of last year were under debate in the Senate was 14. Absentees announced on days when the single appropriation bill was debated this year averaged the same number—14.

In summary, the record shows that enactment of the single appropriation bill this year required less time, promoted fuller participation and resulted in savings rather than increases.

These statements are based on examination of the RECORD itself and they are submitted in the nature of a factual reply to criticism which may be summarized by the remarks of the majority leader of the Senate, who, at the conclusion of the debate on the single appropriation bill, August 4, 1950, (column 3 of p. 11821 of the RECORD), said:

"When the Congress convenes next year I think it will seriously consider the repeal of the rule which provides that an appropriation may be considered in one package. I am convinced that, as the result of the ex-

perience we have had this year, the work we are now going through has saved no money, so far as decreases in appropriations are concerned. I am convinced that we have consumed more time than was necessary in handling this appropriation bill collectively than would have been consumed had we considered the bill in separate categories. I have talked with many Senators and have found none who disagreed with this particular thought."

As a sponsor of the resolution for the single appropriation bill procedure which was approved by unanimous votes in both the Senate Rules Committee and the Senate itself, I would not expect the majority leader to have included me among those to whom he talked in an effort to find agreement with his view that we should seriously consider changing the procedure. Of course I know that the single appropriation bill required changes—changes in committee procedure, changes in committee staff work, changes, in some cases, in committee and subcommittee organization, changes in preparation of the bill and report, and changes in the management and presentation on the floors of Congress. And I know that changes in long established customs are the most difficult changes to make. But I believe in this case, the record shows that the changes have been good and progressive in all of the aspects involved.

I believe especially they have been in the interest of more intelligent consideration of the budget by the Congress, individually and collectively. I dare say more Members of Congress know more about what is in the budget this year than at any other time since World War I, when the budget first began to assume colossal proportions.

Contrary to the views which were found by the Senate majority leader, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, who more than anyone else in Congress has the responsibility for appropriation legislation, on June 20, after he had steered the single appropriation bill through the House Committee and the House itself, said "the single appropriation bill offers the most practical and efficient method of handling the annual budget and the national fiscal program. Judged by our experience there is no legitimate reason which can be advanced against it. Conversely, there is every reason for the consideration of all appropriations in one bill. The consolidated bill is in conformity with the best business thought of the Nation. It is supported by the weight of public opinion. It has been approved by metropolitan newspapers in every section of the country."

These are quotations this year, after he had worked with the single appropriation bill, by the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. He summed up his remarks on experience with the single appropriation bill, in contrast with his long experience with the old methods to which the majority leader of the Senate, would return, by saying:

"It is inconceivable that the Congress should consider taking a backward step reverting to multiple supply bills. They are the quill and pen and the three-legged stool in an adding-machine age. They are the ox-cart and the kayak in a jet-plane era. The decision on the applicability of the one bill to modern budgetary conditions determines whether under our form of Government the representatives of the people can control national spending or whether they will continue on down the rapidly accelerating declivities of the road to unbalanced budgets and mounting national debt."

These quotations from the Hon. CLARENCE CANNON are taken from the beginning and the end of his June 20 estimates of the value of the single appropriation bill. In between he refuted every criticism that has been made of the new procedure.

As to the charge that the single appropriation bill opens the way for more partisan

manipulation of the budget, Mr. CANNON said: "Neither party can possibly gain or lose any political advantage except by making it in any case an instrument for carrying out more completely and more effectively its platform pledges for economy and better administration."

Chairman CANNON's answers to other criticisms may be paraphrased as follows:

1. The single appropriation bill provides a means of proper and orderly retrenchment through better allocation of funds.

2. The single appropriation bill permits earlier reporting of the appropriation recommendations in the aggregate. (The House had the full appropriation bill before it on March 21.)

3. The single appropriation bill lends itself to better organization of subcommittee, and committee staff organization, with the result of a more thorough consideration and processing of estimates and appropriations. The effect was demonstrated by the relatively few changes made in the committee recommendations found by the House to be necessary.

4. The single appropriation bill, lending itself to a more complete and comprehensive understanding of the fiscal situation, protects the bill against ill-conceived and poorly drafted amendments.

5. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee found that the single appropriation bill tended to keep members on the floor during its consideration.

6. He emphatically refuted the contention that the single appropriation bill would be conducive to increased log-rolling. Actually, he said experience with the single appropriation bill this session demonstrates that it effectively disposes of the old system of log-rolling so prevalent in the consideration of individual departmental bills.

7. The House chairman said the single bill visualizes at a glance the outline of national income and expenditures and centers the attention of the country on the national fiscal program. "It was the pitiless lime-light of national attention concentrated on the final votes" he said, "that offset the pleas and importunities of the pressure groups and special interests."

8. He said that the single appropriation bill procedure eliminated the practice of a dozen or more subcommittees, working in their segregated corners of the budget, spending in the dark.

9. He said the single appropriation bill, in itself, tends toward the elimination of conflicts, duplications and overlapping expenditures.

10. He said the single appropriation bill discourages the practice of attaching irrelevant riders either in committee or by floor amendment.

11. The House chairman disclaimed the contention that the Senate must mark time until final action on the single appropriation bill is taken by the House. On the contrary, he said, under the new system the Senate may begin work much sooner than before—within a week or two after the session opens—because the House subcommittee transmits to the Senate committee the printed hearings as they progress.

12. As to the item veto objection, Chairman CANNON first referred to the constitutional question involved and then said the item veto could be used on the single appropriation bill as well as on the separate bills and that the veto power would be stronger on the single bill than on any of the separate bills because operation of virtually all of the Government instead of a relatively small segment would be involved.

13. Chairman CANNON said the most untenable of all the objections to the single appropriation bill was that it was unwieldy. To this he replied the experience of every major nation in the world and every State in the Union belies such criticism.

These are the views, based on experience with both the old system and the new, of the man who has the prime responsibility for appropriation legislation in Congress.

Anything I would say, of course, would be anticlimactic. But in my humble judgment the Congress has done a better, a more thorough and a more intelligent job on appropriations this year than at any time since I have been privileged to be a Member of the Senate. That goes for the membership of the committees as well as the full membership of both Houses. I think the procedure has been more orderly, the debate more complete and enlightening, and the action has by far been based on better consideration as a whole.

I believe the public has a better comprehension of the task involved, that it has a better appreciation of the problems which have to be solved, and that it, too, has benefited from the more intelligent debate.

This in itself is progress. I believe that we would have come close to producing a balanced budget, despite the President's January requests for \$5,000,000,000 of deficit financing, if it had not been for the outbreak in Korea.

I believe under normal conditions, with the single appropriation procedure we can do a better job, a more intelligent job, and balance the budget with less time consumed and a fuller participation in debate. It is certain that it would have been impossible to write \$2,000,000,000 of reduction in 11 regular appropriation bills scattered hit and miss over the 8 months since January.

Even if it had taken half of an entire session to pass the appropriation bill, the time and the effort and the study would be fully justified, for the budget of the United States is the biggest fiscal operation on earth. And without sound financial conditions in this Government there can be no hope for the preservation of our freedoms, or security against invasion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BRIDGES] and also in the remarks just made by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], with reference to section 508 of the conference report. I do so as a Member of the Senate and as one who sat as a conferee attempting to iron out the differences confronting the Senate and the House.

The so-called Bridges-Byrd amendment was worked out over many weeks. It provided a sound formula. If we are to make cuts in appropriations from now on, I doubt if we could find a formula which would be more practical than the one that was submitted. The Bridges-Byrd amendment, calling for a 10-percent cut was adopted by the Senate by an overwhelming majority. Under it the responsibility would be placed squarely on the Congress. We would not have delegated the authority. I remember the complaint that was made a year ago by columnists throughout the country. They said, "This is a meat-ax cut. You are simply squirming out of your responsibility and putting it on the shoulders of the President." Yet here we are supplanting the so-called Bridges-Byrd formula with the old meat-ax formula. That is exactly what is being done. The power is delegated to the President to make the cuts where he pleases. Granting that he would make them and get the most efficient economy possible, yet it is very

difficult to do the job. It is very difficult, indeed, because the bill contains one chapter here, another chapter there, and various subsections in the chapters. They were all gone over very carefully, and the Congress accepted the full responsibility and told the Bureau of the Budget and the executive agencies where to make the cuts percentagewise. That constituted a sound formula. It was adopted, as I said before, by an overwhelming vote of the Senate. Now it has been taken out in conference. That is to say, there was no agreement on it because of the pressure to pass the appropriation bill. It was said "We must pass the appropriation bill out. If you hold it out any longer, this and that will be jeopardized."

If the conference report is adopted, I trust that the membership of the Senate will remember that the formula we are adopting is the old meat-ax formula. The cuts will be made by the President through his executive agencies, and they will be made where and when he wants to make them. He takes the full responsibility off the shoulders of Congress under a delegated authority. It is contrary to the basic theory of the Byrd-Bridges amendment, which I think would have been most successful in application.

Mr. President, no doubt the conference report will be adopted. There are other things about which I might comment, because I worked very diligently with the committee. I voted with the Senator from New Hampshire to strike out section 508, because I felt that if cuts are to be made, they should be made under the formula, not in the manner in which they would be made under the conference report, with instructions to the President to cut approximately \$550,000,000 from appropriations which now total, or will total, when we add the supplemental deficiencies to the omnibus appropriation bill, in the neighborhood of \$60,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I hope when the Committee on Appropriations does its work in another year, the program which was industriously worked out by the members of the committee will not be disregarded. If it were not for the fact that apparently there is much anxiety about having the appropriation bill passed, I think this would be one time when Members of the Senate would be justified in attempting to resist the conference report in order to strike out the provision delegating the authority to the President, and reinsert the Byrd-Bridges amendment. It seems to me that if we want to do the job and do it right, and provide a formula which can be used from now on, we should not disregard the formula, which we would surely do if we were to accept the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I regret to hear my friends denounce the conference report and charge that the reduction is to be made with a meat ax. The committee took almost 10,000 pages of printed testimony. It heard practically everyone who wanted to be heard; no one was denied a hearing. The committee did not turn down the Bridges-

Byrd amendment. There was all kinds of evidence about the Byrd-Bridges amendment. We took evidence on practically every item in the bill, which consists of nearly 500 pages—478 pages as I recall—and embraces many subjects. Meat ax? Oh, no. It is based on testimony. Since January 28, 1950, the committee has been diligently at work. It did not work for some weeks and then do nothing the next week, but it worked diligently every day and every week. Meat ax? Oh, no. That is ridiculous, Mr. President. I am astonished that my friends should complain about the Byrd-Bridges amendment not being retained and that the committee used a meat ax. What in the world would they want us to do? Let us look at the report. By how much did the committee reduce the appropriations originally contained in the bill? I have some figures before me.

The House bill as passed—I am making a recapitulation of the figures—appropriated \$27,346,713,664. The Senate bill as passed appropriated \$32,577,362,231. The conference action, as is usually true in conference actions, was a compromise. Incidentally, in this instance there was a real and free conference, not only in the opinion of myself, but in the opinion of many other members of the conference committee. The conference action provides appropriations of \$32,253,455,425, which is under the amount in the Senate bill by \$323,906,806. It is under the Budget estimate by \$1,646,753,223. Does that look as though the committee had used a meat ax?

Let me tell the Senate something else. The Appropriations Committee worked from the 26th of January to the 28th of August, or approximately 7 months, in preparing the bill.

It is said we should have cut the appropriations 10 percent, and left them there. There is not a Senator in this body who would have done that; not one would have voted for such a thing. Would any Senator have voted to cut by 10 percent the amount required to pay the interest on our bonds? Would any Senator have voted to cut 10 percent from the amount going to our soldiers and sailors of the First World War, the Second World War, or any other war, who went forth to fight for the Nation? It is said the conferees excepted those items. They did except some, it is true. But what about a proposal that would take in everything, and make no exception?

This is the first unified bill we ever had. The chairman of the committee time and again said we were going to give the unified bill the fairest show in the world, and if the committee did not give the unified plan a fair show, then it is impossible to give it one, because we made every effort to do so. There was not a member of the committee who did not try to give it a fair show.

Before we went to conference, the House had abandoned the plan for a reduction to the extent of not including the ECA funds.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I will state the reason.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator should tell the whole story. The authorization bill had not been passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was the excuse for it; but it could have been put in just as easy as not.

Mr. President, that is not all. The House abandoned something else. Names were given for the various appropriations, like the "Army bill," the "Navy bill," the "Treasury bill," and the various other bills. The House changed those to "chapters," but the bills are virtually the same as before. The various appropriations are contained as "chapters," instead of being designated "Army bill," and various other bills.

Before I leave the subject of the 10-percent reduction, I wish to say that we have reduced the bill more than 10 percent. As I remember the figure, it is reduced by nearly 12 percent. It has not been reduced by guess, not by a formula that says it shall be reduced 10 percent whether the appropriation is good, bad, or indifferent. We have not reduced it in that way. We have taken proof, we have heard evidence on the bill, and after taking the proof and after cutting as much as we could, we had to make provision for war expenses. Some might have conceived that we would have a war, but I do not think all did. That changed the action of the committee to some extent. It should have changed it. We had to change it.

Mr. President, I am a realist when it comes to some things. Looking at both sides of the Senate, not leaving out the Republicans on the other side, I ask if there is a Senator who thinks we should not have increased the war items when requested to do so by the President after we got into the Korean war. If there is one, I would like to have him hold up his hand. I want to see what Senator would have reduced those items by 10 percent or any other percentage.

Under our rules, the committee hears the evidence and determines on the evidence what the appropriations shall be, and after we pass a bill we have a conference with the House. As I have said, we worked on this bill for more than 7 months and we worked on it daily, not merely when Senators happened to be in town.

While I am talking about what the committee itself has done, I wish to say a word or two about those in the employ of the committee, from Mr. Everard Smith on down to the last employee. I have never known the employees of a committee to do such outstanding work as has been done by the attachés of the Committee on Appropriations in this case, and I take my hat off to them. I would not say a word in criticism of any of them. I cannot agree with my friends who are so violently opposed to the conference report. I believe six or seven Senators already have spoken stating this was the most outrageous bill ever to be passed. These men are well-intentioned, but the members of the Committee on Appropriations are not violent characters one would assume they were from what has been heard from five or six speakers. They are fine men, and they want to do what is right,

and have tried to do what is right. As God is my judge, I have had but one idea, and that was to do the best I could for the people of the country. That has been emphasized as we met the unfortunate circumstance of being in war. We have had to increase the appropriations. We could not decrease them by 10 percent.

Mr. President, what has been the history of this body? The Senate has been in existence since 1789, and the committees have been in existence for that time. There is nothing in the law, there is nothing in the rules, providing that appropriations shall be reduced according to percentages.

My good friend the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is seated just in front of me. He is one of the finest men God ever made; there never was a finer. I have known him since he was a youngster, and there is nothing but good I could say about him. But he cannot demonstrate that a straight cut of 10 percent would be a cure-all for the difficulties in which we find ourselves with regard to appropriations. They have to be investigated. They have to be examined. The committee has to take testimony. It has to know where to make a cut and where not to make a cut.

Mr. President, I am asking the Senate to stand by the committee. Of course, errors have been made by the members of the committee. I know errors have been made by the chairman of the committee. I freely confess to mistakes and errors. But we were trying to do our best for the country, and that was emphasized when the war unexpectedly came on. It was unexpected to me. I never dreamed we would be in a war. That made the condition worse and made the obligation on the members of the committee greater. I want to say to Senators who are for this bill and Senators who are against the bill that the committee has done its best to do what is right.

At this point I wish to read the remainder of the recapitulation to show what the committee has done. From what has been said about the committee's action one might think it had not done anything. One might think that perhaps the members of the committee had looked into the committee room occasionally, but had not really done anything. One would think our employees have not done anything. Mr. President, I wish to say that in all my life I have never seen any employees work like those of the committee.

What are the savings the committee has effected? I have the figures before me. I shall state first of contract authority. The amount carried in the House bill was \$2,147,626,500. The amount carried in the Senate bill was \$2,184,570,000. The conference action left the amount at \$2,170,145,000. The reduction made in conference is \$14,425,000. That is in contract authority alone.

In cash the total amount of the reduction made in conference is \$323,906,806, which added to the contract authority reduction of \$14,425,000, makes a total of \$338,331,806.

We have taken \$1,600,000,000 off the bill, and authorized the President to take

off more. Some say we should not have done that. As a general thing, I should say it would have been better not to have done so. It was done this time, however, because the President wrote a letter to the Congress, which he gave out to the press, as well, in which he told us what he wanted to do. The Constitution says he must do so. He merely carries out his duty as President. He may be wrong. I do not know. Presidents are sometimes wrong. But certainly there is no reason in the world to think that he would disregard the wishes of Congress. The Congress said, "We will cut off 10 percent and give you authority to change the percentage if you want to." We have appropriated for the specific items. We have told the President what we wanted. It is going to be done, too. We all know that.

Those of us who have been here these many years, who have seen Presidents come and go, and some have even seen Senators and Representatives come and go, know how these matters are carried out. I believe that President Truman will do his duty. He did his duty when he was a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. He was a member of that committee for a number of years. He is familiar with the committee, its operations, and the thoughts of the members of the committee. In my judgment, he wants to do the right thing.

I have seen a number of Presidents ever since President McKinley. I have seen President McKinley, President Theodore Roosevelt, President Taft, President Wilson—one of the greatest human beings I ever laid my eyes on, one of the most remarkable statesmen who ever walked these halls. I have seen President Harding, President Coolidge, President Hoover, President Franklin Roosevelt, and President Truman. I think every one of them was an honorable man and wanted to do what was best for his country.

Mr. President, I do not have much sympathy for abuse of men. Perhaps that is because I myself have received too much of it in my own life. But I think we could get along better perhaps by looking at things in a kindlier way. Sometimes it is necessary to use somewhat stern language, but it is not often necessary, and we should endeavor to avoid the use of such language as much as we can. Why should the Appropriations Committee be abused in view of the hard work it has done? We have passed on every item it was necessary for us to act upon. We have dealt with every problem with which we were confronted. We have heard every witness who desired to be heard. We have denied to no one the right to come before the committee and testify. Believe me, many witnesses came before us. There are 10,000 printed pages of hearings in connection with this one bill.

Mr. ECTON rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield for a question.

Mr. ECTON. No, Mr. President. I wanted to make a few remarks.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I thought the Senator from Montana wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two about some other matters. Much has been said about the Byrd-Bridges amendment. More has been said about that particular item than any other item in the bill. The Congress has never adopted such a method of dealing with appropriations. I know the Senator from Virginia so well and I know the Senator from New Hampshire so well that I know they want to save money, and that they honestly believe their method is the best way to save money. I have the same feeling as they do; that is, I want to save every dollar that can be saved. The bill resulted in saving more than \$2,000,000,000, when all items are included. The bill was \$2,000,000,000 under the budget estimate. It is not often a committee reports a saving of \$2,000,000,000. Did anyone hear of that having been done before? Any Senator who has ever heard of the Appropriations Committee saving more than 2,000,000,000 in one bill let him hold up his hand. I do not see any hands held up. I did not see any hands held up a while ago when a similar question was asked. We have taken \$1,600,000,000 off the bill and authorized the President to take off \$550,000,000 more. The committee has saved more than \$2,000,000,000 in this one bill, Mr. President. Why has that been done? It has been done because of a plan.

Mr. President, it is a remarkable thing that today we have reached the rather unusual situation in which a man cannot be a statesman unless he has a plan. We have the Jones plan, the Smith plan, innumerable plans. If a Senator is to be regarded as a statesman, he must have a plan. Let me say to the Senator from Virginia, whom I know affectionately as Harry, that I think that is one mistake he and I have made; I do not believe either of us ever has reached the point of having a plan. Under present circumstances, it seems to be obvious that a Senator cannot be a statesman unless he has a plan; he must have a plan. Similarly, legislation is not regarded as the kind of legislation it should be unless it is based on a plan; there must be a plan.

My friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is looking at me now, and is smiling—delightful gentleman that he is. I say to him that he had better get a plan as soon as possible.

My good friend—I started to say my lifelong friend, for he is very nearly that—the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], one of the handsomest and one of the best men I know, has a plan, does he not? He has been so successful that I am rather inclined to think he does have some plan.

Mr. President, not long ago I was talking to an outsider about the same thing. He said the mistake I have made in my official life has been that I never had a plan; and he pointed out that if a man is to be a statesman he must have a plan. I suppose that is so.

Of course, Mr. President, there are plans and plans—some of them very good, some not so good.

Although I have not had a plan, I wish to assure the Senate, Mr. President, in the presence of Almighty God, that I have had but one desire in connection with this bill, and that has been, and still is, to save as much money as possible and, at the same time, to provide the necessary funds in order to permit the Government to realize its ideals and to effectuate its policies to the greatest extent possible. I believe that has been the attitude which all of us have maintained, and certainly it has been mine.

The able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who preceded me as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is one of the finest men in the world. Despite all he has had to say about this measure, I think that inwardly he knows that this is the way to legislate, namely, to legislate item by item, to take the proof, to obtain the facts, and to legislate on the basis of the facts, not on the basis of guesses.

Mr. President, let us not legislate on the basis of percentages. Whenever I think of percentages, I think of my early days, when I had to borrow some money. I did not like percentages then because I had to pay a good deal more than is required to be paid in these days when a person borrows money. I never liked percentages then, and I am still not wedded to percentages. They are all right in a way, but I am not wedded to them insofar as legislation is concerned. I think we should be more reasonable, more accurate, and more aware of exactly what should be done so that we can deal in exact amounts rather than in percentages.

Mr. President, complaint is made because the conferees voted to provide a little more money for ECA—although we voted to reduce the amount by \$200,000,000—than some persons thought should be provided. Some Members of Congress think we should reduce that amount by an additional 10 percent.

I wonder whether the Senators who now are listening to my remarks—and I thank them very much for doing so—remember that about a year ago I tried my best to have the Senate reduce the amount of the appropriation for ECA. I am in favor of the ECA appropriation carried in this bill because the Senate directed me to be in favor of it. The Senate voted for the largest amount proposed for that purpose, and so I have tried to do my duty, just as my friend who is sitting across the aisle—I refer to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is smiling, as he always is—always tries to do his duty. The Senate will recall that a majority of the Senate voted against me in connection with that item, and a majority of my own committee voted against me then. After my own committee opposed me on the question of reducing our gifts to foreign countries, I accepted the judgment of my friends in the Senate, for this is a wonderful body, made up of wonderful men, and all Senators should stand by its collective judgment. I am not one of those who disbelieve in the Senate or who disbelieve in our form of

government. I am not one who believes in a one-man government. In my opinion the time will never come when we have a one-man Government.

I am in favor of the United States Government as it is constituted under our wonderful Constitution. I held up my hand before Almighty God and took an oath forever to defend this Government of the United States, and I will always do so.

I think the Senate is a great body—although not because the Senate usually goes along with me, for actually the Senate usually goes against me. Many of my friends on the committee have voted against me at this time. Nevertheless, I know that the Senate does what it thinks is best for the Republic, and I commend the Senate.

Mr. President, there is another thing which I do not think should be done. I refer to the way some Senators voted in regard to the appropriation for Spain. I shall not go into the details of that matter, other than to say that the committee voted in favor of the proposal, and the House agreed to it, and the item is carried in the conference report. So I think it is our duty to uphold what has been done by the committee, by the House and by the Senate up to this time.

Mr. President, I hope to heaven this conference report will be adopted promptly. I was in hope that it would be agreed to very quickly, as quickly as I have seen many other conference reports on appropriation bills agreed to—in short, without any discussion at all. In fact, I was so much in hope of having that done that, as Senators know, I had not even prepared a speech on this measure.

A short time ago I was talking about the conference report to another member of the committee, and he wished to know how long I would speak on it. I told him I would not speak at all, if I could avoid doing so. He said, "I think the report will be adopted in about 45 minutes." Well, Mr. President, we have already been considering the conference report for over an hour now, and we have not yet begun to vote on it.

Ordinarily the Senate does not take long to act on a conference report on an appropriation bill which has been thoroughly considered, a bill which the committee has gone over thoroughly, item by item, and then has reported to the Senate, and after the Senate has gone over all the items and has argued every one of them. Every one of the items which has been referred to in the debate today has been argued before this body and has been approved by this body by an overwhelming majority, and then has gone to the House, and the House conferees have agreed to it; and the House itself has agreed to all these items, with one exception, which I shall mention in a moment. Certainly the Senate already has voted in favor of these items. Under these circumstances, the Senate usually takes very prompt action on a conference report on such a measure.

By the way, Mr. President, one of the finest men I ever knew was a predecessor of mine. Some persons know him simply because he was General Pershing's father-in-law, but I knew him as

Francis E. Warren, a Senator from Wyoming, an able and splendid man, conscientious to the highest degree. He served as governor of his State, and he served his people well and faithfully; he served them as few men ever did.

I have seen him do as I have done, when I attempted quietly to lay a conference report before the Senate and move that it be agreed to. I have seen Senator Warren time and again rise to say, "Mr. President, I submit the conference report, and ask for its immediate consideration"—and he got what he wanted. He would then say, "Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report." Without objection, the conference report would be agreed to. Frequently I have seen conference reports agreed to without objection, though, of course, if any Senator opposed it and wanted a vote he could have a vote and be recorded as voting against it.

Mr. President, I wonder whether Senators knew that some of those who supported the bill seem now to be against it. I am not referring to my friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], because he told us when he signed the report that there was one item in it which he did not like, but he would sign the report because he thought the bill ought to pass.

Mr. President, this bill ought to pass. It is now nearly 2 months overdue. That, by the way, brings up something else. I wonder whether I can state it. In doing so I hope I may be able to state it without offense to anyone. Senators will remember that when early in the session the question came up of a unified appropriation bill—not 12 or 13 separate appropriation bills, as we had before that, but of combining them all in one bill—I did not favor it. We were informed by Members of the House that a unified bill would be passed by the House and sent to us for consideration by April 15, and that we would have 2½ months in which to pass it. It was not long until, judging from the newspapers, it appeared that it would be impossible for the House to pass it by April 15. June 1 was being discussed. First, it was thought it could be passed by May 15, I think it was, and then by June 1. I called upon our committee to begin work on it. We took testimony on the bill before it ever came to us. I was about to say we took tons of testimony—it was not tons, but there were 10,000 pages of it, all told. We began in January, and when we concluded, about April 15, we were informed it would be about May 1 before the bill would reach the Senate; which was later changed to May 15, then to June 15, and then to July 1. I think it came to the Senate about June 26. Am I correct in that? Mr. President, I believe this is the first time I have ever wanted to ask a question of one of our able assistants to the Appropriations Committee when they were not on hand. I see that Mr. Everard Smith is on hand. He is always on hand. He informs me the bill passed the House on May 10. But it reached the Senate later than that. I desire to be accurate in my statements, and if I am in error I shall ask to have it corrected. I have no desire to say anything except what is the truth.

Senators see how the unified bill works. I may say it has worked the Senate Appropriations Committee tremendously hard. But we have done our duty. I ask Senators, not as members of the Democratic Party or as members of the Republican Party, but as Senators to stand by the good work which the committee has done in cutting one bill—think of it—more than \$2,000,000,000. I am very proud of that. I may be the only Senator who is proud of it. Other Senators may think it should have been cut less. It may be said we could have saved a great deal more than that by adopting certain rules. Yes, Mr. President, by adopting a rule, perhaps we could have saved the entire \$34,000,000,000, the amount we are to appropriate this year. We could have saved the entire amount, not by cutting it 10 percent, but by cutting it all out.

Mr. President, I believe I have now said everything I wanted to say, except on the subject of Spain. Let me return to that for a moment. I have never talked to Mr. Franco. In fact, I have not talked with any of the men who control the affairs of other countries. But, in times gone by, when I did not have so much work to do, when I had a little free time after the courts had adjourned for the summer, I occasionally went to Europe. In fact, I went a number of times. I saw the people there. All their governments are very similar. Why should Spain be excluded? Why should we treat her differently from other European countries? I am not going to argue the question at all. A lady once wrote me a letter in which she gave me, if I may use the expression, "unshirtd Hades" for favoring such a tyrant as Franco. I do not know Mr. Franco. There may be other Senators who know him, and if so, they know whether he is a tyrant; I do not know. I did not make my decision on that basis. I decided it upon the facts. I am a great believer in that. I know there were many people in the city of Memphis where I lived who sold goods to Spain. I took it up with them, and they informed me that the Spaniards paid their debts certainly as well if not better than the people of any other European nation. That is a pretty good recommendation. In these days it is an exceedingly good recommendation. I like people who pay their debts.

I was trying to reach a conclusion, and I did so. I believe that if we lend them money they will pay it back. We are not giving it to them; we are loaning it to them.

With that, Mr. President, I leave things to take care of themselves.

One other point, and I am through. It has been stated that there should be a horizontal cut. I want to have an experience meeting here. I wonder if there is a Senator listening to me—and there are a goodly number on both sides who, I think, are my friends—I wonder if there is a Senator in this body, including my very dear friend whom I see before me now, Mr. CORDON, who believes we should reduce expenditures by horizontal cuts. If there is such a Senator

present, I should like to have him hold up his hand.

I see no hands held up.

In what do Senators believe? They believe, with me, that we should get the facts and pass upon the items of the bill, just as the committee did, and cut certain items.

I see my friend from Oregon looking at me rather quizzically.

Mr. CORDON. And approvingly.

Mr. McKELLAR. He is one of the ablest members of the committee. I want to take time to say that, Mr. President. He is one of the ablest men on the committee. I have told him, confidentially, of course, that if I should get into trouble, if I were ever prosecuted for any offense, I wanted to engage him as my lawyer so that I would be certain that he was on my side and not on the other side.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. I yield to the Senator every day.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon would suggest that this is the first time he has ever found the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee off base.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall take a chance on that. I have taken a great many chances in my life, and I shall probably take a great many more.

Mr. President, I have already consumed too much time. I say to those who are taking such a strong stand on the other side that they may be right and I may be wrong, but there is no chance to put through their plan this time. If there is anything in the plan, it will certainly be adopted in days to come. The appropriation bill is on its last legs. We have fought over it for nearly 8 months. Let it go through. Ordinarily, the chairman of a committee, when he presents a bill to the Senate, makes a speech about it, and he should do so. I have already done that. I had hoped that after the bill had gone through all the processes, when it came to agreeing to the conference report, there would be an agreement without debate. When I talked to my friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] it was his idea that it would take approximately three-quarters of an hour to agree to the conference report. I did not think it would take that long.

Mr. President, we should adopt the report now. It does not give the President any greater powers than any President has had. The statement of the President was in every way a proper and able statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I think we all appreciate what the very able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee has said. We likewise appreciate the long months of hard work which he devoted to the consideration of this bill. I do not believe there is any Member of the Congress who would even intimate that he did not think the Senator from Tennessee and his committee had done a good job.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ECTON. I want my very good friend to understand that what I am going to say is absolutely no reflection on him, on the members of his committee, or on any member of the conference committee, but I still do not like the conference report. I appreciate the fact that there are many thousands of words printed with reference to the appropriation bill. I also appreciate the fact that the Senator from Tennessee and his committee labored day and night listening to everyone, on both sides, with reference to the intended appropriations. I want to compliment them on their judgment and their recommendations. They made some splendid recommendations to the Senate, and the Senate supported them by a substantial majority on most of their recommendations. But what concerns some of us is that after they had devoted to the bill many months of consistent hard work, they felt they had to abdicate in conference.

I am not blaming them. I realize what they were up against. I realize they could not do anything else. But, Mr. President, I think it behooves us all to recognize now what happened in the conference committee and in the conference report. If we open our eyes we can really see bureaucracy in action behind what has been done.

I am not talking about the cuts on various items. I am going to talk about something about which I think I know a little bit, for it pertains to my own State. Otherwise I would have nothing to say. I believe in the importance of each and every man who represents a State knowing the problems which confront his State a little better than they are known by anyone else.

I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on the way he and his committee have always treated me in connection with the problems concerning my State when I have appeared before the committee and asked for consideration. I could not wish for any better attention or for any more wholehearted consideration than I have received.

Mr. President, I do not know whether we realize just what is happening in this country. We are going a long way toward a goal, and I think we shall be very sorry about it some time. Not only have the people been warned but time and time again over the years, and yet it is being said, "Oh, it cannot happen in America. This is America. It cannot happen here."

I believe the Senate of the United States recognizes what can happen and what might happen in this country. I congratulate the Senator from Tennessee and his committee again for making specific recommendations in the report which was submitted to the Senate on this bill some time ago.

At this time, the Reclamation Bureau is busily engaged in building numerous dams and making plans for building many more in my State. We have all been in favor of reclamation. We all recognize that the arid West must have dams, electricity, and new

acres of land brought under cultivation and under irrigation.

It has been recommended by the Senate time and time again that the Government should work in cooperation and in unison with private capital and private industry to help bring these things about. The Committee on Appropriations has made such recommendations. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to read from the committee report at page 145. It relates to a power company which operates in Montana and tries to formulate a policy which Congress should follow.

The funds appropriated in the fiscal year 1950 were appropriated with the understanding that the funds would not be used by the Bureau if a wheeling agreement could be entered into with the Montana Power Co. whereby the REA's in the area involved could be supplied with power at the Reclamation Bureau rate. Such a wheeling agreement was not entered into and testimony at the Senate hearing this year was to the effect that the Reclamation Bureau felt it should build these facilities even though a wheeling agreement should be entered into with the Montana Power Co. On April 12, 1950, the Montana Public Service Commission approved a 5½ mills per kilowatt-hour rate for all REA's on the Montana Power Co. system, which rate is identical with the rate offered REA's by the Reclamation Bureau. Inasmuch as any savings to REA's in Montana resulting from the construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations by the Reclamation Bureau have been met by the new REA rate of the Montana Power Co. approved by the Montana Public Service Commission, the committee does not believe the Reclamation Bureau should continue its work on these facilities, which was only recently begun.

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

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The chairman of the subcommittee which has the matter in charge is not present today. I refer to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He is in Arizona. I am sorry he is not present, because probably he could give the Senate the reason why the Senate conferees yielded on this amendment. However, I have the idea—and the Senator can correct me if I am wrong—that it involved a fight between the power companies in Montana and the REA, and the House would not accept the amendment under the circumstances after hearing all the proof.

Mr. ECTON. I believe the Senator has been misinformed in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am asking the Senator for information.

Mr. ECTON. I do not think it is a controversy between the power companies and the REA. The difficulty lies with the Reclamation Bureau in Washington, which wants to monopolize all the power in Montana, and put our own companies out of business. That is where the trouble lies. Nine REA's signed contracts with the Montana Power Co. after the first of the year under which the REA's were to get a rate equal to the Bureau's rate. All they had to do was to have their contracts O. K.'d in Washington. What happened? The contracts have not been O. K.'d yet.

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

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not correct to say that the nine REA's had to sign the contracts?

Mr. ECTON. They did.

Mr. LANGER. But they did not sign it until after the construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line had commenced.

Mr. ECTON. They were not in on the Havre-Shelby transmission line.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the line which the Senator is discussing was supposed to have been completed on the first day of September?

Mr. ECTON. It will be completed.

Mr. LANGER. It will be?

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the entire matter was gone into very carefully, and it would have meant the loss of over a million dollars if the line had not been completed.

Mr. ECTON. It would mean a loss of \$3,000,000 to the Federal Government.

Mr. LANGER. But it would have meant the loss of over a million dollars to the Bureau of Reclamation, because the work would have to be abandoned.

Mr. ECTON. I realize nothing can be done about it now. What I am trying to have the Senate understand is that after the Montana Power Co. reduced its rate to the level of the Bureau rate, and the Senate committee had recommended that construction of the line be not continued, the Bureau went ahead and worked practically day and night to get the line as nearly completed as possible. I admit they have gone so far that no one can buy them out. The Government is in the power business in Montana at the expense of the taxpayers. The Bureau would never have needed to build that line in the first place if they had let the Montana Power Co. take it over and operate it.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not correct to say that unless the Bureau of Reclamation had built it the farmers in that area would not have obtained the cheap rate.

Mr. ECTON. No; that is not correct.

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

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. What were the farmers charged before the Bureau of Reclamation put in the line?

Mr. ECTON. The Bureau of Reclamation operating through the REA's told them they would never get electricity unless the Government built the line. That is what they said.

Mr. LANGER. That is true, is it not?

Mr. ECTON. When the Bureau of Reclamation was first created it was designed to bring land under irrigation. They have forgotten all about irrigation. The main thing they are interested in is corraling all the power in the country. I venture to say, Mr. President, that one investigation that will have to be made within the near future is an investigation of the policy and determination of the Bureau of Reclamation to get into the power business.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator knows, does he not, that literally thousands of farmers in Montana and North Dakota would not have REA current on their farms if it were not for the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. ECTON. The Bureau of Reclamation had nothing to do with setting up the REA. We were all in favor of rural electrification long before the Bureau of Reclamation ever thought about it. They had nothing to do with it. We had REA in Montana before the Bureau of Reclamation ever started to get in there.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator knows, does he not, that the Bureau of Reclamation has built lines in North Dakota.

Mr. ECTON. I do not know anything about North Dakota. I will leave the interests of that State to be taken care of by the Senator from North Dakota. I would appreciate it if sometimes someone else thought that I knew something about my own State. When the Bureau of Reclamation was created, it was established on a bipartisan basis. It was not ever designed as a political medium. I venture to say that the Bureau has resorted to the direst kind of questionable politics during the past few years, and it will continue to do so. It condemns the private power companies on the ground they have a monopoly. That is what the Bureau want themselves. They want a Government monopoly. To my way of thinking, it is 10 times worse to have a Government monopoly than a private monopoly, which is financed by individual stockholders. I do not own any stock in any private power company. If I did, I could at least sell the stock and get something out of it. I would like to know how much the Federal taxpayers can get out of the stock if they own Federal power lines all over the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to make it plain that I never opposed Federal power lines where they were necessary. What I am disgusted with, and what I condemn Congress for, and what I condemn the bureaucracy for furthering, is the building of power lines at taxpayers' expense, parallel to power lines which have already been built by private enterprise.

We hear many people condemning capitalism in this country. When they talk about it, they are talking about the old feudal capitalistic system of Europe. Our economy is based on a people's capitalism. It is from the people that the money comes to form the corporations to manufacture the articles which we use—automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and the like. The people individually invest in the companies. It is people's capitalism.

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

Mr. ECTON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I know it is true in Montana, because the same company operates there that operates in North Dakota, but is it not true that before the

REA's came in, a utility company line would go by a farmer's house, even though it was only four or five poles away, and the company would charge from a thousand to fifteen hundred dollars to hook the farm up to the company line? That is why the REA came into existence.

Mr. ECTON. I do not know about that, but I do know what happened in my own experience. I was in an REA one time trying to get electricity to my ranch, and we were to obligate ourselves to pay in the neighborhood of \$10 every month for 20 years. I never figured it out. We had to guarantee that we would put up that much to the REA in order to get them to hook up.

We fooled around 2 or 3 years and we could not complete the project. Then the Montana Power Co. in that neighborhood offered to permit us to hook up to their line. They built the first 1,000 feet free, and if we were more than 1,000 away from their line, they built the line, and we paid them 15 cents a foot for building it. We did not have to look after the wire, or poles, or insulators, or transformers, or anything of that kind. They gave every farmer the first 1,000 feet, and then charged 15 cents a foot thereafter. We had the same rate after that as if we had lived in town. If one had a pumping station or shop equipment, he got a reduced rate, just as the industrialist in town gets a little reduction on the quantity he uses. So do not say they did this and did that. I know what happened in my own actual experience.

Mr. President, probably some private companies did have bad relationships with public officials; I do not know anything about that. I am not here defending anyone. I am merely telling what could have been done and what the Senate was willing to do and recommended being done. But the conferees on the part of the House had the advantage. There are more of them, they are backed up by the bureaucracy downtown and all they have to do is to sit tight. The conferees on the part of the Senate do not have a chance. They have to accept what is offered.

Does anyone think the men on the conference committee over there would do anything about parallel lines in Montana? They did not ask me about conditions. I doubt if they asked the other Senator from Montana.

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

Mr. ECTON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is one time we did not have to do what the Senator has indicated we did.

Mr. ECTON. I have the information here. I can almost prove it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I ask the Senator to prove it. The Senator made a statement a while ago that the bureaucrats in Washington—

Mr. ECTON. I said it was bureaucracy in action.

Mr. McKELLAR. That it was a bureaucracy matter. I wish to say that not a single member from a Government bureau called on me at any time.

Mr. ECTON. Certainly not; they would know better than that.

Mr. McKELLAR. No lobbyists called on me, either.

Mr. ECTON. They did not have to. They get the job done. The Senator has been around here for a good many more years than I hope to be—

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not mean what he said, surely. He does not mean that I am controlled by anybody, surely. I resent that statement.

Mr. ECTON. I beg the Senator's pardon; I am not accusing the Senator of anything.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, the Senator is. I desire to say it is absolutely without the slightest foundation in fact that anyone controls me. I have been controlling myself a long time, and I still do it, and I am very active about it. I do not talk to a lobbyist that I know of, and I think they all know me and that I do not talk to them at all. I do not talk to lobbyists in the Government or lobbyists out of the Government. I think they all know it. The Senator has not been here long enough, or he would not have made such a statement about me.

Mr. ECTON. I am not accusing the Senator of anything. I said that the Senate conferees did not have a chance.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is wholly incorrect. The Senate conferees got more out of this appropriation bill from the conferees of the House than they have ever received in any conference since I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and that has been a long time.

Mr. ECTON. That may be, but at the same time they restored all the items for parallel public power lines, and that is what I am objecting to, after the Senate recommended that they be left out. The testimony was brought out.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not on the subcommittee; therefore, I do not know what the facts are. I am taking the facts as the Senator has stated them. I believe the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was chairman of the subcommittee having this matter in charge, and he is not now present, but I had the very distinct impression, as a member of the committee, that there was a fight between the private power companies and the rural electrification people.

Mr. ECTON. Oh, sure, that is the old gag.

Mr. McKELLAR. It may be an old gag, but it is a well-known gag, I tell the Senator. I do not believe there are many here who do not know the difference between the power companies and the Rural Electrification Administration. The latter has done wonders in my State, and I hope it has done wonders in the Senator's State. I like to see the whole country improved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana can yield only for a question.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Tennessee to understand that I have not intended to impugn his motives in any wise.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is very kind of the Senator, and I accept what he says in the spirit in which he says it.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, in order to show that this is not merely a question of the REA's, raised under amendment 273, the conference committee provided an appropriation of \$295,828,000, instead of \$297,467,000 as proposed by the House, and \$294,713,000 as proposed by the Senate. That is for construction of the Brighton-Brush transmission line substations, Colorado-Big Thompson project.

But with the following exceptions to such ratification:

(a) In addition to \$343,000 allowed by the Senate for the Fort Peck project, Montana, \$750,000 is also allowed to complete construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and substations. This is in lieu of the \$1,400,000 allowed by the House and of the entire disallowance of funds for this line as proposed by the Senate.

In other words, money was provided so as to insure that the Havre-Shelby line would be completed after the Montana Power Co. on April 12 reduced their rates to equal the Bureau rates. On top of that, the Montana Power Co. offered to purchase from the Government at cost all the materials which had been delivered on the project at that time. After they built that line as fast as they could, the Montana Power Co. made a cash offer in addition to a stretch of line between two places in Montana that did not have a line. The company offered to purchase that, and hook it up to their own line in order to supply the farmers and the people in that section of the State at the same rate as that charged by the Bureau. The Senate recommended that that be done.

I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that now it is too late to take corrective action. I agree with the recommendations of the conference committee in that respect for the line has been completed at public expense, at the taxpayers' expense, although the Montana Power Co. has a line there, and another line was not needed. So there is nothing to do but to proceed with the line and operate it at the taxpayers' expense. That is what happened.

Let us now consider item (b) of amendment No. 273. This is the thing that makes one's hair stand on end. This is what prompted me to say what I have said. The Bureau of Reclamation is building what they call the Canyon Ferry Dam in Montana. I think I know what I am talking about when I speak of that project, because it is only about 80 miles from where I live. What did the conference committee do? They put back in the bill \$365,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to build a line from Canyon Ferry Dam to Great Falls. The Bureau of Reclamation knows that the Montana Power Co. has two 100,000-volt lines into Great Falls from East Helena. It is only 17 miles from East Helena to the Canyon Ferry Dam, and the Montana Power Co. offered to build a line to take the power off the Canyon Ferry Dam when the dam is completed. Then the conferees put back \$365,000 for the Government to build a parallel line from Canyon Ferry into Great Falls, when there are already two 100,000-volt lines running between the two points.

Money has been provided in the bill to build a 115,000-volt line. That line will serve no RJA's in that territory.

The contention is made that it is REA versus Montana Power Co. No, Mr. President; it is not. The farmers of that area are told that the Montana Power Co. is out to get them. That argument is made for political reasons. The line from Canyon Ferry to Great Falls will serve no REA. It will be a duplicate transmission line. That is all it will be, pure and simple.

Mr. President, I realize it is useless for me to make any comments on this subject now. I realize it is useless for me to oppose the conference report because of this item. The damage has already been done. We thought we might be able to have inserted a proviso that if the power company did not permit the use of their lines into Great Falls, that is, enter into an agreement or complete negotiations to that effect with the Bureau within a reasonable time, then the Bureau could proceed and build these lines. But no, Mr. President, there is nothing in the bill like that; \$365,000 was put back in the bill with which to proceed and duplicate power lines at the taxpayers' expense.

The people of my State are becoming tired of such things, Mr. President. We have a public service commission which regulates the power companies within my State. The three members of the commission are elected directly by the people. Then we find some board or bureau in Washington, in the name of reclamation, going into Montana and putting up parallel power lines. When we come down to the real nub of the matter, we cannot blame the Bureau of Reclamation. The fault lies with Congress. It is our fault because we give the Bureau the money. Those in the Bureau would not amount to a hill of beans if they did not have the Federal Treasury behind them. You and I, Mr. President, could be big shots, too, if we had the Federal Treasury to back us in all our plans. We could then be statesmen, as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] said earlier today. We could all formulate plans if we could dig into the Treasury and back up our plans with the Treasury's dollars.

Mr. President, I say the time has come when a halt must be called on the actions of the Bureau of Reclamation. As I said before, they are no longer interested in irrigation. They are interested in creating power and controlling it. There was a man some years ago in the Bureau whose name was Raushenbush, or something like that. I remember he made the statement that one man within the Bureau with his plans is worth a hundred outside. Sometimes I believe there is not only one man with a plan in the Bureau, but that there are many such men, and that it will take thousands on the outside, yes it will take more than that, it will take the Congress of the United States to put a stop to their doings.

I am not against the Government building transmission lines where it is necessary, but I am against the Bureau of Reclamation building power lines at

taxpayers expense, duplicating and paralleling already existing facilities. I am mighty sorry that the conferees saw fit to restore to the bill the \$365,000 item with which to build the line from Canyon Ferry to Great Falls when it is not at all needed.

As I said before, it is useless to say anything now about the matter. It was railroaded through the conference committee. I cannot hold up the plan, and I suppose the Senate cannot either, because the conference report has already been adopted by the House. It was adopted there under such rules that no Representative dared speak on the subject except the chairman of the subcommittee, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Montana without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to support the conference report. I regret very much that my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. ECTON] finds it necessary to make a serious attack upon the conference report. I think he is making a great error when he says that the people of Montana are tired of the program which has been carried on in respect to these transmission lines in our State.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot yield, for I have been yielded to by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ECTON. When the Senator says the people are not tired of the program which has been carried on—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor, and can yield only for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Montana may make a brief reply, without causing me to lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. For how many minutes will the Senator from Montana speak?

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to speak for 5 or 6 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us provide 6 minutes for the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the senior Senator from Montana is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not rise to make any criticism of my colleague. He has a perfect right to take the stand he has taken. I know his position very well. Since he has been a Member of the Senate, he and I have cooperated very nicely, and I do not criticize him for the stand he now takes. He has a perfect right to attack the pro-

gram which has been carried out in Montana, but I think he makes a great mistake when he does so.

Heretofore the farmers of Montana have been compelled to pay high rates for electric power. Transmission lines did not reach some parts of Montana, and as a result it was necessary for the REA to undertake a program of making power available to the farmers. As a result of the building of the Hungry Horse Dam, it has also been necessary to build transmission lines. A huge transmission line carrying electric power from that dam to Anaconda, to serve the area there, has been built. It has also been necessary to build transmission lines in the Canyon Ferry-Great Falls area.

With reference to the Havre-Shelby transmission line, let me say that matter has been a subject of controversy here for a number of years. Last year we had a long debate in regard to that project, and after a full discussion the Senate finally voted in favor of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and provided appropriations for its construction.

Later on the Montana Power Co. sought to have construction of that line discontinued; but the line was in the course of construction, and as authorized it was completed. It already had been approved by the Congress. So it seems to me it is very unwise now for Senators to talk about discontinuing a line which has been wholly completed and will be of great benefit to the people of Montana.

As a result of this power development in Montana, our State now, for the first time in 40 years, is beginning to develop industries and, as a result, new settlers are beginning to come into the State. As a result of the reclamation program and the power-development program we have instituted, new industries are coming into Montana and the population is increasing, whereas theretofore the population had been decreasing.

So I think it is a great mistake for anyone now to attack a program so beneficial to Montana, especially after there was complete debate on it in 1949, and inasmuch as the program and the appropriations for its construction have been settled so far as the conference report is concerned. I submit that it is a very valuable program for the State of Montana and will be of tremendous benefit to all our people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of directing my remarks to the portion of the conference report pertaining to the elimination of the International Children's Emergency Fund, under the United Nations.

Before I refer directly to that portion of the conference report, let me say that I appreciated and enjoyed very much and, I am sure, benefited from the remarks of the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar].

Many comments have been made today regarding the conference report. I suppose several of us are a little unhappy about the report. Nevertheless, all of us realize the great responsibility

involved in connection with the preparation of an appropriation bill.

I, for one, as a newcomer in the Senate, wish to say that I did not find the over-all, one-package appropriation bill very desirable as it has operated to date. I believe it was much easier for us to know what is going on and to know the facts behind each appropriation request and recommendation when the appropriations were handled individually. With only one large appropriation bill and one over-all report on it, the detailed factual material we needed was not available. To be sure, the members of the Appropriations Committee are fully informed; and, as the Senator from Tennessee has said, they act on the basis of the facts and the testimony, not on the basis of guesses and percentages. Nevertheless, those of us who are not on the Appropriations Committee, but who have a vote—a vote which is just as important as that of the committee members—must form our judgments on the basis of the report the committee makes. I have found that on the basis of the over-all, one-package appropriation bill, the one-package committee report was not as documented or detailed as it could have been under the procedure of handling the appropriations under a series of bills, as has been done in former years.

I shall not speak in regard to how best to make the proposed cuts, except I wish to say it should be clearly understood that substantial cuts were made in the appropriation items. It is always difficult to know whether there should be percentage-wise cuts or cuts straight across the board, or whether certain exclusions should be provided for when cuts are made in the appropriations.

Be that as it may, the committee has reached its decision. The committee has decided to make a cut of approximately half a billion dollars in the appropriations—in fact, almost the same cut as would have been provided by the Byrd-Bridges amendment. Of course the exact method of making the cut is a matter of judgment which I shall not discuss now.

Neither shall I debate the merits of the Franco loan or of the loan to Yugoslavia. I listened with keen interest to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who made a very persuasive argument. I feel that any loan which is made should meet uniform conditions. However, once the decision is made, we have no choice but to follow it. After all, we operate on the principle of majority rule.

A decision has been made in reference to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund. Certainly I am not going to balk at adoption of the conference report and try to prevent its approval, as one Member of the Senate, just because I do not care for this particular decision. However, I feel that it is important to have the record clear in regard to what happened in the conference committee to the appropriation for the children's fund. I understand that a deficiency appropriation bill is being prepared. Therefore, I make these remarks now for the benefit of the RECORD and for the benefit of the committee. The points I shall make in this connection have been

fairly well substantiated, I think, by the evidence produced before the committee.

I was literally shocked and amazed when I read in the newspapers that the provision in the appropriation bill for the International Children's Fund had been eliminated from the conference report. The appropriation for that purpose was \$12,500,000, and it had been voted by the Senate after considerable debate. I cannot understand how the Senate conferees could recede from supporting that appropriation, when it had been strongly supported by the Senate.

Let me remind the Senate what happened in regard to that item.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator realize that, as I have been told, the House conferees were under the impression that \$25,000,000 was left over from last year's appropriation and would be available this year? However, that appropriation expired; and our whole point in providing \$12,500,000 in this measure was because the previous appropriation had expired and had not been extended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is my judgment that the conferees were laboring under a misapprehension in regard to the facts.

I am entirely in accord with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, and I think this point should be made for the RECORD, because the Children's Fund is one of the finest enterprises which has been under way since the war; but now it must go by the board, because no appropriation will be made for it, so far as this measure is concerned.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much for bringing up this question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his remarks, for he has been in the forefront of the fight to obtain this appropriation. I recall very well the valiant effort he made a few months ago in its behalf, and I thank him for the observation he has made and for the information he has given the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to say that there was such a statement made before the committee, as the Senator from New Jersey says. For myself, I am very much in favor of the fund designed to aid children. I think the Government of the United States should participate, and later on, we shall have a bill coming up at this session of the Congress, at which time it might be well to submit the matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for his last words, because it is our hope that we may come before his committee to plead again the cause of the children's fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee will be glad to have the Senator do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The distinguished chairman has always been most courteous and most generous with his time, and I know he will give us a friendly hearing.

I desire now to go over the record, so that we have it clear in the RECORD as to what happened. Twenty Senators, from both sides of the aisle, including the very distinguished leaders of the minority and of the majority, sponsored the original authorization for \$25,000,000. On the floor of the Senate this authorization was confirmed without a dissenting vote in connection with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1951. Then, thirdly, the conferees under the authorization bill cut the authorization from \$25,000,000 to \$15,000,000, and gave the President wide discretion in the use of the money.

Fourth. When the conference report was returned to the Senate floor it was severely criticized for the changes made by the conference committee.

Fifth. The Appropriations Committee tightened the legislation, but at the same time made another cut to \$12,500,000, which is 50 percent of the original authorization. This appropriation was again supported, and I remind the Senate that it was supported without a dissenting vote, on the floor of the Senate. Then, later, on my request for a yeand-nay vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to exclude the Children's Fund from the 10 percent, this body voted 44 to 41 against the 10-percent reduction. Right down the line there is a record of support in the Senate of the United States for the Children's Fund that is without equal. What is the logic then in exempting this organization from the 10-percent reduction, and then ultimately eliminating it entirely?

There has been much criticism of the United Nations on the floor of the Senate, and I am sure that most of that criticism has resulted generally from the idea that the United Nations is purely a public forum in which the delegates talk about international problems but never make an attempt to do anything about them. I do not concur in that statement, but there are some people who feel that way. But the United Nations Children's Fund program is a No. 1 demonstration that the United Nations can and has acted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary to have order on the floor of the Senate. Let the Chair observe that the speakers would be more limited in their remarks if they were getting closer attention. I think we can all save time by giving the speakers undivided attention, thereby letting this bill move along.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this speaker has not very much more to say. But he is talking about a subject which is important in terms of world peace and world understanding. This program is a demonstration that the United Nations can and has acted to save millions of children from malnutrition and disease. At the same time it is establishing permanent services for child health and welfare. I still think that the value of this program must be measured not only

in the terms of direct assistance to millions of children in 54 countries throughout the world but also in terms of the measure of cooperation which it has stimulated. I point out that this program operates in 54 nations of the world. First of all, there are 43 governments which have made voluntary contributions in the sum total of \$30,000,000. In addition, the people of 45 countries have contributed another \$10,000,000. In turn the recipient governments where the Children's Fund is used have provided more than another \$100,000,000 in local supplies and services. The administrative costs of this fund have been from 2 to 4 percent—as low as 2 percent and 4 percent.

Mr. President, I point out that every newspaper in America, with very few exceptions, has supported this fund, and that many prominent citizens have supported it. I have a list here of people from public life, from agriculture, from labor, and others, starting, first of all, with former President Hoover, who, in April of this year wrote a letter to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] supporting this program. There are also endorsing letters from William Green, president, AFL; Philip Murray, president, CIO; John Lynn, legislative director, American Farm Bureau; Wallace Campbell, the Cooperative League; Mr. Sanders, the National Grange; and Russell Smith, National Farmers Union.

There were also endorsing letters from all the church organizations. How in the name of common sense, with all that support, with the House and with the Senate of the United States again and again reiterating support of this fund, it could have been dropped in conference is more than I can understand.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say in answer to the Senator's question—and he put it in the form of a question—that I was a member of the conference committee. I voted for the international children's fund in the subcommittee and also in the full committee. I tried to retain it in the bill. The only reason the Senate conferees allowed it to be dropped was that they were convinced that it would be impossible to get a conference report without doing so. The conferees on the part of the House were adamant in their opposition to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I see.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If there is any method by which an appropriation for the children's fund can be provided, as the Senator wishes, that is another matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful for the action and statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. I also understand that our State Department was not in support of the children's fund.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The State Department was not enthusiastically in fa-

vor of the International Children's Fund, either before the subcommittee or the full committee. In spite of that, the Senate voted a substantial amount for it, which it yielded in conference, when it became perfectly clear, in the opinion of one conferee—myself—that it would be impossible to obtain an agreement to have the item included.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Being a member of the conference, I want to assure the Senator from Minnesota that the Senator from Michigan was in favor of the Children's Fund. It had passed the Senate, and he felt that it had a place in our scheme of things. But I am also satisfied, as was the Senator from Massachusetts, that it was impossible to get agreement with the House on a report on the omnibus appropriation bill with the Children's Fund in it, and it was therefore removed, over the protests of conferees on the part of the Senate. In the final compromise it had to be omitted in order to get a bill. It was not because of the merits or the lack of them, so far as the Senate was concerned at all. As the Senator has indicated, the State Department was not enthusiastic about it, but that was not a reason for omitting it from the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful for that information.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I may say that I desire to submit a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations. It will only take a moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall conclude in a moment.

Mr. GREEN. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I am not through, but when I have concluded, I shall be more than happy to yield the floor to my friend from Rhode Island.

All I want to say is this: We are appropriating billions and billions of dollars for the war—and that is absolutely essential. Here is one program which is directed toward the lives of children who have not made up their minds what kind of politics they favor, whether they are going to be Communists or non-Communists, whether they are going to be social democrat or Christian democrats, who have not made up their minds as to what their party politics may be. To think that the Congress of the United States would miss this opportunity for psychological advantage, for what I call effective political advantage, is something that I simply cannot quite understand. I shall go before the Appropriations Committee, and I understood my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], is going to appear before that committee, and, if the House of Representatives is adamant in its resistance,

then we shall have to break down the resistance, because this is an important program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the State Department must bear a large share of responsibility for the defeat of this program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was referring to that but a moment ago. I want to say now that if the State Department is opposed to this program, the State Department is wrong, it is lacking in vision, and it is about time that some of us who have supported the State Department told the State Department to get in line, where it belongs, which is on the side of the people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my judgment that the State Department has been almost a malignant enemy of the children's fund, that it is not interested in saving the lives of children, that it is primarily interested in conferences, where there is talk, talk, talk, with very little action. In my judgment, the State Department should be told to keep out of appropriation matters and to let the Congress of the United States legislate. I say that as one who has supported most of the proposals of the State Department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I concur in the statement of my friend from Illinois and tell him, very frankly, that I think his position is sound. The Senator from Minnesota is very much aware of the validity of the comment of the Senator from Illinois. I had taken upon myself, as one Member, to express a very sharp rebuke to members of the State Department for opposing this appropriation measure. They always seem to get themselves, on this issue, on the wrong side. Why, in the name of common sense, they cannot understand that this is an operating agency of the United Nations where we learn to work together before we get together politically, I do not know.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota mean to emphasize the word "this" when he says the State Department is on the wrong side of this issue?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota put the proper emphasis on the proper word at the right time. We will take up the other issues one by one. This is the children's fund.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, when the appropriation bill was under consideration in the Senate, and before final passage on August 4, I made some remarks about it. These remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 11817. I do not need to repeat at this time what I then said. What I said about the bill I believe to be equally true of the confer-

ence report. It is my belief that the report is unrealistic in that it does not take into consideration the demands upon the Government and upon the American people for national defense at this time. It represents the thinking of the Appropriations Committee prior to the time the bill was reported, and in that sense it is not in keeping with the present situation. This is unfortunate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the conference report on the omnibus appropriation bill.

There being no objection, Mr. O'CONNOR's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONNOR

In acting today upon the conference report on the omnibus appropriations bill, the Congress of the United States has opened the way for deserved consideration to the already overburdened taxpayers of the country. With approval of the conference report it remains for the President to take decisive action to affect substantial reductions in the budget.

It is a tribute to the earnestness and patriotism of the American people that they have expressed such a general willingness to supply whatever funds are needed to see us through the emergency caused by the conflict in Korea. This state of mind entails a great responsibility on the part of the Congress and of the Executive Department of the Government. There is an imperative need for elimination of nondefense items for the saving of critical material and manpower in this time of crisis.

There is ample authority under the bill for the President to cut nondefense spending to the limit. In fact there is unmistakable evidence of the determination of the people, speaking through their elected legislative representatives that numerous projects be eliminated or reduced.

I feel it is the will of the Congress and of the people that such items should be cut to the fullest extent possible, without impairment of any essential functions of Government, and I sincerely trust that the sum of \$550,000,000, recommended in the bill be realized by deferment of the nondefense projects. This action by the Executive will go far to convince the citizenry of the readiness of Government to curtail in times of grave emergency.

In this connection I ask that an editorial from this morning's Baltimore Sun entitled "Nondefense Spending Is the Place To Save" be inserted in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks, as follows:

"NONDEFENSE SPENDING IS THE PLACE TO SAVE

"Now that the House has passed the \$16,771,384,479 emergency defense bill we begin to realize what the operation in Korea and other defense measures are going to cost us. This is just a beginning. We are warned that the Defense Department is preparing an additional request for approximately \$10,000,000,000.

"In his report from Washington on the action of the House, Mr. William Knighton, Jr., calls attention to the unpleasant prospect that the total budget for the fiscal year ending next June 30 will be around \$70,000,000,000. In short, \$20,000,000,000 to \$25,000,000,000 are being added to military outlay.

"It should be obvious that with this vast emergency expenditure for defense involving all-out war in Korea, partial mobilization and arms for our allies, life in this country

cannot go on without change. Unless we are to invite financial disaster drastic efforts must be made to meet a part of these excessive expenditures as they occur.

"Without question there must be an increase in taxes. The Senate is debating a bill that would raise personal income taxes by \$2,700,000,000 and corporation taxes by \$1,500,000,000 for a total of \$4,200,000,000. But that will go a small way to balance the emergency defense costs.

"Another means of bringing expenditures more into line with income is to cut down on nondefense expenditures. Attention already has been called here to the claim of Senator BYRD, of Virginia, that nondefense spending can be cut as much as \$10,000,000,000. Yet, he says, that would still leave the administration as much to spend for its domestic schemes as it had in 1948.

"It is not necessary to check Senator BYRD's estimate to the exact dollar to know that there are many public works projects and other programs for the outlay of Federal funds that are not urgent. They have nothing to do with national defense. They could easily wait until more propitious times. But as yet, little more than a start has been made in this direction. Our best efforts at defense will be useless if they result in national bankruptcy. Our enemies know that all too well. The safeguard is to cut down on non-defense spending."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I shall not, so far as I am personally concerned, ask a record vote on the adoption of the conference report. I think it is quite evident from the speeches of Senators today that there is dissatisfaction with certain sections of the report. I think there is an over-all need of passing the bill; as has been stated, the major portion of the bill is satisfactory. On most points the conference committee did a good job; but I think what I said earlier, and what other Senators have said, should show that there is dissatisfaction with some parts of the report which are very fundamental. I think the necessity for the adoption of the report and the fact that such an excellent job was done on most sections of it warrants the position I take in not asking for a record vote.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as a member of the conference on the omnibus appropriation bill, I desire to make a few remarks.

I am not satisfied with the report. I feel that \$550,000,000 is not a sufficient reduction in the nonessential expenditures provided for by the bill. There are other items with which the Senator from Michigan is not at all pleased, but he had to come to the conclusion, after the sessions with the House conferees, that it was necessary to take the bill as it now stands. Otherwise, we would be unable to agree upon the report.

That does not mean, Mr. President, that we do not at times have to compromise on some figures. I hope the President of the United States, when he receives the bill, will revamp his thinking and that the Budget Director and his organization will revamp their thinking as to where they can cut certain items and reduce the cost of Government. I have come to the conclusion that it is very difficult, if not impossible, for committees to take the fat out of the cost

of Government. Every department which appears before the committee lays stress upon the fact that every item is essential; every project must be given its full amount in order that the agency requesting the appropriation may function at all. That is not a fact, but we are unable to get from the witnesses who come before the committee any idea as to where we can cut the budget.

Last year the Senator from Michigan was of the opinion that there should be a cut very similar to the one recommended this year, and that the President of the United States should do the cutting, because he would be able to eliminate the excess and get down to rock bottom. The Senate thought otherwise. This year there may be a reason why the President will decide actually to take \$550,000,000 out of the various funds. Let me say, for one, that if he should take much more out, \$550,000,000 should not be a limitation; it should be only a suggestion. He will find many places in which he can eliminate more than that amount. He saw last year places in the defense budget amounting to more than a billion dollars, which could be eliminated, and he said he would not expend the amount. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope he will find in the civilian end of the budget this year that there are items as to which he can save money, that it is unnecessary to spend the full amount of money which we have appropriated and which we shall appropriate for national defense, and that he can save more than a billion dollars, even though we have limited the reduction he may make to \$550,000,000.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was not the Byrd-Bridges amendment, on which the Senator from Michigan worked so hard over a number of months, the most practical method which could be found by the group who worked on it, without hurting any Government agency or any of the defense departments involved?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that the Byrd-Bridges amendment, of which he was a cosponsor, together with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], was the ideal way of saving a part of the cost of government without in any way adversely affecting the Defense Department or any of the other essential departments of government; but in the conference committee we discovered that the House conferees argued about the method we had been using, which was, in effect, a scientific method, which had been taken up with the Office of the Comptroller General, with the Office of the Director of the Budget, and had been worked out so that it would not create any hardship. They had a small rider they wished to insert which would not compel the President to do the cutting, so that no one would be on the spot.

It is the old practice of passing the buck. We could have made the cut under a scientific method. That was the proper way of doing it. However, it

could not be done that way, and therefore it was essential that we take the bill as we find it now.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator from Michigan agree—and I am satisfied that I should also ask the same question of the Senator from Massachusetts, in view of the fact that he raised the question—that approving the conference report in no way convinces the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Massachusetts, or the Senator from Nebraska that the formula which was submitted is not the proper way to make the cuts in the appropriations. If the conference report is adopted without a record vote, it does not mean that the Senator from Michigan is repudiating in any way the formula that ought to be used in making cuts in appropriation bills. To the contrary, we are accepting the conference report because apparently there is no other way of getting the bill passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Nebraska is correct. It is not a repudiation. If I had the right to vote on a method of effecting cuts in the appropriation bill, I would vote to do it under the Bridges-Byrd amendment, because I think that is the proper way. However, in the Senate of the United States one does not always get a vote on the exact issue involved. Sometimes we get a vote, as we are getting one today, on what it is possible to get through the Senate. Therefore if we can save \$550,000,000, as I said before, as a suggestion to the President that Congress wants a cut in unnecessary expenditures, he should do the rest and make a real cut in expenditures.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in connection with the pending conference report, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

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

ECONOMIC COOPERATION
ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D. C., August 28, 1950.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: The news which greeted me upon my return to Washington that the Congress is considering a further \$200,000,000 cut in the ECA appropriation came as a great shock. We requested from the Senate Appropriations Committee an appropriation of \$2,853,000,000. Since that request was made, prices of goods to be purchased under the program (largely in the United States of America) have increased by approximately \$300,000,000. That means, of course, that there must be a cutback in the goods supplied under the program to offset this increased cost. Then the Senate made a further cut of \$203,000,000, which, of course, involved another cutback. Now an additional cut of \$200,000,000 is proposed. I would be derelict in my duties as administrator of ECA if I did not state that this latest cut represents a serious threat to the effectiveness of our program.

It is also proposed that there be a reduction of ECA administrative funds by \$1,-

250,000. This comes at a time when the administrative task of ECA has become more difficult and complicated as a result of superimposing an intensive rearmament effort upon our program for economic recovery. We will, of course, continue to operate this program as economically as possible, but if we are effectively to supervise the expenditure of funds entrusted to us, it may be necessary to apply to Congress after the first of the year for additional administrative funds.

I stated that the cuts made in the ECA appropriation came as a shock to me. I was shocked because these cuts indicated that too many people have not yet recognized that to safeguard the security of the United States we must not only step up our military program, but also our programs in the economic, political and informational fields in those areas of the world vital to our security, which certainly include the areas in which ECA now operates. In those areas, we must, in my opinion, help (1) to build up the military strength so that aggression can successfully be resisted, (2) to build up economic strength so the people will have a real incentive to resist communism, and (3) to promote an understanding through intensive informational activities of the advantages to them of democracy and of the perils of communism.

In closing, I would like to extend my thanks to you as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the other members of your committee, and all those Senators who have fought so stalwartly for the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. HOFFMAN, Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7786, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered

(Chapter II) 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 26, 28, 39, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51;
(Chapter III) 94, 107;
(Chapter V) 142, 148, 151;
(Chapter VI) 157, 166, 201, 223, 224, 232, 234;

(Chapter VII) 254, 275, 277, 278, 279, 285, 295, 300, 302, 306;
(Chapter VIII) 342, 353;
(Chapter IX) 398;
(Chapter X) 417, 418, 451, 456;
(Chapter X-B) 474, 478, 480, 481, 482, 483, 485, 486, 488; to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 13 of the Senate amendment, strike out "\$832,000" and insert the following: "\$722,000, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "of which sum \$100,000 may be available for the purpose of preserving friendships with the peoples of western European countries by means of radio

broadcasts, said programs to be created and produced under the supervision and control of the Department of State by experienced private international broadcasting organizations; and"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$17,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 175, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert the following: "including \$30,000 for the acquisition of land and construction of buildings for inspection of livestock at Canadian border ports of entry."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 189, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$1,250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 192, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$750,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 198, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$700,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 200, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$41,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 209, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$8,315,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 215, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the agricultural conservation program for any county may be allotted with the approval of the State committee to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program and the funds so allotted shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such county."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 238, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the words "on or before August 1, 1950" in said amendment insert the following: "within 30 days after enactment of this act."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 284, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate

compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws;".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 288, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the act of April 19, 1945 (43 U. S. C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except \$7,200,000 under the head 'General administrative expenses' and \$1,193,205 (\$197,925 for reconnaissance, \$769,080 for basin surveys, and \$226,200 for general engineering and research) under the head 'General investigations.'"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 289, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In the last line of the matter proposed by said amendment, before the period, insert: "Provided, That amounts equal to the value of all property transferred hereunder and used shall be charged, in the same manner as appropriations are charged, as part of the construction or appropriate other costs of the Columbia Basin project, such value to be determined by appraisal approved by the Administrator of General Services of the market value of such property current at the time of transfer hereunder less expenditures on such property by the Bureau of Reclamation prior to such transfer."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 319, and concur to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Displaced Persons Commission: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended by the act of June 16, 1950 (Public Law 555), including personal services and rents in the District of Columbia; travel expenses, including travel expenses outside continental United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, and the rates of per diem allowances under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; purchase (not to exceed three) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); expenses incident to the primary and secondary education of American children who are dependents of Government personnel paid from this appropriations and stationed overseas; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); employment of aliens; and payment of rent in foreign countries in advance; \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That allocations may be made from this appropriation by the Commission upon approval by the Bureau of the Budget to any department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment of the Government for direct expenditure for the purposes of this appropriation, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, corporation, or independent establishment to which amounts are allocated: *Provided further*, That the Commission may enter into agreements with United States governmental agencies and may make payment in advance or by reimbursement for expenses incurred by such agencies in rendering assistance to the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this act."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 337 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$4,350,000".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 338 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$1,324,000".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 345 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$9,889,600 (and any part of the amounts of \$100,000 for valuations of pipelines, and \$3,831,920 for the work of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, contained in this paragraph, may be transferred as the Commission may determine for carrying out other functions of the Commission)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 354 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "or, in any case involving charges of such collaboration or disloyalty which have not been adjudicated by any such court, where the Commission, after hearing and evidence, certifies that it is satisfied that the person so charged is guilty of such collaboration or disloyalty."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 361 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$64,875,000 of the funds and contract authority made available for new ship construction, including reconditioning and betterment, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, shall continue to be available until December 31, 1950: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation or contract authorization shall be used (1) to start any new ship construction for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year; or (2) to start any new ship construction the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 10 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such ship construction and the Director shall submit forthwith a detailed explanation thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; and, as used herein, the term 'budget' includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 363 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for obligation, nor any obligation made, for the payment of an operating-differential subsidy for any number of ships in excess of the number of 263, unless a certificate has been received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, that an operating-differential subsidy is required for a larger number of such ships in connection with national defense."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 373 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$15,024,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate num-

bered 388 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 13 of said amendment, and after the figure \$76,000, change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 399 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In line 2 of said amendment strike out the words "not to exceed 23."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 467 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the language proposed by the said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "During the current fiscal year, appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations, available for military functions under the Department of Defense, shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1111 of this act."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 471 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in line 15 of said amendment insert "\$2,250,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 472 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in line 6 of said amendment insert "\$62,500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 473 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$14,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 475 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$500,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 476 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided further, That after November 1, 1950, no funds herein appropriated shall be made available to any nation of which a dependent area falls in the opinion of the President to comply with any treaty to which the United States and such dependent area are parties."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 477 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to provide assistance to any participating country which, in the opinion of the President, has failed, refused, or neglected to support the United Nations in resisting aggression."

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 68, 72, 92, 175, 189, 192, 198, 200, 209, 215, 238, 284, 288, 289, 319, 337, 338, 345, 354, 361, 363, 373, 388, 399, 467, 471, 472, 473, 475, 476, and 477.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to be recognized on his motion?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I think not. They are all inconsequential amendments. The one disagreement will be explained by the Senator from Nevada in a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed by the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, it is proposed to insert the following:

Eight hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment proposed by me to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it is the remaining amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is on what is known as the watchdog committee. It will be explained by the Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the subcommittee. It is the only remaining amendment in the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment adopted by the House with reference to the watchdog committee, which would eliminate the joint committee. The amendment which came over from the House reduced the amount of the appropriation by \$100,000. The Senate amendment would reinstate the \$100,000, to which we understand the House will agree. However, the Senate agrees that the watchdog committee as a joint committee will, under the language of the Senate amendment, go out of business.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire where the money is to come from? Under the present arrangement, does it come out of the contingent fund?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is an appropriation which goes into the contingent fund of the Senate, the same as any other appropriation that goes to the contingent fund.

Mr. LUCAS. The joint committee would be eliminated by the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. It would go out of business on August 31, 1950, by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LUCAS. We would have a watchdog committee composed of Senators only?

Mr. McCARRAN. Probably we would have a watchdog committee composed only of Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. How much is involved in the amendment? What is the total amount involved?

Mr. McCARRAN. One hundred and ten thousand dollars.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not quite clear what is happening. As a

member of the watchdog committee, may I inquire what responsibility we are assuming?

Mr. McCARRAN. The language of the amendment adopted on the floor of the House would eliminate the joint committee entirely. As the Senator will recall, in July or August the House passed an appropriation bill declaring that the joint committee should wind up its affairs on June 31 of this year. In the meantime the Senate passed a resolution giving the joint committee \$130,000 to carry on its work. In order to get that money it had to go into the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Was that action taken by the watchdog committee when the Senator from New Jersey was absent? I do not recall any action authorizing that appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was taken by the Committee on Appropriations, providing \$130,000 to continue the work of the watchdog committee. It came entirely out of the contingent fund of the Senate. It did not come about by the joint action of the House and Senate. It came entirely out of the contingent fund of the Senate. The House amendment strikes out the language which would continue the joint committee, strikes out \$110,000 from the appropriations which would go into the contingent fund of the Senate and declares that the affairs of the joint committee shall be terminated on August 31. That is the language of the House amendment. In the meeting today of the Committee on Appropriations the committee decided to accept the language of the House, thereby doing away with the joint committee, but restored the \$110,000 to the contingent fund of the Senate. The Senate Committee on Appropriations can do as it likes about watching its own appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. May I understand what we are doing? Do I understand what is left of the watchdog committee is only the Senate part of it, and the committee will have \$130,000 to spend for its operations?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is that still in abeyance?

Mr. McCARRAN. The joint committee goes out of business. Therefore the entire committee goes out of business. It applies to both the Senate and the House parts of the committee. As I understand, it will go out of business by August 31, 1950. As chairman of that committee, I say I think we are in a position so that we can finish the business of the committee by August 31, and the balance we have on hand will go into the contingent fund of the Senate.

The House struck \$110,000 completely out of the appropriation for the contingent fund of the Senate. The House is now content that we restore the \$110,000 to the contingent fund of the Senate, but we agreed to the language of the House which abolishes the joint committee.

The House language is really an amendment to a legislative bill. We

could have amended it, but we did not do so. We thought it best not to hold up the appropriation bill, but rather to agree to the House language, let the joint committee go out of business, and the Committee on Appropriations, if it sees fit, can set up its own committee, or do as it likes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement, in view of what the Senator from New Jersey has said about having a joint committee, which has taken no action whatever on this appropriation, yet the Committee on Appropriations assumed the jurisdiction to appropriate \$110,000 for a committee that is not in existence.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon for interrupting—

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator. Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is in error. Let me again clear the atmosphere as best I can. By the language inserted by the House, the joint committee goes out of business. By the change which the Senate committee would suggest, we restore \$110,000 to the contingent fund of the Senate, that is all. We give nothing to the joint committee whatever. The joint committee goes out of business.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is going to handle the \$110,000 if the joint committee is out of business?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senate of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Another committee will have to be appointed if a watchdog committee is desired?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; if the Senate wants a watchdog committee, another committee will have to be appointed. It can be appointed by the Committee on Appropriations or by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think I understand the situation. I was under the impression in the beginning that \$110,000 had been appropriated for a committee that was not in existence; but the Senator from Nevada has explained that the \$110,000 goes into the contingent fund.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The Committee on Appropriations has agreed that that be done. Perhaps that is the best thing to do. However, the committee that has been called the watchdog committee, according to what the Senator from New Jersey has said, has had nothing to say about this particular \$110,000 item.

I thought it was a mistake for the Congress to appropriate money for the joint committee out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and I so stated on the floor of the Senate when this matter was up a couple of months ago. It did not seem to me to be the way to do business. In other words, we were paying all the freight.

I am very glad we have gotten completely out from under the joint committee, and are now appropriating a certain amount of money to go into the contingent fund. Whether or not the committee will be established remains for the Senate to say in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 272, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill, 1951, is authorized and directed to correct chapter and section numbers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3659) to amend title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the issuance of dealers' identification tags for use on trailers, to provide for the revocation and suspension of dealers' registration and identification tags, to change the fee for dealers' identification tags, to provide for the issuance of special use identification tags, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 2887. An act to amend the Architects' Registration Act for the District of Columbia in order to safeguard life, health, and property, and to promote the public welfare;

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

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; and

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

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

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

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

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

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1838) to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7265) to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7824) to

provide for the administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. REES had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8992) to eliminate the additional internal-revenue taxes on coconut oil coming from the trust territory of the Pacific islands, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. WOODRUFF had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2484. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide war risk and certain marine and liability insurance;

S. 3724. An act for the relief of Maria Sulikowska Forbes;

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.; and

H. R. 9134. An act to amend section 4311 of the Revised Statutes (46 U. S. C. 251).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC AIRPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to 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, which were, on page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Administrator of Civil Aeronautics (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator')" and insert "Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary')"; on page 1, line 10, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 2, line 9, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 2, line 15, after "days" insert ": 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, with respect to the suitability of the site to be selected, and its possible impact on the vicinity"; on page 2, line 16, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 2, line 24, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Civil Aeronautics Administration" and insert "Department of Commerce"; on page 3, line 21, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 3, line 22, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 4, line 4, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary";

on page 4, line 23, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 5, line 2, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 5, line 6, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 5, lines 6 and 7, strike out "Civil Aeronautics Administration" and insert "Department of Commerce"; on page 5, lines 8 and 9, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 5, line 22, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 5, line 25, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 5, line 25, strike out all after "the" where it appears the second time over to and including "Interior," on page 6, line 2, and insert "Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion,"; on page 6, line 8, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 6, line 10, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 6, line 17, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 6, line 20, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; on page 7, line 1, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary"; and on page 7, lines 4 and 5, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Senate bill 456 is an authorization for the building of a new airport in the vicinity of Washington, D. C. The bill passed the Senate and passed the House. The House added some technical amendments. The Senate bill called upon the CAA Administrator to do certain things, and after one of the reorganization plans had gone into effect it was necessary to change the designation to the Secretary of Commerce instead of the CAA Administrator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the matter I am about to bring up is a minor one, but to me it seems rather important. Does the distinguished Senator contemplate that in the construction of the new airport those responsible will build an iron fence around it and install a hedge so that people cannot see in, and they will charge admission for a view of the airplanes as they land and take off, as has been done at the present airport in Washington?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know what the plans for the security and safety of peeping Toms, or anything of the kind, are.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the public generally, not about peeping Toms? I know that many a time I have gone down to the airport and looked over and have been inspired to see the beautiful planes landing and taking off. There is now a hedge about the field, about 30 feet high, and an iron fence, so that it is not possible for those outside to see anything. I wonder if some money is in prospect by granting a concession under which a fee is charged to view the planes. Could not the distinguished Senator, who is an expert and an authority on transportation, have the new airport built without a high fence and

hedge, so that the public generally could see the activities on the landing field?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I certainly hope that when the airport is constructed, since it is to be constructed from public funds, there will be no impediments of any kind, except to prevent the public being hit by propellers, or the lives of people endangered in some way.

Mr. WHERRY. After one would pay his dime or 25 cents, or whatever the fee might be, he would still have those hazards to avoid. I am serious about this. It seems to me the interest in aviation is so great, especially among young people, that every possible opportunity should be given to the public generally to have a chance to see what goes on, rather than take it away from them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should be very glad to call the attention of those who are going to construct the airport to what the Senator has said. I agree with him that the public must be treated fairly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado to concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

REVENUE ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8920) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The business before the Senate is the tax bill. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for himself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to explore the situation for a moment to ascertain whether or not we may not reach some agreement about voting on the tax bill. It is my understanding that there are two or three very controversial amendments, and that after the Senate votes on those amendments, perhaps we can get along very speedily toward final disposition of the measure. I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia, would care to express an opinion as to when he thinks we might be able to finish the bill, in view of what has transpired in the past.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no way of knowing how much further debate there will be on the excess-profits-tax amendment, as well as on the amendment which has been offered to it, and some other amendments which are independent of it. It is quite impossible for me to say. I will say that these amendments, of course, raise issues which cannot be intelligently or properly settled on the floor. I do not know whether the Senate is going to recognize that fact, or whether it will proceed to write a tax bill of the most complicated and technical kind on the floor. If so, there is very little need of a Finance Committee or any other committee. The Senate might as well write all its tax bills on the floor.

The Finance Committee has done the very best it could, and followed faithfully—I repeat the word faithfully—the requests and recommendations made by the President and by the Secretary of the Treasury, and tried to eliminate from the bill highly controversial matters which require further consideration, and which the Treasury itself desires to consider further. Therefore, we in the committee decided that we would pass certain things over to the regular bill, the general tax bill, which would immediately follow this bill. We gave instructions to the committee staff to begin work on certain of these important matters.

The committee did not feel that it had sufficient information, based upon the House committee hearings or upon the Senate committee hearings, to pass upon such highly complicated questions as the appropriate taxation of cooperatives, of building and loan associations, of mutual savings banks, and other like organizations. It felt that it would have to have some hearings upon those particular matters. The committee was certain from the beginning and, as I thought, without substantial opposition to the view, that we would have to have some hearings upon an excess-profits tax before we could formulate a proper tax that would be both effective as a tax and yet not destructive of business.

So we promptly said that we would let the subject of the cooperatives, the building and loan associations, and other like organizations go over for study for the general tax bill, and also the excess-profits tax. It was also requested by certain members of the committee, the committee agreeing, that we would ask for certain reports and studies from the staff on the turn-over tax and other types of tax that might have the approval of the committee, or at least be considered by the committee when it undertook to consider the general tax bill.

So, Mr. President, I will say in answer to the question of the Senator from Illinois that I do not know. We are confronted with an excess-profits tax proposal. The amendment on the subject which was submitted to the Senate committee I undertake to say was wholly unworkable. It provided a credit for corporations of 175 percent of their base-period earnings, whereas under the wartime excess-profits tax, the credit was only 95 percent. That provision was probably a mistake. Subsequently there were other excess-profits proposals submitted to the Senate. One was submitted on the 22d and one on the 24th. The latter is the last edition I have seen of the excess-profits tax amendments. I undertake to say, and it can be demonstrated mathematically, that the excess-profits tax amendment of August 24 would not produce any more revenue of any consequence at all for 1950 than the committee bill itself would produce. The excess-profits amendment would produce only from \$37,000,000 to \$40,000,000 more than the committee bill in 1950. That is less than the 10-percent tax on television will bring into the Treasury.

I do not know what other amendments are going to be offered on the excess-

profits tax proposal. So far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to stay right on without any vacation. In fact, I have no particular desire to leave Washington. I would much rather write a sound tax bill if it can be written, and I would much rather stay here and have some hearings that would give us some facts on which we could base intelligent conclusions, than to rush through an excess-profits measure which would be more or less destructive of our economy and which would fail to raise any revenue. I do not think the committee would want to sponsor that sort of a measure. So I am wholly unable to say how much time will be required, I will state in reply to the Senator from Illinois.

We are confronted with an amendment with respect to copper. While personally I favored the reduction or further suspension of the tariff on copper, at the same time the committee was against me. That amendment is to be offered. When that amendment is offered, inasmuch as the committee was almost unanimously against it, only two of us voting for the amendment, I would feel it to be my duty to make a motion to table it. I cannot say what the Senate will do about it.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I had a good deal of experience in the last war in attempting to draw an excess-profits tax bill. We drew two during that period. I know how difficult it was to draw one then. It is much more difficult now. Is it not true that in the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, of the chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, Mr. Stam, who is rated as one of the best tax experts in the Nation, and of a majority of the Finance Committee, that committee does not now have ready to be presented to the Senate for action a proper excess-profits tax measure, and that action on such a proposal—since it will produce no additional revenue in the next few months—should be postponed until we can secure a proper one?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. And the committee has gone on record, at least the chairman has gone on record, as assuring the Senate that an excess-profits tax bill, if approved by the Senate, would be made effective at the beginning of 1951, that is January 1, next year. But all those assurances seem to carry no conviction with those who would write an excess-profits tax measure—and I congratulate them on their optimism—on the floor of the Senate. I simply cannot do so. The committee has not had hearings.

I should like to add to what the Senator from Virginia has said, that not only has he stated the opinion of the committee, but the joint committee staff and the Treasury itself are working to produce an excess-profits tax which they will be willing to recommend if it seems advisable to present such a recommendation to the committee in connection with the general tax bill which will follow immediately.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that in the last war we had an excess-profits tax law which provided two methods of base, one of invested capital and one of average earnings during a bona fide prewar period, and then from time to time we had to make additional provisions for new companies, and for unusual situations? We had to adopt amendment after amendment. Whereas, the excess-profits tax amendment to be voted on here, offered by the distinguished Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], has only the one base in it, and those are not normal years. It has no invested-capital base.

Mr. GEORGE. No, I think it has. I cannot very well interpret the amendment, I must be frank; I cannot now actually apply the amendment to a given case which involves anything but the simplest imaginable situation. However, I think the amendment contemplates having both an earnings base and an invested-capital base.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to say that I am very much in favor of an excess-profits tax, and I hope one will be properly drawn. However, I am not sure that in this particular period we should leave to the industries of the United States a net effective profit of only 15 cents out of every dollar they earn. I understand that is one of the provisions the amendment carries.

Mr. GEORGE. The last amendment has provision for a flat tax of 85 percent, yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Under the last excess-profits tax we found instance after instance of corporations having only 15 cents of profit left out of each dollar of earnings, with the result that it made no difference to them what expenses they incurred, because all expenses were deductible. Thus the corporations lost all incentive and initiative, since, regardless what they earned, they had remaining only 15 cents of profit out of every dollar of earnings.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is entirely correct. Now the situation is completely reversed from that which obtained under the last excess-profits tax. At that time we had a base period of 1936 to 1939 and we had a depressed industry and we had average earnings of corporations which might be effected of probably not more than between \$5,000,000 and \$8,000,000. When we passed that excess-profits tax bill, it was quite possible that it would bring in considerable revenue, because we were starting from such a low base; and during the war period of course there was a rapid increase in corporate earnings.

However, at this time corporate earnings are at a peak, probably the very peak. Certainly I would say they are at the peak. So to impose an excess-profits tax now on the abnormal base of these prewar years will produce little revenue, except out of middle-size and small corporations. The large corporations that have brought up the general average of their earnings in this

postwar period will have such enormous average earnings and invested capital as to escape, practically speaking, the excess-profits tax. That would not be true in all instances; but the general effect of levying a tax based upon these abnormal years, which is the base set up in the last amendment, would be practically to eliminate and excuse from the payment of excess-profits taxes most of the large corporations, which in themselves have accounted in large part for the high average earnings.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Although I did not hear all the distinguished Senator from Georgia has said, yet I gather from what I have heard him say that one who is interested in and who believes that ultimately we should have some form of excess-profits tax, will be given an opportunity to vote for a well-worked-out, well-considered tax bill to date from January 1, 1951, if the Senate Finance Committee's recommendation at the present time is followed. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. That is exactly true. I myself have said that although I recognize weaknesses in an excess-profits tax—and there are many—at the same time I recognize that it is a system or a method through which we can gain revenue. However, we shall not obtain the revenue unless we have a wider base upon which the tax is to be applied than is provided in any one of the amendments now submitted to the Senate.

In other words, if we can widen the base by a readjustment of the base period or a readjustment of the invested capital credits or a readjustment of the general formula, then we can obtain revenue under an excess-profits tax; but we cannot obtain the revenue from a comparatively few corporations.

I doubt very much whether under any one of the amendments which have been submitted—and the fact that there already have been three of them clearly ought to illustrate that we are not proceeding with full information or with any accurate information—more than 20,000 corporations in the United States would pay any excess-profits tax. There are 383,000 profit-earning corporations; but under these amendments the base would be so narrowed that we would obtain no considerable revenue. The tax would be the most disappointing excess-profits tax one could imagine, if we were to adopt the scheme which has been presented to us.

The only way to obtain considerable revenue, in view of the abnormally high rate at which corporate earnings are now running, is to widen the base upon which we apply the tax. The amendments which have been proposed do not approach the problem from that angle at all, in my opinion.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Georgia to say that in his opinion the base which is set forth in the amendment offered by

the Senator from Texas and myself is too low, or is it his opinion that the base is too high?

Mr. GEORGE. I undertake to say that the base would excuse from the proposed tax nearly all the corporations having large excess-profits earnings. Probably the entire automotive group would pay only very small excess-profits taxes. The great steel organizations would pay none. I say that most of the revenue the Senator's measure would produce would come from the moderate-sized or medium-sized or the rapidly growing smaller-sized corporations.

I wish to add that the committee has not had hearings and does not have sufficient information on the subject—and neither does the Treasury have sufficient information—upon which we now can formulate an excess-profits tax measure which will produce revenue and at the same time will at least be bearable—not easy, but at least bearable—by the corporations which will pay the tax.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask another question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to preface the question by restating what I understood the Senator to say a moment ago, namely, that under the amendment, no considerable revenue would be received by the Federal Government.

Mr. GEORGE. I said especially for 1950, and I said the revenue received under the amendment would be disappointingly low for 1951.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then the Senator's objection must be on the ground either that the base is too high or that the rate is too low. Will the Senator be kind enough to tell the Senate which of those alternatives he adopts?

Mr. GEORGE. I have stated the matter to the Senate as clearly as I could. I wish to preface my reply by saying that the chairman of the Finance Committee and most of the other members of the Finance Committee are at least not omniscient; unless an adequate study is made, we cannot tell what base should be adopted, and we cannot determine how the rates should be applied so as to cover a wider base to obtain more revenue, and at the same time impose a rate of taxation which would operate justly upon the corporations.

I have done everything within my power. I have followed, and the committee has followed, faithfully the recommendations of the Treasury and of the administration. We have done everything within our power to assure the Senate that, early in the year—and certainly it makes no difference whether it be March or April, but early in the year—we will bring to the Senate a bill which will impose an excess-profits tax, if the Senate approves it, effective on January 1, next. There is no harm in that, because we can give advance information that we propose to make it effective for the full year. For that reason I have thought Senators would permit us to have the study, on which we could proceed with some degree of confidence.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on the basis of what the Senator has just said, that under his interpretation of this amendment it would produce considerable revenue for the year 1950, what possible harm can be done to anyone by getting that additional inconsiderable revenue now, and then having the Senator, the Treasury Department, the Finance Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee bring in a substitute, which will be much more expertly drawn, perhaps, than that which we have presented? The Senator takes the position that the fault of this amendment is that it raises no considerable revenue. Very well. I say to the Senator and to the Senate, if this amendment adds but 10 cents to the revenue of the Federal Government, it is beneficial.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me ask the Senator a question. Does he propose to amend his last amendment, which was submitted to the Senate on the 24th of August?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall offer a perfecting amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well. When that is done, we can take a look at it. That will be the fourth, I believe. If the Senator is going to do it, then he might be able to get some revenue for 1950, but I do not know by what method he is going to get it. I am saying that his last amendment will produce no revenue for 1950 of any consequence.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is that the same amendment which the Senator from Wyoming told the Senate, on Friday, would produce, in his opinion, \$2,700,000,000 for 1950?

Mr. GEORGE. It is the same amendment. I do not remember what the Senator from Wyoming said it would produce for 1950.

Mr. KERR. I shall refer to the RECORD and will advise the Senate. But if that is what the Senator said with reference to it, will the chairman of the Finance Committee now tell the Senate that a study of that amendment discloses that in reality it would produce no revenue for 1950 above the approximate \$30,000,000 to which he referred?

Mr. GEORGE. I say to the Senate, and I speak deliberately, that a careful estimate based upon that amendment, made by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, shows that for the full half of 1950 it will produce from corporate earnings only from \$37,000,000 to \$40,000,000 more than the bill which the committee itself submitted to the Senate. That is mathematically demonstrable, and it is based upon the amendment of August 24.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator be good enough to yield to me, in order that I may make straight the record with respect to what I said on that day?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I did not undertake to quote the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator did not. I was very well aware of that, and

I was grateful to the Senator for it. I responded to the inquiries of the Senator from Oklahoma, as I recall our exchange, and I said to him that this amendment was intended to produce revenue on the amount of excess-profits-tax income, which would be the upper 20 percent of the base period which was chosen. I told him that the amount of revenue which would be produced would depend upon the amount of profits which accrued, and that if it were assumed that those profits for 1950 would amount to \$28,000,000,000, it was my judgment that, for half of the year 1950, the income would be \$40,000,000,000. The \$2,400,000,000 to which the Senator from Oklahoma referred a moment ago had to do with the full year's income, the full year's tax, when the income was at a slightly higher rate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KERR. I am reading from the RECORD of August 25, page 13432, the first column:

Mr. KERR. Having identified ourselves in that regard, would the Senator give us the benefit of his judgment as to what his amendment would produce in excess of what the committee bill would produce for the year 1950?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall answer the Senator's first question first. It is my opinion, which the chart bears out, that, with prices rising, as they are rising—and I refer to the record, and not to anyone's judgment, because we have the record as reported by the Federal Reserve Board—our national income by the end of 1950 will have reached certainly not less than thirty-seven or thirty-eight billion dollars. It may go to \$40,000,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator speaking of corporate profits?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Corporate profits. If it goes to \$40,000,000,000 the profits on the annual base would be \$5,400,000,000. On the 6 months' basis it would be half of that. It would be \$2,700,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Yes. The Senator from Oklahoma understands—and I should like the Senator from Wyoming to confirm it or deny the understanding—that it is the judgment of the Senator from Wyoming that if his amendment is adopted—and I refer now to the last amendment—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The one in which I joined with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. KERR. Yes. If that amendment is adopted the Senator from Wyoming advises the Senator from Oklahoma that, in the opinion of the Senator from Wyoming, it would produce in the year 1950 something over two and a half billion dollars in revenue above what would be produced by the committee bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Provided that the corporate profits reached the \$40,000,000,000 rate.

Mr. KERR. Is it the judgment of the Senator from Wyoming that they will reach that rate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Is that the colloquy which took place?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly the colloquy.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for having yielded for that question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma will observe that he read the proviso that I inserted: "Provided that

the corporate profits reached the \$40,000,000,000 rate." The Senator from Oklahoma did not read this extract from our colloquy, which starts in the last column of page 13431.

Mr. KERR. Does it precede the other?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It precedes it. I was speaking. Responding to the Senator, I said:

It was the intention to draw the amendment in such a fashion that it would have an impact on 1950 only for the last half of the year. The best estimates I can make are those which I have already presented, namely, that since the impact of the tax begins after the average income reaches \$26,100,000,000, the revenue which would be produced would depend upon how much the income rose above that figure. Therefore, if the corporate income in 1950 should reach, let us say, \$28,100,000,000, according to our calculations the revenue on that amount would be, for the full year, \$300,000,000. Inasmuch as the amendment was drawn to levy the tax only upon a half year, the production at that level would be \$400,000,000. If on the contrary, the average income were \$30,100,000,000, the return for 1950 would be \$800,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator read the next question and answer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma understand that I was telling him that the amount of revenue to be derived would depend wholly upon the amount of income?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma understands that perfectly. He read the RECORD in which the Senator from Wyoming said that if corporate profits reached \$40,000,000,000, the profits on the 6 months' basis would be \$2,700,000,000; and the Senator further said that, in his opinion, corporate profits would reach \$40,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Therefore, he gave it as his opinion that the amendment as presented by him and the Senator from Texas would yield in excess of \$2,700,000,000 in revenues for 1950 above what the committee bill would produce. Then I asked the chairman of the Finance Committee what, in his opinion, the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas would produce above what the committee bill would produce, and the chairman of the Finance Committee told us that mathematically it should not produce in excess of \$37,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma, I am sure, will agree that what I said last Friday and what I now repeat is that the production from this proposed excess-profits tax in the manner in which it was intended to be drawn will vary according to the amount of the income above the base. If it is a low level above the base, it would be low. I stated that if in 1950 the corporate income should reach \$28,100,000,000—

Mr. KERR. I beg the Senator's pardon, but—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor. He yielded only for a question.

Mr. GEORGE. That is all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator was very kind.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, what any given rate will yield depends upon the state of the economy. Under the third amendment, if we have some increase in corporate profits, there will be a difference of only \$37,000,000 in 1950 as between what the committee bill will bring in and what the excess-profits amendment would produce, because what will raise the excess profits will raise the normal tax and the surtax.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the statement which the Senator from Georgia has just made is only true on the assumption that the corporate-profits tax will apply for the whole year, and that the excess-profits-tax proposal of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas will apply for only half the year?

Mr. GEORGE. No. The corporate normal and surtax proposal which the committee is presenting applies for one-half a year only, from July 1 to the end of the year. It is projected over the entire year, at a rate of 42 percent rather than 45 percent, in order to take care of inequalities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The rate of 42 percent is projected over the year as a whole?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the point I was trying to make. If that system is retained in the proposal of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas, namely, a basic 42-percent tax on corporate profits as a whole for the entire year, plus an 85-percent tax on surplus profits over the 80-percent base, the tax proposed by the Senators from Wyoming and Texas represents a net addition to the revenues which would be obtained by the proposal of the committee. Certainly more than \$37,000,000 would be raised.

Mr. GEORGE. No. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that the excess-profits-tax amendment which the distinguished Senators from Wyoming and Texas last proposed provides for a rate of 42½ percent on excessive profits over the whole year, which means a change in the effective rate as of July 1, just exactly as the committee amendment provides.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my understanding that the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas are proposing a perfecting amendment which removes this weakness and will make the excess-profits tax a net addition.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that is in another amendment, which I have not seen.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that it is coming. It is that point to which the discussion should be directed.

Mr. GEORGE. Not before I have seen it. I am not exactly disposed to accept an excess-profits-tax amendment which I have never even seen. I am submitting the fact only that it seems to be necessary to have four or five excess-profits-tax proposals before we can perfect it to a proper point. That is very conclusive proof that we should not write an excess-profits-tax measure on the floor.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My only reason for asking the Senator to yield is to clarify the matter for the benefit of the Senate. I shall be very glad to take the floor later on if it becomes necessary. But, knowing the Senator as I do, I am sure that we can work it out here.

May I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the criticism which he and the Senator from Colorado made of the pending amendment last Friday was that during the year 1950 it would not raise any considerable amount of revenue more than would the bill reported by the Finance Committee?

Mr. GEORGE. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator did not say it would not produce a larger amount for the year 1951?

Mr. GEORGE. No. But I do undertake to say that it would be a very disappointing excess-profits-tax provision for 1951.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator if his criticism was not based upon the fact that as he read the amendment, it seemed—

Mr. GEORGE. Please say "as the amendment read."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. GEORGE. Because it was printed three or four times.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And it was presented by the Senator from Wyoming to the Finance Committee at a hearing of that committee on the 4th of August, which was almost a month ago.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the first version.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It may be worthy of note that no record was kept of that meeting.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not sure about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was no stenographer there. I stood there for an hour and a half or two hours.

Mr. GEORGE. It was an executive session.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. The Senator was kind enough to permit me to present the matter on the 4th of August. But is it not a fact that the only defect to which Senators have been referring is that the amendment, as it reads, does not appear to grant a credit for normal and surplus taxes for excess-profits-tax net income, as provided in section 26 (e) of the code?

Mr. GEORGE. It grants a credit for a full year against the normal and surtaxes; that is, in computing them. It cuts down the income subject to the normal and surtax to a point where the committee bill would produce nearly as much money as would the Senator's amendment and the committee bill combined.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator not recall that I stated to him in the committee that my purpose was to provide an excess-profits tax which would collect only half of the excess-profits tax for the year 1950? In other words,

that I intended to make the impact of the tax fall after the Korean war started.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator said he was not desiring to make it effective beyond the date the committee's bill would become effective, which would be July 1.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. As we then contemplated, and as we subsequently proposed in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator now says this amendment provides a tax for half the year and a credit for the full year. Is that the Senator's statement?

Mr. GEORGE. No. It does not provide a tax for the full year. It provides a credit which would greatly reduce the normal and surtax base.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator not agree, then, that if a perfecting amendment is presented, as I intend to present one, which will make clear that the credit will be prorated for 1950, that defect will be removed?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I will not admit that, because other questions are involved. Let me say to the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators that it may seem like a very simple thing to write an excess-profits tax bill. Actually, the only way to write it, to be fair and yet get revenue, is to work out formula after formula and case after case based upon actual facts. When the facts have been ascertained a bill can be formulated which will at least substantially accomplish justice as between various corporations, and at the same time get an adequate amount of revenue. The only purpose the Committee on Finance could have in writing an excess-profits tax bill at this time would be to get revenue. First of all, in order to accomplish that purpose we must have a widened base. Because of the abnormality in our present economy and in the whole postwar period, nothing less than that can suffice. From an actual study of case after case, and fitting a formula into them, we can establish an adequate base at proper rates—and not confiscatory rates—and thus obtain a reasonable return from the tax.

I frankly say to the Senator that in actual practice if he could have his way his tax proposal would hit awfully hard the medium-sized and rapidly growing smaller corporations. The big corporations, about which one hears so much today, would escape, because while they have had abnormally high average earnings, they have also built up abnormally large invested capital bases, and through one or the other of those circumstances or facts they would pay under the Senator's tax amendment very little in the way of an excess-profits tax. Many of them would pay none at all. Some money would be raised, but unfortunately it would come primarily from the smaller corporations and those which did not move up into very high earnings. It would fall against those corporations and against the rapidly growing smaller type of corporation.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has stated that it is the purpose of the Committee on Finance to study the matter and bring in an excess-profits tax bill in the new year.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly. The Senator is correct. That was the decision reached in committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator whether the application of the excess-profits tax would be retroactive to July 1, 1950?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think that we would undertake to make it retroactive to July 1. However, it would be applicable and effective from January 1, 1951. Perhaps it would be a bit harsh to make it effective from July 1. Of course, I cannot speak for the committee on that point, but I doubt if the committee would be willing to make it retroactive. The committee was not willing to make the increase in the normal and surtax rates retroactive beyond July 1, 1950.

I again remind the Senator that we have put some very heavy burdens upon corporations for the last half of this year. We have gone up to 45 percent on most of them, or at least on the larger ones. Not only that, but we have added about \$800,000,000 in 1951, and nearly \$1,000,000,000 in each of the years 1952 through 1955, which they must pay at an earlier date through the adoption of what we call the Mills formula.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask another question of the Senator?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it be true that the proposed excess-profits tax which the Senator will bring to the floor of the Senate some time next year is not made retroactive to July 1, 1950, all profits above the base of 80 percent of the average of the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949 will escape taxation.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no. They would not escape taxation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I mean an excess-profits tax.

Mr. GEORGE. They will have to pay a heavy tax because we are putting the rates up higher, and they will be taxed higher. We are making the increased rates applicable as of July 1.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was asking about an excess-profits tax.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say with equal plausibility and logic that all corporations which in 1949 made more than 80 percent of the average earnings in a base period have escaped an excess-profits tax. We did not have such a tax.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was because there was no Korean war.

Mr. GEORGE. It was because we did not have an excess-profits tax.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; and because we were not trying to balance the military budget. The proposition which the Senator is arguing for is to relieve corporations from the burden of an excess-profits tax for the 6 months from July 1 to at least January 1.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no. The Senator is entirely wrong. I repudiate his statement. I am arguing for time to have the industries of the country furnish us with information which will enable us to write a fair, just, and comprehensive excess-profits tax bill which will bring in rev-

enue. That is precisely what the Treasury Department is asking for. They have not submitted, and they have said they are not in a position to submit, an excess-profits tax plan. That is all we are trying to do. Let me repeat that there is no likelihood the bill can be passed in time to become effective by October 1 unless we act quickly on it. What the Senator is proposing to do is to lose the increase on individuals, because after October 1 it will not be feasible to increase the tax rates on individuals.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has seen the table which appears at page 13534 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Saturday, when the House was acting on the supplemental appropriation bill of some \$16,700,000,000. The table shows the prices being paid by the armed services for certain commodities. It shows that the prices have risen as follows between April 1950, and the current purchasing period:

Fuel oil, up 54.5 percent. Gasoline, up 12.4 percent. Diesel fuel, up 15.1 percent. Cloth, cotton, up 12.8 percent. Cloth, cotton twill, up 25.2 percent. Shirts, cotton khaki, up 8.5 percent. Cloth, wool serge, up 28 percent. Trousers, cotton khaki, up 16.2 percent. Beef carcass, up 7.5 percent. Pork, up 42.5 percent. Lard, up 27.7 percent. Hams, up 28.8 percent. Coffee, up 23.3 percent. Lumber, up 28.7 percent.

I say to the Senator that in the face of that record I cannot see how we can be satisfied with a tax bill which purports to raise less than \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. GEORGE. I have not seen the table, but I would suppose that the control bill was designed to reach that very situation. If the control bill is not effective to reach the price of pork, the price of gasoline, the price of fuel oil, and so forth, then it is a very poor bill.

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

Mr. GEORGE. Just let me finish my statement. I had also assumed that the contract renegotiation bill, which I have been advised was in the House ready for action, and which at least it is hoped it may become law soon, would affect all direct contracts made by the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But no indirect contracts.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, subcontractors.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that we will meet to consider the control bill conference report tomorrow at 10 o'clock, and hope to have it ready to submit on Wednesday. I think the control bill as agreed to will cover some of the things which have been mentioned by the Senators.

Mr. GEORGE. I should certainly think it would reach some of those situations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A tax bill would be the most efficient and effective method of keeping prices down.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I again say that I challenge that statement. I

do not hope to convince the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, but I wish now to repeat that an excess profits tax bill will not directly affect prices. The only way in which an excess-profits tax bill can affect prices is by raising enough revenue to keep the Government from borrowing from the banks and borrowing from outsiders. The one type of tax that is definitely inflationary is the excess-profits tax.

Let me ask the Senator, whose dollar goes to the market? Is it the corporation's dollar that goes to the market to buy beef, to buy fruits, and vegetables? It is the dollar of the individual, the baker, the candlestick maker, the professional man, the worker. That is the dollar that goes to the market.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The dollar of all of us.

Mr. GEORGE. Of all of us. It is not the corporate dollar that goes directly to the market. I tried to say, and I repeat, and I am willing to stand on it, that the excess-profits tax is directly inflationary, until wages and prices of commodities are controlled.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On that point the Senator and I completely disagree, because the record before us I think is clear that most of the raw material products, most of the minerals, most of the basic commodities, are produced by corporations, and what they charge goes through the whole economy. We are struggling here to put a brake upon inflation, by an excess-profits tax, an inflation which could easily destroy the economy.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree that any sort of excess-profits tax will of course affect the rise of inflation. It has a direct bearing on it, and if it reduces the necessity for the Government to borrow money, or anything of the kind, it of course is helpful. But the committee is not trying to deny the Senate or the country the opportunity to have an excess-profits tax bill. The committee has said in all frankness, under the earnest recommendation of the President and of the Treasury, that all we want is, between this time and January, to learn enough of the facts to enable us to write a bill that will be effective in raising revenue, and have a wider base, and one which would actually leave industry, or particular industries, able to travel under the heavy burden of any sort of wartime taxation. That is what the committee has asked, and that is all it has asked.

I regret to say—and I measure my words—that there are those who think that this sort of highly technical tax bill can be better written on the floor of the Senate than it can be by an honest, conscientious committee that is working on the problem, and proposes to work on it constantly and continually, rather than be driven into the acceptance of an excess-profits tax proposal at this time without any actual knowledge of how it will work.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for a question; but I did not want to take much of the time this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have heard the Senator state on several occasions that if we insisted on trying to insert an amendment providing for excess-profits taxation, and if the effort were successful, it would prevent a tax bill either from being written at all or from being written before the first of October. I have heard that statement, and I am puzzled as to why that would be the effect. It would seem to me that if the Senate decided that it was desirable to take a portion of the excess profits above 8 percent, on an average, in the country, during the last half year, that could be done rather quickly, and then the House would act rather quickly.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think that it can be done quickly, and fairly and effectively.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the opinion of the Senator from Illinois it can be.

Mr. GEORGE. But the Senator is passing more or less on a principle, without study. What I am saying is that the committee certainly ought to permit industry to bring to us their cases, so that we can work out a formula which will result in an effective excess-profits tax, because there is practically nothing to be lost.

What I mean to say is that unless we get a tax bill on the books very quickly the Treasury cannot supply the forms for withholding for individual taxpayers, and the increased income taxes could not go into operation until practically the first of the year, because if the forms are not printed and sent out until after October we will get surprisingly little revenue from the individual taxpayers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator is not saying, and I do not think he is saying, that if the Senate in its judgment should adopt an excess-profits tax provision, there would then be a move to recommit the whole bill.

Mr. GEORGE. No, I am not saying that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very much reassured.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not saying I would make any motion to recommit, but I say now to the Senator from Illinois and to all other Senators that the Committee on Finance will take a few days, if it is necessary, to get the facts on which we can hurriedly write a bill. The committee also has a responsibility. We recognize the judgment of the Senate as being controlling on the basis and on the years, but we must write a bill that is workable.

I am anxiously awaiting the latest amendment which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the distinguished Senator from Texas intend to submit, because I desire to see how they have dealt with this very intricate problem, which after all, is a small problem in an excess-profits tax amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a further question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator stated that the Treasury was unprepared to deal with the subject of excess-profits taxes. Is it not true that if the Treasury is unprepared to deal with the question

of excess-profits taxes that is an indication of gross and indeed almost criminal negligence on the part of the Treasury, not to be ready, in the event of a national emergency such as the present emergency, to have a system of excess-profits taxes?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think so at all. I would hesitate to allow that implication, or charge, or accusation, to stand unchallenged.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. In the opinion of the Senator from Georgia, is it not possible that the Treasury, out of its long experience, and the knowledge it has gained from it, is aware of the fact that it is not possible to write an adequate or equitable excess-profits tax measure on the spur of the moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. My point is that it should not be on the spur of the moment.

Mr. GEORGE. I would like to say for the Treasury that it could write an excess profits tax. It could copy one from the World War I act. But that would not fit the present conditions, because the conditions then were absolutely opposite to and the reverse of present conditions. I mean the conditions are different as of the dates of the passage of the two acts.

Mr. President, what the Treasury means is, that until it undertakes to apply the general principles of an excess profits tax to the economic conditions as they actually exist, and until it has had the opportunity of fitting the facts into the formula and seeing how an effective excess-profits tax and at the same time a reasonably equitable excess-profits tax can be formulated, such a tax simply cannot be written. I beg the Senator to bear in mind that in the opinion of the Treasury—and I add that I think they are right—it takes a little while to do it. But there can be practically no loss to the Treasury with a reasonably effective price-control bill—the distinguished Senator from South Carolina assures us that the conference report on that bill will be submitted this week—and particularly if we have a contract renegotiation act, which we already have on the books so far as airplanes and other matters are concerned. Perhaps one of the large expenditures in the immediate future for national defense will be in the field of the aviation industry, the producing end of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me if I ask one more question?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, I pardon the Senator. I am glad to answer his questions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Georgia is always gracious. The Senator from Georgia is aware of the fact that under the supplemental deficiency bill passed by the House, and which will be before the Senate probably by tomorrow, and which the Senate will probably pass, we will be committing ourselves to an added appropriation of nearly \$17,000,000,000 a year on top of the present budget, and that this is merely

a foretaste of things to come; that the expenditures during the remainder of the year will run at a high level; that the tax bill reported by the Finance Committee will yield only a portion of the added outlay, and that the result will be that the Treasury will be forced to borrow from the banks, with an inflation of credit, and a further rise in prices, which no price-control bill, however stringent, can stop. So that we are in a race with inflation. It seems to me that in view of the fact we must act quickly to raise more revenue.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not in disagreement with the Senator's general philosophy. Indeed as lawyers would say it is sort of hornbook text. I am not quarreling with it at all. But what I am saying is that until we go on a wartime controlled economy we are on the most dangerous ground when we undertake to enact an excess-profits tax provision, because the inevitable result of it is to add to waste and extravagance, and to run prices up, and especially to run wages up.

That is not the reason why we are not ready with an excess-profits tax bill. The Senator from Illinois must remember that we did not have the time table for the Korean war. The other fellow started it, and we had to meet his time table. We were not better prepared with an excess-profits tax bill because we could not anticipate nor read the future any better than could the Treasury. That does not mean the Treasury is not prepared, but until it applies the facts of the present picture to the general principles of an excess-profits tax it cannot formulate an excess-profits bill that will be equitable and at the same time be effective and raise a really substantial amount of revenue. I do not believe the Senate will want an excess-profits tax that does not raise a substantial amount of revenue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one more question, please.

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the practice of any general staff to have ready a wide variety of military plans, depending upon the actual military contingency which occurs. A general staff will have perhaps 50 different sets of war plans ready. If the opponent makes move A, we will put into effect plan 1. If the opponent makes move X, we will put into effect plan 26. And so on. The Treasury should have foreseen the possibilities of hostilities involving great military expenditures, and have had a series of financial plans ready for the various contingencies. If they have not done that, I want to say that in my judgment the Treasury has failed in its duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has the floor and can yield only for a question.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Illinois a question. I am very glad to have his statement. I want to ask the Senator, What war plans did the Army have to put into effect in Korea on June 25?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not on the Armed Services Committee, but we put

some divisions into Korea, and we arrested, or we slowed down the movement of the North Koreans. We took action, and we are supplying the divisions in Korea. Now, my objection, if I may put it as such, to the distinguished committee, and I have great respect for its chairman and for its members, and to the Treasury, is that apparently—and I put the chief blame on the Treasury—they were not ready for the financial contingency which developed. In view of that situation, when Members such as the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Wyoming are trying to repair that defect on the floor, I think they should be patted on the back and encouraged, and technical defects in their amendment should be smoothed away, rather than that pitfalls should be put before them at every turn.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say that the Treasury did have a plan. The President did have a plan. The Treasury asked the committee to postpone, for the time being, consideration of a tax-reduction bill, and subsequently sent to the committee specific recommendations which are contained in the bill before the Senate. The Treasury and the President repeatedly urged that we not go far afield with the necessary effect of delaying action upon the recommendations which they themselves submitted.

I think the Treasury did the best it could. But the Treasury differs from the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Texas. I do not think the Treasury is necessarily culpable. It was trying to meet a situation. It sent to the Congress specific recommendations and the committee faithfully followed the recommendations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the plan which the Treasury submitted would have yielded only \$5,000,000,000 in a full year of application, and now, as whittled down by the committee, it would yield only \$3,000,000,000 for the current year, despite the fact that the Department of the Defense was sending up a budget asking for nearly \$16,000,000,000 in appropriations for the same year? The two things simply do not meet. We cannot pay for the war when we have presented to us a bill for \$16,000,000,000, against which we collect a tax of \$3,000,000,000.

Mr. GEORGE. And it will not be paid for with the committee bill plus the excess-profits tax as it has been proposed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It will more nearly be paid for by the two.

Mr. GEORGE. The addition of the excess-profits tax will pay very little more. Of course, more will be paid under any bill if we are to continue in a period of constantly rising production.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I should like to observe that I hope the distinguished chairman of the committee will continue to yield so graciously to the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois. Today he has condemned the President, the Treasury, and the State Department. Yield to him another time and he will condemn

the whole caboodle, which he ought to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say in reply to the very witty Senator from Colorado—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say in reply to the very witty Senator from Colorado that this touching devotion on the part of the Senator from Colorado and the members of the Finance Committee to the recommendations of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury is very appealing indeed. This is about the first time since I have been in the Senate that I have heard the Senator from Colorado take refuge in the recommendations of the President. I wonder why this new-found affection and devotion has suddenly developed on his part.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But it is war, Mr. President, and we must agree as far as we can with the indispensable Commander in Chief. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is it not true in the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Georgia that we shall have a tax bill next year?

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly that is so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If we are to have a tax bill next year, is it not also true that since notice has been given to the corporations and taxpayers generally, we will be able to obtain, in fact, all the revenue needed, by means of retroactive action?

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is undoubtedly true.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a few minutes the general subject which has been under debate for the past hour or two.

Mr. President, in my judgment, it is extremely unfortunate that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], has chosen this particular time to inject the question of excess-profits taxation into the debate in the Senate. I say it is unfortunate because, in my opinion, the Senate is simply not in position to take proper action on such a complex and intricate subject at this time.

When I first became aware that the subject of excess-profits taxation would be brought up for consideration, I immediately set to work to gather what data I could on the subject. I checked with the staff of our Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. I asked whether any thorough study had been made by the staff of the Joint Committee of the actual operations of the excess-profits tax we had during World War II. I learned that no such study had yet been made. I checked with the Treasury, especially with the office of Mr. Vance Kirby, the tax legislative counsel of the Treasury, who has been working day after day with the Finance Committee on all the various tax problems that are dealt with in this bill. Mr. Kirby's office has made no study or thor-

ough investigation of the experience with the excess-profits tax we had during the war.

During the last few years, Treasury tax experts have made a number of excellent studies of various other aspects of our tax and revenue system. They have incorporated the results of their studies in documents which are very useful to any student of tax questions. Unfortunately, they have not yet gotten around to making any such study of our excess-profits-tax experience.

When the question was raised, "Should we add an excess-profits tax to the pending bill?" the only answer I could get was, "The President has not recommended it, and the Treasury is not in position to make any recommendation as to the form it should take at this time." Then I asked, "If Congress should decide to put on some kind of an excess-profits tax at this time, would the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming be the best form to follow for such a tax?" The only answer I could get to that question from the Treasury was, "We are not even in a position to make a recommendation as to that."

In short, Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming asks us to proceed virtually in the dark. He asks us to ignore all of the experience we acquired with the excess-profits tax during World War II, to neglect the lessons we might learn from that experience, and to accept on the floor of the Senate a hastily drafted amendment designed, he says, to "draft profits along with manpower."

Mr. President, I certainly believe that every Member of the Senate is willing to draft profits, at least to the same extent that we are willing to draft manpower. That is not the issue today, however.

An excess-profits tax is one of the most intricate, complicated pieces of legislation that any taxing committee could be called on to develop. In order to take the profits out of war, we must levy taxes on excess profits at rates which are virtually confiscatory. That means that we must so draft the legislation as to levy these extremely high rates on profits which are excess but, at the same time, exempt entirely from the excess-profits tax the profits which are not excess. Such profits—normal profits—should, of course, be subject to the regular corporation tax rates, which are high enough; but I am sure the Senator from Wyoming will agree that we do not want to levy an excess-profits tax on profits which are not excess.

In other words, the definition of "excess profits" is all-important. It is much more important, I think, than the rates. Most of us will, in due course, I am sure, be willing to vote for very heavy rates on excess profits, but some of us want to be sure that we do not catch normal profits, legitimate profits, in our definition of "excess."

That is the big problem in talking about excess-profits taxation. Unfortunately, that is exactly the type of problem that is absolutely impossible to deal with intelligently in the hurried way that we must operate on the floor of the Senate at this time. That is the type of problem that can be handled properly

only through long hours, days and perhaps weeks of careful study and consideration in a committee.

In his remarks the other day, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] stated that he had been working on this question for several years and that he had had the advantage of consultation with the technicians of the Treasury. Knowing the Senator from Wyoming as I do, I am sure he has studied these problems most carefully, and that he is as well qualified as any other Member of the Senate to draft such an amendment and to reach wise decisions on the various technical problems that arise. Nevertheless, even he must attempt to work under the same obstacles and handicaps which have confronted the committee. No careful study and thorough investigation of our experience with the excess-profits tax of World War II was available to him. No really detailed examination of the results of that experience has been made.

As a result, the amendment which has been drafted ignores all the lessons we might have learned from that experience. It proposes simply to reenact all the provisions, both the wise and the unwise, the workable and the unworkable, of the World War II tax—except those pertaining to rates and the tax base. Every other provision of the World War II tax is to be placed again in full force and effect.

Surely the Senator from Wyoming knows that not every paragraph of the old tax law worked perfectly. Surely he knows that many of those procedures and devices were found to be unjust or inadequate. I am sure he realizes that many cases of grave injustice existed, and never have been corrected. Nevertheless, the amendment proposes to restore every line and paragraph of the system we struggled under during the war.

Let me give just one example of the type of difficulty we labored under as a result of the way the 1940 act was drafted. Under that act, the earnings base adopted was the period 1937 to 1939. Of course, that was a logical and natural base to use. It happens, however, that those years, 1937 to 1939, were very poor years in the State of Nebraska. We had a drought and various other difficulties to contend with; and earnings were not good, generally speaking.

As a result, the wartime earnings of thousands of corporations in Nebraska, when compared with the earnings in the base years, 1937 to 1939, fell within the definition of "excess", as set forth in the law. Some relief was supposed to be provided in that type of situation, of course. There was supposed to be a recognition of such factors under section 722, so that corporations caught in such a situation could expect those administering the law to realize that the earnings during the base period were not in any sense normal. As the distinguished chairman of our committee recently pointed out on the Senate floor, section 722 has not worked at all satisfactorily from the point of view of most of us on the committee. It has simply not provided the measure of relief it was supposed to provide.

I do not intend to be caught, or to have the people of my State caught, in that type of situation again if I can help it. I believe that the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee have a responsibility to work out methods of giving real relief to those taxpayers who deserve it. I do not believe that adequate measures of relief can be worked out hastily on the floor of the Senate.

It is all right to talk about taxing 85 percent of earnings which are really excess. It is something else to take 85 percent of earnings which are really normal, and not actually excess.

Let me say that so far as I know, I have no particular reason for objecting to the years, 1946-49, proposed as a base period in the amendment that is pending. So far as I know, these years were generally good, normal years for corporations throughout the country. So far as I know, the selection of those years would do no particular injustice to the taxpayers of my State.

But the difficulty is that those years, or any other years that might be selected, might not be a fair and equitable base for every class of taxpayer in every part of the country. It is a common experience that even during boom times some particular industries or some particular States are relatively depressed. As a result, their base period gives them a relatively low level of normal earnings, for excess profits tax purposes, and the high rates of the excess profits tax may be a crushing burden on taxpayers caught in that situation.

I can give one example off-hand where that might be the case. The Territory of Hawaii, with whose problems the Senator from Wyoming is very familiar, has since the end of the war been visited with a series of devastating strikes. Not a single year has gone by without a prolonged industrial struggle in one or more of the three or four industries on which all business in the Islands depends. Last year—1949—for example, as I am sure the Senator recalls, the entire business life of the Territory was brought virtually to a dead halt by a strike of the longshoremen which lasted about 6 months. During that period, shipping could not move. The sugar mills and sugar plantations curtailed operations or closed them down completely because they could not ship their products. The commercial establishments dependent on these basic industries saw their sales slump. I have not tried to secure exact figures for the earnings of corporations in Hawaii for 1949, but I cannot imagine that anyone made very much money during that year, if any.

The Senator's amendment, by including the year 1949 in the tax base, would require Federal taxpayers in Hawaii to consider 1949 as a normal year for tax purposes. Any earnings above that level would be considered excess and taxable at 85 percent. In 1946, 1947, and 1948, likewise, there were damaging strikes, although not so bad as the one of 1949. I feel sure that the Senator's amendment, if enacted, would bear down extremely heavily on the taxpayers of Hawaii, who are struggling to recover from the series of disastrous losses and

to rebuild the economic productivity of the Territory.

Of course, situations of this type are supposed to be taken care of by the various provisions for relief contained in the basic statute. During the war we had the "75 percent" rule, the "growth formula," and, in some cases, a predecessor's earnings. Then we had section 722. Section 722 was supposed to provide in all those cases which could not be reached by any of the other provisions of the act.

The simple fact, however, is that all these relief provisions taken together did not really solve the problem. On that point, let me quote but one sentence from an article by the distinguished economist, Roy Blough, who has recently been named a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. In an article entitled "Measurement Problems of the Excess-Profits Tax," appearing in the National Tax Journal, December 1948, Mr. Blough says:

Neither the relief afforded by the 1918 act, nor that by the 1942 act, can be considered a success.

In the face of this record, the amendment proposes to restore intact the system that we had during World War II.

Now, as to the specific provisions of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], as I understand, in his latest proposal he intends to use 80 percent of the average earnings of the years 1946 to 1949 as the base, and to apply the 85-percent rate to earnings above that level. As I stated before, I have no particular objection offhand to the selection of these years, but I question the proposal to take 80 percent of average earnings as a legitimate base for an excess-profits tax.

It is clear that the Senator from Wyoming considers the earnings of some of those years too high. He wants to cut them all back to 80 percent of what they made during that period. In other words, this proposal is not a war-profits tax at all. The earnings of 1946 to 1949 may have been too high or not, but they were peacetime earnings. They were properly subject to normal tax and surtax, and, under this bill, the tax rates on those earnings will already be increased sharply up to a level of 45 percent—nearly half.

The Senator from Wyoming feels that that does not go far enough. He wants to apply the excess-profits rate of 85 percent to a portion of the peacetime earnings of substantially all the larger corporations. He wants to place this 85-percent rate on top of the 45-percent rate of normal tax and surtax which the committee has recommended.

It may be that that is the thing to do, but I do not believe that is the type of decision the Senate wants to make hastily on the floor. The distinguished chairman of the committee has promised that the committee will go promptly to work at drafting a proper excess profits tax law, and that, if enacted, it will be retroactive to January 1, 1951. I want to register now my support for the chairman in that program. I believe, however, that when the committee gets into

this question it will want to go very carefully into this problem of the appropriate base, above which the excess-profits tax would apply. It is rather important whether we should decide that the base be the average earnings of taxpayers during a series of normal peacetime years or, as the Senator from Wyoming has proposed, whether that base should be only 80 percent of the normal peacetime earnings of the taxpayers.

Senators will please remember that we are already proposing to tax all these earnings of the larger corporations at 45 percent. We are not proposing that the large peacetime profits at the 1946-49 rate, to which the Senator from Wyoming objects, should go scot free.

The committee bill has already provided that we take nearly half of those earnings. I cannot see why we must be so hasty about taking 85 percent of the other half of earnings no greater than those received by taxpayers during the peacetime years of 1946 to 1949.

As a matter of fact, the proposal of the Senator from Wyoming is not based purely on our need of revenue to finance the war. The Senator from Wyoming has been in favor of an excess-profits tax for a long time. Two or three years ago, when we were all more hopeful of a prolonged period of peace, he proposed that we add an excess-profits tax to our regular peacetime revenue system. He would be glad enough to have an excess-profits tax adopted by the Congress at any time, peace or war. His insistence on adoption of this amendment right now, instead of a few months from now, is an indication of his feeling on that matter.

I do not question his right to hold those views. He has a perfect right to advocate an excess-profits tax at the height of prosperity or in the depth of depression, during war or peace, or both. I am merely trying to point out that the chairman has promised us that there will be an excess-profits tax within a very few months, if the present crisis continues. He has promised us that it will be a more carefully considered and carefully drafted measure than the amendment we have before us.

We all know the headaches which result from improperly drawn tax laws. No single subject that the Senate has to consider requires more careful consideration, more conscientious attention to detail and to the exact shade of meaning of every word in every paragraph. It is an absolute certainty that if we adopt this amendment we shall have to do the whole job over again next year. I know that Members of the Senate will not want to have to apologize to constituents in their States because they voted for a bill which does not mean exactly what we thought it would mean. Yet that is what we may have to do if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will stand by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. We all know that no Member of the Senate has had the years of experience with tax matters that he has. He has promised us that the staff of the joint committee will go promptly to work on this problem and that we will have an excess-profits

tax bill to act on early next year. We all know that we can depend absolutely upon his promises. He has repeatedly proved to the Senate that he will not use his position as chairman to pigeon-hole or stall or delay any measure on which the Senate desires to vote and reach a decision.

As chairman of the committee, he feels he has the responsibility to make sure that the tax legislation enacted by the Senate is fair and workable, whether he happens to agree with every provision of it or not. He is entitled to our support in carrying out that responsibility.

Now it is proposed to thrust on him from the floor of the Senate a highly complicated and technical tax program on which the Treasury has never passed judgment, the committee has never passed judgment, and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has never reached a conclusion. I believe the Senate should support the chairman and the committee and give us an opportunity to do this job properly in the way he feels that it should be done.

Mr. President, in conclusion I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of August 25, 1950, entitled "Delay Would Be Wiser," with the thought that it expresses, to my mind, the general opinion of people throughout the country.

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

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of August 25, 1950]

DELAY WOULD BE WISER

There is little doubt that an excess-profits tax will be added to other methods to raise the enormous amount of extra revenue required to finance the war in Korea and to build up our defenses. Certainly there is no inclination on the part of the administration to resist such a tax. But the President's tax program is more sensible than the drive now headed by Senator O'MAHONEY to attach an excess-profits tax, by Senate amendment, to the quickie tax bill now pending in the Senate.

This bill is designed for quick passage, in time to apply the higher personal income and corporation taxes in the final quarter of this year, which starts in October. All the machinery for collecting the tax is available. But the perfection of a workable and fair excess-profits tax will require more time, both in the writing of the bill and in preparing for its administration. The tax is a complicated one. The Government is still cleaning up the leftovers of this tax levied in World War II and its technicians are still trying to improve on its form.

To attempt to attach an excess-profits tax provision to the pending bill, without benefit of careful committee examination, is apt to snarl the works. It may delay passage of any tax bill. The more reasonable procedure would be to enact the stop-gap bill now, in the knowledge that its provisions will be supplemented later—perhaps in January—by additional measures, including an excess-profits tax.

DISPOSAL OF REMAINING GOVERNMENT LOTS IN ST. MARKS, FLA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its dis-

agreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8028) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the remaining Government lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION OF PERFORMANCE-RATING PLANS FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7824) to provide for the administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG, and Mr. DWORSHAK conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERNAL REVENUE TAXES ON COCONUT OIL FROM TRUST TERRITORY OF PACIFIC ISLANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8992) to eliminate the additional internal-revenue taxes on coconut oil coming from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERIODIC CENSUS OF GOVERNMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7265) to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7265) to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
WILLIAM LANGER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

TOM MURRAY,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

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

REVENUE ACT OF 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8920) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, ever since the end of World War I, during all the period between the end of that war and the present time, the people of the United States have felt that if we should ever confront another great national emergency such as the last one, we would pay on a current basis as large a part of the cost of that emergency as would be possible. Today we are advised that we confront a deficit this current fiscal year of at least \$20,000,000,000, of which sixteen and a half billion dollars are ascribable to recent new expenditures recommended by the President; the balance represents a deficit carried over from the appropriations voted some weeks ago and finally approved today. Against that deficit it is proposed that we pass a tax bill which, according to estimates by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, will bring to the Treasury of the United States approximately four and a half billion dollars, or less than 25 percent of the amount we need to meet the impending deficit. That is far from pursuing a policy of pay as you go.

Mr. President, the people of this country feel strongly that it would be a great mistake if we do not increase our tax revenues and put into effect as rapidly as may be possible a pay-as-you-go policy.

The excess-tax proposal sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming and the eminent senior Senator from Texas would, at least to some extent, bring about the result that is desired.

We all know that nothing could more seriously and harmfully affect the economy and the well-being of this country than inflation. I hope the control provisions of the defense-production bill will be effective in combating inflation. Certainly, if the high hopes we hold for it are realized, that measure would control inflation to a very considerable degree. But it will not, by any means, control all inflation. Therefore, in my opinion, it is tremendously important that we soak up all possible excess profits, and

thus hold in check the amount of money that will be used to compete for and bid up the limited supply of materials, goods, housing, and other facilities which may be available.

The proposed amendment of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas will, I believe, greatly help in controlling the inflation with which we probably shall be confronted unless we take every possible means to combat it.

There are other reasons which impel me to support and to urge the approval of the excess-profits-tax amendment. I think the people of this country are, to some degree, dissatisfied because they feel an inequality in the sacrifices which are being called for and made. Many of the sons, brothers, and husbands of our people are being called upon to run the risks of combat and, in many cases, to lay down their lives. I think we would fail in our duty and betray the people of the country if we did not make it perfectly clear, if we did not demonstrate beyond any doubt, that we are not only conscripting human lives, but also profits. That would be brought about under the amendment which is now pending.

The distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee has pointed out the difficulty of writing a bill which is shown to be perfectly drafted and sound. I appreciate the difficulties. I know that the Finance Committee has given to this important subject a great amount of thought and will continue to do so. I want to make it clear that I do not in any way minimize the difficulties in connection with the writing of an excess-profits-tax provision. The chairman of the committee has already stated on the floor of the Senate that his committee will present such a provision at the next session.

The amendment which is now before us, I think the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will agree, is not perfect. It is very difficult to write a perfect excess-profits-tax bill. But I submit that the pending proposal is workable and that it will save many months in its operation. Certainly it can be perfected next year. If it saves these next few months, it will bring in vitally needed additional revenues, and promptly.

I am quite certain that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee will agree with me that profits are today at an extremely high level.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers has reported that the third quarter profits are running at the highest rate in all United States history. Certainly we should not lose them, to the detriment of the entire Nation. We would lose some of the benefit of those high profits if we delayed action on the bill until next year. I have no means of knowing the exact amount of revenue which the amendment would produce, but it has not been questioned that it would increase our revenues to a considerable extent. I believe it would increase our revenues to a far greater degree than has been admitted on the floor of the Senate. However, whatever they are, why should we sacrifice these revenues. Why should we delay? Why

should we not capitalize on these excess profits for the benefit of the people of the Nation? It may very well be that the base which has been set for the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949 is too high. It may be that we should reduce the base. Certainly even on a reduced base, revenues would be increased under the proposed amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Finally, Mr. President—I have talked to many labor people. I know of no group in America which is more willing to do its full part in the war effort than the representatives of labor and the workers—the men and women in the shops and mines, and in the fields—but I think that they want to be assured that capital will also be doing its full share, and that industry and business and commerce will be doing their full share, too. The working people of this Nation will not be satisfied unless we have an excess profits tax, and I predict unless we enact an excess profits tax, we shall very soon see a wave of demands for increased wages, which will be difficult if not impossible to withstand. I think labor feels that unless it is assured that the burden of carrying on the war, which is the responsibility of every American, is fairly, justly, and equally carried, then labor should not be asked to accept the burdens that others refuse to carry.

So, Mr. President, for the reasons I have given, and for many others—and I have not attempted to cover the entire field, because I am eager to have the bill come to a vote—I very strongly urge prompt enactment of a tax on excess profits, as provided in the amendment offered by the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the eminent Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. First, let me say that I very much appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New York. During the course of the debate this afternoon, and, indeed, during the course of the debate on Friday, it was pointed out on behalf of the Committee on Finance by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Colorado that in their opinion the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and myself would produce no considerable amount of revenue for the year 1950. I had stated clearly what the purpose of the amendment was. However, in the course of debate it appeared that the statement of the two Senators, to the effect that the production of revenue would be slight, was based upon their conclusion that a technical defect existed in the amendment.

Of course I took that situation into consideration, immediately made a re-examination of the amendment, and called in the experts of the legislative drafting service, and others. As I stated to the Senator from Georgia earlier in the day, as a result of that reexamination, on behalf of the Senator from Texas and myself I am submitting modifications of the amendment, and I now offer them. In order that the modifications may be available to all Members of the Senate, I send the modified amendment

to the desk and ask that it may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, as modified, will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In order that it may be clear precisely what we are doing, I call specific attention to the basic change which is proposed to be made by the amendment. In attempting to draft an excess-profits tax, it becomes necessary first to determine the base upon which it is to be computed; second, the rate at which it is to be computed; and thereafter the exemptions and credits which are to be provided. It has been said over and over again in debate on behalf of those who oppose the amendment that an excess-profits tax should not be drafted on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I submit that is not what we are trying to do. The tax in its essentials was presented formally to the Committee on Finance on the 4th of August. Sufficient opportunity was offered for the closest possible scrutiny of the measure. The report of the Committee on Finance was not made until last Wednesday. So that almost 20 days elapsed between the time the amendment was presented to the Committee on Finance and the date upon which the bill was reported. I am reliably informed that no evidence of any kind was taken after I appeared before the committee.

It is also apparent that it is not an attempt to write an amendment on the floor of the Senate, when I say that it is practically a restatement of the World War II excess-profits tax, with the base and rate changed. Instead of providing for a base of the average profits of the 4 years, 1936 to 1939, we have set up a base, not of the average profits of the period 1946 to 1949, 10 years later, but only 80 percent of it. The World War II tax fixed its base upon the average profits, without any percentage reduction. Moreover, the rate provided for in the amendment is 85 percent. The rate which was in effect in the World War II act was 95 percent. Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to be perfectly clear that in the pending amendment we have presented a much more moderate excess-profits tax than was provided in World War II.

It happened that when the tax bill of 1945 was enacted Congress did not repeal the excess-profits tax, it merely suspended it. But it did repeal section 26 (e) of the code, which provided that in the computation of the normal surtax upon corporations credit should be given for the excess-profits tax net income. So in presenting the amendment on which I spoke the other day there was a paragraph beginning on page 6, line 15, entitled "Technical Amendments." These were amendments which were designed to gear the new excess-profits tax, with the new base and the lower rate, into the excess-profits-tax law which was suspended, and to gear it also into the bill as reported by the committee.

In subsection (j) on lines 22 and 23 we have a provision which would have the effect of reinstating section 26 (e),

relating to the credit for income subject to the excess-profits tax.

There was an omission. That omission was that section 26 (e) was not made effective for the computation of the normal and surtax upon corporate profits. So that the important part of the modification which I have sent forward is designed merely to provide that section 26 (e), which was repealed by the act of 1945, shall be reenacted, and made applicable, as it was in the World War II excess-profits tax, as a credit upon the income of corporations subject to normal and surtax.

Mr. President, I felt that it was desirable to make this explanation, to show that the modification is what I described it to be, namely, a technical modification designed to repair an omission which resulted in the situation described by the Senators from Georgia and Colorado, namely, that without this credit reestablished the excess-profits tax would be very much smaller than was intended. But there is no doubt that the Senator from Texas and I stated from the very beginning that it was our purpose that the excess-profits tax provided in the amendment should be applicable for only 6 months of the year 1950. The technical omission is repaired in the modification which I have sent forward, and as there will be no attempt to have a vote upon this matter today, when it comes up in the morning the full text of the amendment, with the technical corrections, will be available to all the Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion for a moment?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I am glad to withhold it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding that no attempt will be made to have a vote this evening. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] desires to speak upon the amendment, and I think there are other Senators who desire to speak. I believe it is not the desire of the Senator from Georgia to ask for a vote this evening.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I might say that the amendment which I have offered to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas is the pending question, and before a vote on that amendment is taken, I had promised other Senators that there would be a quorum call. However, the hour is late, and I would really prefer waiting until tomorrow.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], I should like to discover where there is any other Senator who desires to speak upon the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is the Senator from Wyoming speaking directly with reference to the excess-profits tax amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have finished what I care to say today. I was endeavoring to ascertain whether or not the Senator from Illinois desired to have any executive business taken up, and I suggest that one of the staff of the Senate make inquiry as to what his desire is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has a number of amendments, and I wish to discuss them, but I think it might be better to wait until we have had full discussion of the excess-profits tax amendment, because the amendments in which the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators are interested are amendments to the committee bill, with deletions, and reverting back to the House language, and they are not new additions to the bill, as is the excess-profits tax amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me, I suggest that his discussion of those amendments might better take place tomorrow, it is now so late. It is correct, as the Senator from Delaware has just stated, that he offered an amendment to the excess-profits tax amendment, an amendment which, I may say, is wholly irrelevant to the excess-profits tax amendment, inasmuch as it does not deal with excess profits at all, but deals with cooperatives, and for that reason I feel it should not be attached to the excess-profits tax amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I may say that I differ with the Senator from Wyoming that this amendment is not germane, because it was what the Senator from Wyoming suggested so eloquently on the floor of the Senate that led me to offer the amendment to his amendment, when he said all corporations should be made to pay their proportionate part of the war expenses, and said that he would not only raise corporate taxes to 45 percent, which represents a 20-percent increase, but would include an excess-profits tax. Surely it seems that this is the time when we should consider a tax on those who are not paying any taxes at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with regard to the logic of considering the amendment, that is true, but my point is that it should be considered in connection with the bill as reported by the Committee on Finance and not in connection with the amendment. But that is not a matter which we could decide this evening.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was my understanding that the Senator was hopeful that his amendment would become a part of the bill, and if we adopted my amendment, we would have a much better bill, an all-inclusive bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the solicitude of the Senator for the excess profits tax amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. While the argument has been made that no hearings have been held on the subject matter of the excess profits amendment, that is not true as to the subject matter of my amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was a hearing, and I was there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There were rather extensive hearings on the cooperative provision, which have been held during the course of the past several years, and I was hopeful that the Senator from Wyoming would accept my amendment as a part of his amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I fear I shall not be able to grant the Senator's request.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my intention to address myself tomorrow to the committee bill as amended, and to refer in particular to what I consider to be the loopholes in the bill, and some of the language of the bill which I believe adds to the loopholes which the President called to our attention in his message on the tax program some months ago. The committee bill as it was accepted in amended form contains about 12 particular provisions which need real discussion, to determine whether or not we are now opening up the gate just a little wider than it was open, particularly since this is supposed to be an interim bill, it appearing that as an interim bill we ought not to leave the floodgates any further open than they are. It is for that reason that I shall address myself tomorrow on the 12 points I have outlined as being highly questionable as tax legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to hear that the Senator from Minnesota is going to do so.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 35 to the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2633) 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, and it was signed by the Vice President.

GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK, WYO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3409) to establish a new Grand Teton National Park in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes, which were, on page 6, line 21, strike out "four" and insert "nine," and on page 6, line 23, after "land" insert a comma and "together with any improvements thereon."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House; ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the

two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. MILLIKIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE SITUATION IN KOREA—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO AMBASSADOR AUSTIN

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the President of the United States to Ambassador Austin, dealing with the situation in Korea.

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

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO AMBASSADOR AUSTIN

DEAR WARREN: As I told you on the telephone this morning I want to congratulate you on your able presentation of the views of the United States Government in the Security Council of the United Nations from the first onset of the aggression against the Republic of Korea. Throughout the entire course of the proceedings you have represented this Government with great effectiveness and in full accordance with my directions.

The letter which you addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations on August 25 on the subject of Formosa admirably sums up the fundamental position of this Government as it had been stated by me on June 27 and in my message to the Congress on July 19. You have clearly set forth in that letter the heart and essence of the problem. You have faithfully set down my views as they were then and as they are now.

To the end that there be no misunderstanding concerning the position of the Government of the United States with respect to Formosa, it may be useful to repeat here the seven fundamental points which you so clearly stated in your letter to Mr. Lie.

(1) The United States has not encroached on the territory of China, nor has the United States taken aggressive action against China.

(2) The action of the United States in regard to Formosa was taken at a time when that island was the scene of conflict with the mainland. More serious conflict was threatened by the public declaration of the Chinese Communist authorities. Such conflict would have threatened the security of the United Nations forces operating in Korea under the mandate of the Security Council to repel the aggression on the Republic of Korea. They threatened to extend the conflict through the Pacific area.

(3) The action of the United States was an impartial neutralizing action addressed both to the forces on Formosa and to those on the mainland. It was an action designed to keep the peace and was, therefore, in full accord with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. As President Truman has solemnly declared, we have no designs on Formosa, and our action was not inspired by any desire to acquire a special position for the United States.

(4) The action of the United States was expressly stated to be without prejudice to the future political settlement of the status of the island. The actual status of the island is that it is territory taken from Japan by the victory of the Allied forces in the Pacific. Like other such territories, its legal status cannot be fixed until there is international action to determine its future. The Chinese Government was asked by the Allies to take the surrender of the Japanese forces on the island. That is the reason the Chinese are there now.

(5) The United States has a record through history of friendship for the Chinese people. We still feel the friendship and know that millions of Chinese reciprocate it. We took the lead with others in the last United Nations General Assembly to secure approval of a resolution on the integrity of China. Only the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and its satellites did not approve that resolution.

(6) The United States would welcome United Nations consideration of the case of Formosa. We would approve full United Nations investigation here, or on the spot. We believe that United Nations consideration would contribute to a peaceful, rather than a forcible solution of that problem.

(7) We do not believe that the Security Council need be, or will be, diverted from its consideration of the aggression against the Republic of Korea. There was a breach of the peace in Korea. The aggression attacked, has been condemned, and the combined forces of the United Nations are now in battle to repel the aggression.

Formosa is now at peace and will remain so unless someone resorts to force.

If the Security Council wishes to study the question of Formosa we shall support and assist that study. Meanwhile, the President of the Security Council should discharge the duties of his office and get on with the item on the agenda; which is the complaint of aggression against the Republic of Korea, and specifically, the recognition of the right of the Korean Ambassador to take his seat and the vote or the United States resolution for the localization of the Korean conflict.

These seven points accurately record the position of the United States.

In the forthcoming discussion of the problem in the Security Council you will continue to have my complete support.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

AUGUST 17, 1950.

FORMOSA—LETTER FROM WARREN R. AUSTIN TO SECRETARY-GENERAL TRYGVE LIE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated August 25, 1950, from Warren R. Austin, United States Representative in the United Nations, to Secretary-General Trygve Lie, on the Formosa question.

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

Following is the text of a letter dated August 25, 1950, by Warren R. Austin, United States Representative in the United Nations, to Secretary-General Trygve Lie on the Formosa question:

"EXCELLENCY: There has been circulated to members of the Security Council a paper which charges the United States with aggression against Formosa. The paper asks the Security Council to consider the question of Formosa.

"The United States Government does not intend to discuss at this time this paper or the ridiculous falsehoods which it contains. It does wish to take this occasion to make a further statement about the Formosan question.

"On June 27 the United States Representative read at the Security Council the following statement of the President of the United States:

"In Korea the Government forces, which were armed to prevent border raids and to preserve internal security, were attacked by invading forces from North Korea. The Security Council of the United Nations called upon the invading troops to cease hostilities and to withdraw to the thirty-eighth parallel. This they have not done, but, on the contrary, have pressed the attack. The Security

Council called upon all members of the United Nations to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution.

"In these circumstances, I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support.

"The attack upon Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and will now use armed invasion and war. It has defied the orders of the Security Council of the United Nations issued to preserve international peace and security. In these circumstances, the occupation of Formosa by Communist forces would be a direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to United States forces performing their lawful and necessary functions in that area.

"Accordingly I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa. As a corollary of this action I am calling upon the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. The Seventh Fleet will see that this is done. The determination of the future status of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan, or consideration by the United Nations.

"I have also directed that United States Forces in the Philippines be strengthened and that military assistance to the Philippine Government be accelerated.

"I have similarly directed acceleration in the furnishing of military assistance to the forces of France and the Associated States in Indochina and the dispatch of a military mission to provide close working relations with those forces.

"I know that all members of the United Nations will consider carefully the consequences of this latest aggression in Korea in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations. A return to the rule of force in international affairs would have far-reaching effects. The United States will continue to uphold the rule of law.

"I have instructed Ambassador Austin, as the representative of the United States to the Security Council, to report these steps to the Council."

"Since then, the President of the United States, on July 19, made the following declaration in a message to the Congress:

"In addition to the direct military effort we and other members of the United Nations are making in Korea, the outbreak of aggression there requires us to consider its implications for peace throughout the world. The attack upon the Republic of Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that the international Communist movement is prepared to use armed invasion to conquer independent nations. We must therefore recognize the possibility that armed aggression may take place in other areas.

"In view of this, I have already directed that United States forces in support of the Philippines be strengthened, and that military assistance be speeded up to the Philippine Government and to the Associated States of Indochina and to the forces of France in Indochina. I have also ordered the United States Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack upon Formosa, and I have requested the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. These steps were at once reported to the United Nations Security Council.

"Our action in regard to Formosa was a matter of elementary security. The peace and stability of the Pacific area had been violently disturbed by the attack on Korea. Attacks elsewhere in the Pacific area would have enlarged the Korean crisis, thereby rendering much more difficult the carrying out of our obligations to the United Nations in Korea.

"In order that there may be no doubt in any quarter about our intentions regarding Formosa, I wish to state that the United States has no territorial ambitions whatever concerning that island, nor do we seek for ourselves any special position or privilege on Formosa.

"The present military neutralization of Formosa is without prejudice to political questions affecting that island. Our desire is that Formosa not become embroiled in hostilities disturbing to the peace of the Pacific and that all questions affecting Formosa be settled by peaceful means as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations. With peace reestablished, even the most complex political questions are susceptible of solution. In the presence of brutal and unprovoked aggression, however, some of these questions may have to be held in abeyance in the interest of the essential security of all."

"These statements and the facts to which they related make perfectly clear certain fundamental points which the people of the world will have clearly in mind:

"1. The United States has not encroached on the territory of China, nor has the United States taken aggressive action against China.

"2. The action of the United States in regard to Formosa was taken at a time when that island was the scene of conflict with the mainland. More serious conflict was threatened by the public declaration of the Chinese Communist authorities. Such conflict would have threatened the security of the United Nations forces operating in Korea under the mandate of the Security Council to repel the aggression on the Republic of Korea. They threatened to extend the conflict through the Pacific area.

"3. The action of the United States was an impartial neutralizing action addressed both to the forces on Formosa and to those on the mainland. It was an action designed to keep the peace and was, therefore, in full accord with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. As President Truman has solemnly declared, we have no designs on Formosa, and our action was not inspired by any desire to acquire a special position for the United States.

"4. The action of the United States was expressly stated to be without prejudice to the future political settlement of the status of the island. The actual status of the island is that it is territory taken from Japan by the victory of the Allied forces in the Pacific. Like other such territories, its legal status cannot be fixed until there is international action to determine its future. The Chinese Government was asked by the Allies to take the surrender of the Japanese forces on the island. That is the reason the Chinese are there now.

"5. The United States has a record through history of friendship for the Chinese people. We still feel the friendship and know that millions of Chinese reciprocate it. We took the lead with others in the last United Nations General Assembly to secure approval of a resolution on the integrity of China. Only the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and its satellites did not approve that resolution.

"6. The United States would welcome United Nations consideration of the case of Formosa. We would approve full United Nations investigation here, or on the spot. We believe that United Nations consideration would contribute to a peaceful, rather than a forceable solution of that problem.

"7. We do not believe that the Security Council need be, or will be, diverted from its consideration of the aggression against the Republic of Korea. There was a breach of the peace in Korea. The aggressor attacked, has been condemned, and the combined forces of the United Nations are now in battle to repel the aggression.

"Formosa is now at peace and will remain so unless someone resorts to force.

"If the Security Council wishes to study the question of Formosa we shall support and assist that study. Meanwhile, the President of the Security Council should discharge the duties of his office and get on with the item on the agenda, which is the complaint of aggression against the Republic of Korea, and, specifically, the recognition of the right of the Korean Ambassador to take his seat and the vote on the United States resolution for the localization of the Korean conflict.

"I request that this letter be circulated to members of the Security Council."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Raymond A. Hare, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first item on the Executive Calendar, a treaty.

THE CHARTER OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the charter (Executive A, 81st Cong., 1st sess.), a Charter of the Organization of American States, formulated at the Ninth International Conference of American States and signed at Bogota in the English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish languages on April 30, 1948, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and by the plenipotentiaries of the other American Republics, which was read the second time, as follows:

CHARTER OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

In the name of their peoples, the states represented at the Ninth International Conference of American States,

Convinced that the historic mission of America is to offer to man a land of liberty, and a favorable environment for the development of his personality and the realization of his just aspirations;

Conscious that that mission has already inspired numerous agreements, whose essential value lies in the desire of the American peoples to live together in peace, and, through their mutual understanding and respect for the sovereignty of each one, to provide for the betterment of all, in independence, in equality and under law;

Confident that the true significance of American solidarity and good neighborliness can only mean the consolidation on this continent, within the framework of democratic institutions, of a system of individual liberty and social justice based on respect for the essential rights of man;

Persuaded that their welfare and their contribution to the progress and the civiliza-

tion of the world will increasingly require intensive continental cooperation;

Resolved to persevere in the noble undertaking that humanity has conferred upon the United Nations, whose principles and purposes they solemnly reaffirm;

Convinced that juridical organization is a necessary condition for security and peace founded on moral order and on justice; and

In accordance with Resolution IX of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, held at Mexico City,

Have agreed upon the following

CHARTER OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

PART ONE

Chapter I

Nature and purposes

Article 1

The American States establish by this Charter the international organization that they have developed to achieve an order of peace and justice, to promote their solidarity, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity and their independence. Within the United Nations, the Organization of American States is a regional agency.

Article 2

All American States that ratify the present Charter are members of the Organization.

Article 3

Any new political entity that arises from the union of several Member States and that, as such, ratifies the present Charter, shall become a Member of the Organization. The entry of the new political entity into the Organization shall result in the loss of membership of each one of the States which constitute it.

Article 4

The Organization of American States, in order to put into practice the principles on which it is founded and to fulfill its regional obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, proclaims the following essential purposes:

(a) To strengthen the peace and security of the continent;

(b) To prevent possible causes of difficulties and to ensure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among the member States;

(c) To provide for common action on the part of those States in the event of aggression;

(d) To seek the solution of political, juridical, and economic problems that may arise among them; and

(e) To promote, by cooperative action, their economic, social, and cultural development.

Chapter II

Principles

Article 5

The American States reaffirm the following principles:

(a) International law is the standard of conduct of States in their reciprocal relations;

(b) International order consists essentially of respect for the personality, sovereignty, and independence of States, and the faithful fulfillment of obligations derived from treaties and other sources of international law;

(c) Good faith shall govern the relations between States;

(d) The solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy;

(e) The American States condemn war of aggression: Victory does not give rights;

(f) An act of aggression against one American State is an act of aggression against all the other American States;

(g) Controversies of an international character arising between two or more American States shall be settled by peaceful procedures;

(h) Social justice and social security are bases of lasting peace;

(i) Economic cooperation is essential to the common welfare and prosperity of the peoples of the continent;

(j) The American States proclaim the fundamental rights of the individual without distinction as to race, nationality, creed, or sex;

(k) The spiritual unity of the continent is based on respect for the cultural values of the American countries and requires their close cooperation for the high purposes of civilization;

(l) The education of peoples should be directed toward justice, freedom, and peace.

Chapter III

Fundamental rights and duties of States

Article 6

States are juridically equal, enjoy equal rights and equal capacity to exercise these rights, and have equal duties. The rights of each State depend not upon its power to ensure the exercise thereof, but upon the mere fact of its existence as a person under international law.

Article 7

Every American State has the duty to respect the rights enjoyed by every other State in accordance with international law.

Article 8

The fundamental rights of States may not be impaired in any manner whatsoever.

Article 9

The political existence of the State is independent of recognition by other States. Even before being recognized, the State has the right to defend its integrity and independence, to provide for its preservation and prosperity, and consequently to organize itself as it sees fit, to legislate concerning its interests, to administer its services, and to determine the jurisdiction and competence of its courts. The exercise of these rights is limited only by the exercise of the rights of other States in accordance with international law.

Article 10

Recognition implies that the State granting it accepts the personality of the new State, with all the rights and duties that international law prescribes for the two States.

Article 11

The right of each State to protect itself and to live its own life does not authorize it to commit unjust acts against another State.

Article 12

The jurisdiction of States within the limits of their national territory is exercised equally over all the inhabitants, whether nationals or aliens.

Article 13

Each State has the right to develop its cultural, political, and economic life freely and naturally. In this free development, the State shall respect the rights of the individual and the principles of universal morality.

Article 14

Respect for and the faithful observance of treaties constitute standards for the development of peaceful relations among States. International treaties and agreements should be public.

Article 15

No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external

affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic, and cultural elements.

Article 16

No State may use or encourage the use of coercive measures of an economic or political character in order to force the sovereign will of another State and obtain from it advantages of any kind.

Article 17

The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. No territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized.

Article 18

The American States bind themselves in their international relations not to have recourse to the use of force, except in the case of self-defense in accordance with existing treaties or in fulfillment thereof.

Article 19

Measures adopted for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties do not constitute a violation of the principles set forth in Articles 15 and 17.

Chapter IV

Pacific settlement of disputes

Article 20

All international disputes that may arise between American States shall be submitted to the peaceful procedures set forth in this Charter, before being referred to the Security Council of the United Nations.

Article 21

The following are peaceful procedures: direct negotiation, good offices, mediation, investigation and conciliation, judicial settlement, arbitration, and those which the parties to the dispute may especially agree upon at any time.

Article 22

In the event that a dispute arises between two or more American States which, in the opinion of one of them, cannot be settled through the usual diplomatic channels, the parties shall agree on some other peaceful procedure that will enable them to reach a solution.

Article 23

A special treaty will establish adequate procedures for the pacific settlement of disputes and will determine the appropriate means for their application, so that no dispute between American States shall fail of definitive settlement within a reasonable period.

Chapter V

Collective security

Article 24

Every act of aggression by a state against the territorial integrity or the inviolability of the territory or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State shall be considered an act of aggression against the other American States.

Article 25

If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an armed attack or by an act of aggression that is not an armed attack, or by an extracontinental conflict, or by a conflict between two or more American states, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the American States, in furtherance of the principles of continental solidarity or collective self-defense, shall apply

the measures and procedures established in the special treaties on the subject.

Chapter VI
Economic standards
Article 26

The member states agree to cooperate with one another, as far as their resources may permit and their laws may provide, in the broadest spirit of good neighborliness, in order to strengthen their economic structure, develop their agriculture and mining, promote their industry, and increase their trade.

Article 27

If the economy of an American State is affected by serious conditions that cannot be satisfactorily remedied by its own unaided effort, such state may place its economic problems before the Inter-American Economic and Social Council to see through consultation the most appropriate solution for such problems.

Chapter VII
Social standards
Article 28

The member States agree to cooperate with one another to achieve just and decent living conditions for their entire populations.

Article 29

The member States agree upon the desirability of developing their social legislation on the following bases:

(a) All human beings, without distinction as to race, nationality, sex, creed or social condition, have the right to attain material well-being and spiritual growth under circumstances of liberty, dignity, equality of opportunity, and economic security;

(b) Work is a right and a social duty; it shall not be considered as an article of commerce; it demands respect for freedom of association and for the dignity of the worker; and it is to be performed under conditions that ensure life, health, and a decent standard of living, both during the working years and during old age, or when any circumstance deprives the individual of the possibility of working.

Chapter VIII
Cultural standards
Article 30

The member States agree to promote, in accordance with their constitutional provisions and their material resources, the exercise of the right to education, on the following bases:

(a) Elementary education shall be compulsory and, when provided by the State, shall be without cost;

(b) Higher education shall be available to all, without distinction as to race, nationality, sex, language, creed, or social condition.

Article 31

With due consideration for the national character of each State, the Member States undertake to facilitate free cultural interchange by every medium of expression.

PART TWO

Chapter IX
The organs
Article 32

The Organization of American States accomplishes its purposes by means of:

- (a) The Inter-American Conference;
- (b) The meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs;
- (c) The Council;
- (d) The Pan American Union;
- (e) The Specialized Conferences; and
- (f) The Specialized Organizations.

Chapter X
The Inter-American Conference
Article 33

The Inter-American Conference is the supreme organ of the Organization of Ameri-

can States. It decides the general action and policy of the Organization and determines the structure and functions of its Organs, and has the authority to consider any matter relating to friendly relations among the American States. These functions shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of this Charter and of other Inter-American treaties.

Article 34

All Member States have the right to be represented at the Inter-American Conference. Each State has the right to one vote.

Article 35

The Conference shall convene every 5 years at the time fixed by the Council of the Organization, after consultation with the government of the country where the Conference is to be held.

Article 36

In special circumstances and with the approval of two-thirds of the American Governments, a special Inter-American Conference may be held, or the date of the next regular Conference may be changed.

Article 37

Each Inter-American Conference shall designate the place of meeting of the next Conference. If for any unforeseen reason the Conference cannot be held at the place designated, the Council of the Organization shall designate a new place.

Article 38

The program and regulations of the Inter-American Conference shall be prepared by the Council of the Organization and submitted to the Member States for consideration.

Chapter XI

The meeting of consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs
Article 39

The Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs shall be held in order to consider problems of an urgent nature and of common interest to the American States, and to serve as the Organ of Consultation.

Article 40

Any Member State may request that a Meeting of Consultation be called. The request shall be addressed to the Council of the Organization, which shall decide by an absolute majority whether a meeting should be held.

Article 41

The program and regulations of the Meeting of Consultation shall be prepared by the Council of the Organization and submitted to the Member States for consideration.

Article 42

If, for exceptional reasons, a Minister of Foreign Affairs is unable to attend the meeting, he shall be represented by a special delegate.

Article 43

In case of an armed attack within the territory of an American State or within the region of security delimited by treaties in force, a Meeting of Consultation shall be held without delay. Such Meeting shall be called immediately by the Chairman of the Council of the Organization, who shall at the same time call a meeting of the Council itself.

Article 44

An Advisory Defense Committee shall be established to advise the Organ of Consultation on problems of military cooperation that may arise in connection with the application of existing special treaties on collective security.

Article 45

The Advisory Defense Committee shall be composed of the highest military authorities of the American States participating in the Meeting of Consultation. Under exceptional

circumstances, the Governments may appoint substitutes. Each State shall be entitled to 1 vote.

Article 46

The Advisory Defense Committee shall be convoked under the same conditions as the Organ of Consultation, when the latter deals with matters relating to defense against aggression.

Article 47

The Committee shall also meet when the Conference or the Meeting of Consultation or the Governments, by a two-thirds majority of the Member States, assign to it technical studies or reports on specific subjects.

Chapter XII
The Council
Article 48

The Council of the Organization of American States is composed of one Representative of each Member State of the Organization, especially appointed by the respective Government, with the rank of Ambassador. The appointment may be given to the diplomatic representative accredited to the Government of the country in which the Council has its seat. During the absence of the titular Representative, the Government may appoint an interim Representative.

Article 49

The Council shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman, who shall serve for 1 year and shall not be eligible for election to either of those positions for the term immediately following.

Article 50

The Council takes cognizance, within the limits of the present Charter and of inter-American treaties and agreements, of any matter referred to it by the Inter-American Conference or the meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

Article 51

The Council shall be responsible for the proper discharge by the Pan American Union of the duties assigned to it.

Article 52

The Council shall serve provisionally as the Organ of Consultation when the circumstances contemplated in article 43 of this Charter arise.

Article 53

It is also the duty of the Council:

- (a) To draft and submit to the Governments and to the Inter-American Conference proposals for the creation of new Specialized Organizations or for the combination, adaptation, or elimination of existing ones, including matters relating to the financing and support thereof;

- (b) To draft recommendations to the Governments, the Inter-American Conference, the Specialized Conferences or the Specialized Organizations, for the coordination of the activities and programs of such organizations, after consultation with them;

- (c) To conclude agreements with the Inter-American Specialized Organizations to determine the relations that shall exist between the respective agency and the Organization;

- (d) To conclude agreements or special arrangements for cooperation with other American organizations of recognized international standing;

- (e) To promote and facilitate collaboration between the Organization of American States and the United Nations, as well as between Inter-American Specialized Organizations and similar international agencies.

- (f) To adopt resolutions that will enable the Secretary General to perform the duties envisaged in article 84;

- (g) To perform the other duties assigned to it by the present Charter.

Article 54

The Council shall establish the bases for fixing the quota that each government is to contribute to the maintenance of the Pan American Union, taking into account the ability to pay of the respective countries and their determination to contribute in an equitable manner. The budget, after approval by the Council, shall be transmitted to the governments at least 6 months before the first day of the fiscal year, with a statement of the annual quota of each country. Decisions on budgetary matters require the approval of two-thirds of the members of the Council.

Article 55

The Council shall formulate its own regulations.

Article 56

The Council shall function at the seat of the Pan American Union.

Article 57

The following are organs of the Council of the Organization of American States:

- (a) The Inter-American Economic and Social Council;
- (b) The Inter-American Council of Jurists; and
- (c) The Inter-American Cultural Council.

Article 58

The organs referred to in the preceding article shall have technical autonomy within the limits of this Charter; but their decisions shall not encroach upon the sphere of action of the Council of the Organization.

Article 59

The organs of the Council of the Organization are composed of representatives of all the member states of the organization.

Article 60

The organs of the Council of the Organization shall, as far as possible, render to the governments such technical services as the latter may request; and they shall advise the Council of the Organization on matters within their jurisdiction.

Article 61

The organs of the Council of the Organization shall, in agreement with the Council, establish cooperative relations with the corresponding organs of the United Nations and with the national or international agencies that function within their respective spheres of action.

Article 62

The Council of the Organization, with the advice of the appropriate bodies and after consultation with the governments, shall formulate the statutes of its organs in accordance with and in the execution of the provisions of this Charter. The organs shall formulate their own regulations.

- (A) *The Inter-American Economic and Social Council*

Article 63

The Inter-American Economic and Social Council has for its principal purpose the promotion of the economic and social welfare of the American nations through effective cooperation for the better utilization of their natural resources, the development of their agriculture and industry and the raising of the standards of living of their peoples.

Article 64

To accomplish this purpose the Council shall:

- (a) Propose the means by which the American nations may give each other technical assistance in making studies and formulating and executing plans to carry out the purposes referred to in Article 26 and to develop and improve their social services;
- (b) Act as coordinating agency for all official inter-American activities of an economic and social nature;

(c) Undertake studies on its own initiative or at the request of any member state;

(d) Assemble and prepare reports on economic and social matters for the use of the member states;

(e) Suggests to the Council of the Organization the advisability of holding specialized conferences on economic and social matters;

(f) Carry on such other activities as may be assigned to it by the Inter-American Conference, the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, or the Council of the Organization.

Article 65

The Inter-American Economic and Social Council, composed of technical delegates appointed by each member state, shall meet on its own initiative or on that of the Council of the Organization.

Article 66

The Inter-American Economic and Social Council shall function at the seat of the Pan American Union, but it may hold meetings in any American city by a majority decision of the member states.

- (B) *The Inter-American Council of Jurists*

Article 67

The purpose of the Inter-American Council of Jurists is to serve as an advisory body on juridical matters; to promote the development and codification of public and private international law; and to study the possibility of attaining uniformity in the legislation of the various American countries, insofar as it may appear desirable.

Article 68

The Inter-American Juridical Committee of Rio de Janeiro shall be the permanent committee of the Inter-American Council of Jurists.

Article 69

The Juridical Committee shall be composed of jurists of the nine countries selected by the Inter-American Conference. The selection of the jurists shall be made by the Inter-American Council of Jurists from a panel submitted by each country chosen by the Conference. The Members of the Juridical Committee represent all Member States of the Organization. The Council of the Organization is empowered to fill any vacancies that occur during the intervals between Inter-American Conferences and between meetings of the Inter-American Council of Jurists.

Article 70

The Juridical Committee shall undertake such studies and preparatory work as are assigned to it by the Inter-American Council of Jurists, the Inter-American Conference, the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, or the Council of the Organization. It may also undertake those studies and projects which, on its own initiative, it considers advisable.

Article 71

The Inter-American Council of Jurists and the Juridical Committee should seek the cooperation of national committees for the codification of international law, of institutes of international and comparative law, and of other specialized agencies.

Article 72

The Inter-American Council of Jurists shall meet when convened by the Council of the Organization, at the place determined by the Council of Jurists at its previous meeting.

- (C) *The Inter-American Cultural Council*

Article 73

The purpose of the Inter-American Cultural Council is to promote friendly relations and mutual understanding among the American peoples, in order to strengthen the peaceful sentiments that have characterized the evolution of America, through the pro-

motion of educational, scientific, and cultural exchange.

Article 74

To this end the principal functions of the Council shall be:

(a) To sponsor inter-American cultural activities;

(b) To collect and supply information on cultural activities carried on, in, and among the American States by private and official agencies, both national and international in character;

(c) To promote the adoption of basic educational programs adapted to the needs of all population groups in the American countries;

(d) To promote, in addition, the adoption of special programs of training, education, and culture for the indigenous groups of the American countries;

(e) To cooperate in the protection, preservation, and increase of the cultural heritage of the continent;

(f) To promote cooperation among the American nations in the fields of education, science, and culture by means of the exchange of materials for research and study, as well as the exchange of teachers, students, specialists, and, in general, such other persons and materials as are useful for the realization of these ends;

(g) To encourage the education of the peoples for harmonious international relations;

(h) To carry on such other activities as may be assigned to it by the Inter-American Conference, the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, or the Council of the Organization.

Article 75

The Inter-American Cultural Council shall determine the place of its next meeting, and shall be convened by the Council of the Organization on the date chosen by the latter in agreement with the Government of the country selected as the seat of the meeting.

Article 76

There shall be a Committee for Cultural Action of which five States, chosen at each Inter-American Conference, shall be members. The individuals composing the Committee for Cultural Action shall be selected by the Inter-American Cultural Council from a panel submitted by each country chosen by the Conference, and they shall be specialists in education or cultural matters. When the Inter-American Cultural Council and the Inter-American Conference are not in session, the Council of the Organization may fill vacancies that arise and replace those countries that find it necessary to discontinue their cooperation.

Article 77

The Committee for Cultural Action shall function as the permanent committee of the Inter-American Cultural Council, for the purpose of preparing any studies that the latter may assign to it. With respect to these studies the Council shall have the final decision.

Chapter XIII

The Pan American Union

Article 78

The Pan American Union is the central and permanent organ of the Organization of American States and the General Secretariat of the Organization. It shall perform the duties assigned to it in this Charter and such other duties as may be assigned to it in other inter-American treaties and agreements.

Article 79

There shall be a Secretary General of the Organization, who shall be elected by the Council for a 10-year term and who may not be reelected or be succeeded by a person of the same nationality. In the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary General, the Council shall, within the next 90 days, elect

a successor to fill the office for the remainder of the term, who may be reelected if the vacancy occurs during the second half of the term.

Article 80

The Secretary General shall direct the Pan American Union and be the legal representative thereof.

Article 81

The Secretary General shall participate with voice, but without vote, in the deliberations of the Inter-American Conference, the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the Specialized Conferences, and the Council and its organs.

Article 82

The Pan American Union, through its technical and information offices, shall, under the direction of the Council, promote economic, social, juridical, and cultural relations among all the Member States of the Organization.

Article 83

The Pan American Union shall also perform the following functions:

(a) Transmit ex officio to Member States the convocation to the Inter-American Conference, the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and the Specialized Conferences;

(b) Advise the Council and its organs in the preparation of programs and regulations of the Inter-American Conference, the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and the Specialized Conferences;

(c) Place, to the extent of its ability, at the disposal of the Government of the country where a conference is to be held, the technical aid and personnel which such Government may request;

(d) Serve as custodian of the documents and archives of the Inter-American Conference, of the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and, insofar as possible, of the Specialized Conferences;

(e) Serve as depository of the instruments of ratification of inter-American agreements;

(f) Perform the functions entrusted to it by the Inter-American Conference, and the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs;

(g) Submit to the Council an annual report on the activities of the Organization;

(h) Submit to the Inter-American Conference a report on the work accomplished by the Organs of the Organization since the previous Conference.

Article 84

It is the duty of the Secretary General:

(a) To establish, with the approval of the Council, such technical and administrative offices of the Pan American Union as are necessary to accomplish its purposes;

(b) To determine the number of department heads, officers, and employees of the Pan American Union; to appoint them, regulate their powers and duties, and fix their compensation, in accordance with general standards established by the Council.

Article 85

There shall be an Assistant Secretary General, elected by the Council for a term of 10 years and eligible for reelection. In the event of a vacancy in the office of Assistant Secretary General, the Council shall, within the next 90 days, elect a successor to fill such office for the remainder of the term.

Article 86

The Assistant Secretary General shall be the Secretary of the Council. He shall perform the duties of the Secretary General during the temporary absence or disability of the latter, or during the 90-day vacancy referred to in Article 79. He shall also serve as advisory officer to the Secretary General, with the power to act as his delegate in all matters that the Secretary General may entrust to him.

Article 87

The Council, by a two-thirds vote of its members, may remove the Secretary General or the Assistant Secretary General whenever the proper functioning of the Organization so demands.

Article 88

The heads of the respective departments of the Pan American Union, appointed by the Secretary General, shall be the Executive Secretaries of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, the Council of Jurists and the Cultural Council.

Article 89

In the performance of their duties the personnel shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority outside the Pan American Union. They shall refrain from any action that might reflect upon their position as international officials responsible only to the Union.

Article 90

Every member of the Organization of American States pledges itself to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary General and the personnel, and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their duties.

Article 91

In selecting its personnel the Pan American Union shall give first consideration to efficiency, competence and integrity; but at the same time importance shall be given to the necessity of recruiting personnel on as broad a geographical basis as possible.

Article 92

The seat of the Pan American Union is the city of Washington.

Chapter XIV

The specialized conferences

Article 93

The Specialized Conference shall meet to deal with special technical matters or to develop specific aspects of inter-American cooperation, when it is so decided by the Inter-American Conference or the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs; when inter-American agreements so provide; or when the Council of the Organization considers it necessary, either on its own initiative or at the request of one of its organs or of one of the Specialized Organizations.

Article 94

The program and regulations of the Specialized Conferences shall be prepared by the organs of the Council of the Organization or by the Specialized Organizations concerned; they shall be submitted to the Member Governments for consideration and transmitted to the Council for its information.

Chapter XV

The specialized organizations

Article 95

For the purposes of the present Charter, Inter-American Specialized Organizations are the intergovernmental organizations established by multilateral agreements and having specific functions with respect to technical matters of common interest to the American States.

Article 96

The Council shall, for the purposes stated in article 53, maintain a register of the organizations that fulfill the conditions set forth in the foregoing article.

Article 97

The specialized organizations shall enjoy the fullest technical autonomy and shall take into account the recommendations of the Council, in conformity with the provisions of the present Charter.

Article 98

The specialized organizations shall submit to the Council periodic reports on the progress of their work and on their annual budgets and expenses.

Article 99

Agreements between the Council and the specialized organizations contemplated in paragraph (c) of article 53 may provide that such organizations transmit their budgets to the Council for approval. Arrangements may also be made for the Pan American Union to receive the quotas of the contributing countries and distribute them in accordance with the said agreements.

Article 100

The specialized organizations shall establish cooperative relations with world agencies of the same character in order to coordinate their activities. In concluding agreements with international agencies of a world-wide character, the Inter-American Specialized Organizations shall preserve their identity and their status as integral parts of the Organization of American States, even when they perform regional functions of international agencies.

Article 101

In determining the geographic location of the specialized organizations the interests of all the American States shall be taken into account.

PART THREE

Chapter XVI

The United Nations

Article 102

None of the provisions of this Charter shall be construed as impairing the rights and obligations of the Member States under the Charter of the United Nations.

Chapter XVII

Miscellaneous provisions

Article 103

The Organization of American States shall enjoy in the territory of each Member such legal capacity, privileges, and immunities as are necessary for the exercise of its functions and the accomplishment of its purposes.

Article 104

The Representatives of the Governments on the Council of the Organization, the representatives on the organs of the Council, the personnel of their delegations, as well as the Secretary General and the Assistant Secretary General of the Organization, shall enjoy the privileges and immunities necessary for the independent performance of their duties.

Article 105

The juridical status of the Inter-American Specialized Organizations and the privileges and immunities that should be granted to them and to their personnel, as well as to the officials of the Pan American Union, shall be determined in each case through agreements between the respective organizations and the Governments concerned.

Article 106

Correspondence of the Organization of American States, including printed matter and parcels, bearing the frank thereof, shall be carried free of charge in the mails of the Member States.

Article 107

The Organization of American States does not recognize any restriction on the eligibility of men and women to participate in the activities of the various Organs and to hold positions therein.

Chapter XVIII

Ratification and entry into force

Article 108

The present Charter shall remain open for signature by the American States and shall

be ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures. The original instrument, the Spanish, English, Portuguese, and French texts of which are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Pan American Union, which shall transmit certified copies thereof to the Governments for purposes of ratification. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Pan American Union, which shall notify the signatory States of such deposit.

Article 109

The present Charter shall enter into force among the ratifying States when two-thirds of the signatory States have deposited their ratifications. It shall enter into force with respect to the remaining States in the order in which they deposit their ratifications.

Article 110

The present Charter shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations through the Pan American Union.

Article 111

Amendments to the present Charter may be adopted only at an Inter-American Conference convened for that purpose. Amendments shall enter into force in accordance with the terms and the procedure set forth in Article 109.

Article 112

The present Charter shall remain in force indefinitely, but may be denounced by any Member State upon written notification to the Pan American Union, which shall communicate to all the others each notice of denunciation received. After 2 years from the date on which the Pan American Union receives a notice of denunciation, the present Charter shall cease to be in force with respect to the denouncing State, which shall cease to belong to the Organization after it has fulfilled the obligations arising from the present Charter.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, whose full powers have been presented and found to be in good and due form, sign the present Charter at the city of Bogotá, Colombia, on the dates that appear opposite their respective signatures.

For Honduras:

M. A. Batres
Ramón E. Cruz
Virgilio R. Gálvez
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Guatemala:

L. Cardoza y Aragón
J. L. Mendoza
Virgilio Rodríguez Beteta
M. Noriega M.
José M. Saravia
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Chile:

J. Hernández
E. Barros Jarpa
W. Muller
Julio Barrenechea
D. Bassi
J. Ramón Gutiérrez
Rodrigo González
Gaspar Mora Sotomayor
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Uruguay:

Dardo Regules
Pedra Chouhy Terra
Juan F. Gulchón
Héctor A. Grauert
Gen. Pedro Sicco
R. Pirtz Co. lho
Nilo Berchesi
Ariosto D. González
Blanca Mieres de Botto
Carlos Manini Ríos
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Cuba:

O. Gans y M.
Ernesto Dihigo
Carlos Tabernilla
Ricardo Sarabasa
Guy Pérez Cisneros
E. Pando
(30 de abril de 1948)

For the United States of America:

Norman Armour
Willard L. Beaulac
William D. Pawley
Walter J. Donnelly
Paul C. Daniels
(30 de abril de 1948)

For the Dominican Republic:

Artura Despradel
Minerva Bernardino
Temístocles Messina
Joaquín Balaguer
E. Rodríguez Demorizi
Héctor Incháustegui
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Bolivia:

J. Paz Campero
E. Montes y M.
Humberto Linares
H. Palza
A. Alexander
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Peru:

A. Revoredo I.
V. A. Belaúnde
Luis Fernán Cisneros
Juan Bautista de Lavalle
G. N. de Arámburu
Luis Echeopar García
E. Rebagliati
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Nicaragua:

Luis Manuel Debayle
Guillermo Sevilla Sacasa
Modesto Valle
Jesús Sánchez
Diego M. Chamorro
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Mexico:

J. Torres Bodet
R. Córdova
Luis Quintanilla
José M. Ortiz Tirado
P. Campos Ortiz
J. Gorostiza
E. Villaseñor
G. Ramos Millán
J. López B.
M. Sánchez Cuén
E. Enriquez
Mario de la Cueva
F. A. Ursúa
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Panama:

Mario de Diego
Roberto Jiménez
R. J. Alfaro
Eduardo A. Chiari
(30 de abril de 1948)

For El Salvador:

Héctor David Castro
H. Escobar Serrano
Joaquín Guillén Rivas
Roberto E. Canessa
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Paraguay:

César A. Vasconsellos
Augusto Saldívar
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Costa Rica:

Emilio Valverde
Rolando Blanco
José Miranda
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Ecuador:

A. Parra V.
Homero Viteri L.
F. Jaramillo A.
Gen. L. Larrea A.
Alberto Puig Arosemena
H. García Ortiz
B. Peralta P.
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Brazil:

João Neves da Fontoura
Arthur Ferreira dos Santos
Gabriel de Rezende Passos
Elmano Gomes Cardim
João Henrique Sampaolo Vieira de Silva
A. Camillo de Oliveira
Jorge Felipe Kafuri
Ernesto de Araújo
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Haiti:

Gustave Laraque
J. L. Dejean
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Venezuela:

Rómulo Betancourt
Luis Lander
José Rafael Pocaterra
Mariano Picón Salas
(30 de abril de 1948)

For the Argentine Republic:

Enrique Goromina
Pascual La Rosa
Pedro Juan Vignale
Saverio S. Valentí
R. A. Ares
(30 de abril de 1948)

For Colombia:

Eduardo Zuleta Angel
Carlos Lozano y Lozano
Domingo Esguerra
Silvio Villegas
Luis López de Mesa
Jorge Soto del Corral
Carlos Arango Vélez
Miguel Jiménez López
Augusto Ramírez Moreno
Cipriano Restrepo Jaramillo
Antonio Rocha

I hereby certify that the foregoing document is a true and faithful copy of the authentic texts in English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish, of the Charter of the Organization of American States, signed at the Ninth International Conference of American States, held at Bogotá, Colombia, from March 30 to May 2, 1948, and that these texts have been duly examined for purposes by coordination by the Special Commission appointed to that end by the Council of the Organization of American States.

Washington, D. C., September 30, 1948.

WILLIAM MANGER,
*Secretary of the Council
of the Organization of American States.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The charter is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the charter will be reported to the Senate.

The charter was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of ratification, with the reservation, will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of 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 in the English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish languages on April 30, 1948, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and by the plenipotentiaries of the other American republics, subject to the following reservation:

That the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the Charter with the reservation that none of its provisions shall be considered as enlarging the powers of the Federal Government of the United States or limiting the powers of the several states of the Federal Union with respect to any matters recognized under the Constitution as being within the reserved powers of the several States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the reservation to the resolution of ratification.

The reservation was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification with the reservation. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the

resolution of ratification, with the reservation, is agreed to, and the Charter is ratified.

ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Morris L. Ernst, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination be passed over, at least until tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. It should go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter Bedell Smith, Lieutenant General, United States Army, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Friday afternoon, after I reported this nomination in behalf of the Armed Services Committee, I withdraw it after the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] asked me to find out whether or not Mr. Smith intended to accept this appointment as a career, or whether he had any intention of accepting it only as an interim appointment, pending his accepting some other position in private industry. In view of that question having been raised, I thought it was only a matter of courtesy owing to the Senator from Iowa to withdraw the appointment until I could secure the information I needed to answer the question.

I have this afternoon talked to General Smith. He took the position which I think is quite proper and right for him to take, namely, that he could not and would not commit himself to any promise that under no circumstances would he accept another position if in the future he decided, for personal reasons or otherwise, that he cared to accept another position that might possibly be offered to him.

I think that is a perfectly reasonable and understandable position for anyone nominated to a Federal position to take. I do not think we have any right to say to anyone who is named to any Federal position that the confirmation of his nomination should be made dependent upon a promise from him that under no circumstances would he accept another appointment.

General Smith said, for example, that he had been under consideration, along with a group of other men, for the presidency of a university. He said he wanted to have it clearly understood before the Senate passed upon this confirmation, that he would not commit himself not to accept the presidency of a university if he should decide, in case such an offer were made to him, that he could perform, according to his lights, a better service in that position than in the position for which he had been nominated. However, he said he thought I would also be within the realm of a completely accurate statement if I notified the Senate this afternoon that it was not his present intention or contemplation to accept another position if one should be offered to him in the immedi-

ate future. That he was planning to proceed with this particular work, because he thought it offered to him a fine opportunity of great public service. Then he added that he wanted the Senate fully to understand, that he considered himself, if confirmed to this position this afternoon, perfectly free at any time, without feeling that he was under any obligation to the Senate, to resign his position as head of CIA if in the future he should decide for his own reasons he should take some position either in industry or in the field of education or in another field. I think, Mr. President, that is a very accurate report of my conversation with General Smith.

Now I wish to say, as a member of the Armed Services Committee in charge of this nomination on the floor, that I also consider it to be a satisfactory answer on the part of General Smith, fully aware as I am of the desirability of long continuity of service in the CIA. Nevertheless, I do not believe we have any right ever to seek to bind a man when we are appointing him to a Federal post as important as this, to any commitment that under no circumstances will he accept another appointment. I think that this position is such a vital one in the critical hour in which we now live, Mr. President, that the appointment of General Smith, with his background, his knowledge of Russia and Russian tactics, is a highly desirable one, even—and I will put this now by way of overstatement—even though it may mean that he will take the position for a relatively short time. However, I have every reason to believe that in all probability General Smith will serve in this position for a considerable length of time, and probably this will be his final career service so far as his public work is concerned.

Therefore, in behalf of the Armed Services Committee, I urge confirmation of the nomination of General Smith.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the evidence taken before the Armed Services Committee reveal a continuity of tenure of office on the part of those preceding the appointee in that position?

Mr. MORSE. The evidence reveals that about four different persons have filled that office.

Mr. WHERRY. In what period of time?

Mr. MORSE. Since approximately 1947, I believe.

Mr. WHERRY. The basic law was written in 1947, as I recall. Inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Oregon has raised the question of continuity, let me say that I agree with him that any attempt to bind the appointee not to accept appointment elsewhere would not be for the best. However, I think the Senator will agree with me that continuity in this important office at this time is most important; is it not?

Mr. MORSE. It is very desirable. We have reason to believe that we shall have continuity of service in that position for whatever time is required in order to have worked out for the Central

Intelligence Agency some policies which need to be worked out.

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

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Did any of the evidence which was adduced show a need for a new appointment in this position at this time? In other words, was there evidence as to whether the services of those who have previously served in this position were completely satisfactory?

Mr. MORSE. The committee did not go into that question at all; so far as I know, no question was raised as to the services of the predecessors in office. We were simply confronted with the fact that a vacancy had occurred and that a new appointment had been made.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. MORSE. We conducted no inquiry into the record of the predecessor in that office, because we did not consider that to be a question before us, in respect to the qualifications of this particular nominee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I did not read all the testimony. However, judging from some of the newspaper reports, and accepting them for whatever they may be worth, it would seem that a change was made in this position for some particular reason; and I wondered what the reason for it might be.

I have known Admiral Hillenkoetter for many years, and I have a very fine and high opinion of him.

Mr. MORSE. I share the Senator's opinion of Admiral Hillenkoetter.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, it may be that he desires to return to service in the Navy, at sea; and perhaps he is needed there as much as he is needed in the Central Intelligence Agency. However, when it is stated in some of the press reports that Admiral Hillenkoetter has failed in his service as head of the Central Intelligence Agency, I wish to say that I think he has done a great job as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. If a change is necessary because of circumstances, I certainly have no objection to the pending nomination, but at least I should like to have the RECORD show my feeling in regard to Admiral Hillenkoetter.

Mr. MORSE. I see that the only other member of the Armed Services Committee who now is on the floor is my friend, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. As I discuss this matter, if he has any comments to make, I hope he will feel free to make them.

I think he will verify the statement I make to the Senate this afternoon in regard to the attitude of the Armed Services Committee regarding this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the report shows what the Senator has said.

I have no objection at all to the appointment of General Smith; but I wish the record to show that so far as I am concerned, the change is not being made because of any failure on the part of Admiral Hillenkoetter. I say that because I have questioned him, and I am satisfied that he has done a fine job in the Central Intelligence Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER CONFERENCE REPORT ON JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO NATURALIZATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on August 14, I moved that the Senate reconsider the vote taken on the conference report on the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 238, to provide for the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence. I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion to reconsider.

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

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE REGARDING A RADIO BROADCAST

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the motion for a minute or two?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in order that there may be no misunderstanding and, certainly, no injustice done in regard to a radio program in which he participated over the week end, and about which there has been some inquiry today either as to what I said or as to what I meant to say, let me make a brief statement at this time for the RECORD:

Over the week end I participated in a radio program with three distinguished Senators, namely, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. It was an extemporaneous program. In the course of our discussion, in talking about the possibilities of war and the effects on the United States of a war with Russia, at the end of the program it appears that the Senator from Louisiana asked me a question in regard to what I thought might be the effects upon our country of a war with Russia. I understand now that included within his question was a reference to the atomic power of Russia.

At the time I did not catch the fact that his question included the phrase "atomic power"; I thought he was asking me what I thought would be the effect upon the United States of a sudden war with Russia. I said, in speaking on that program, what I have said many times in recent months, and what happens to be a conviction of mine, namely, that if we should get into a war with Russia as soon as next week, I happen to believe that within a very short space of time thereafter, even as short a space as a month thereafter, the striking power of Russia would be such that several American cities would be rubble. I happen to believe that, and I said so on that program. However, I did not say that with any intention of giving the impression that I thought Russia had atomic power sufficient to reduce several American cities to rubble. I think Russia has the power to do that irrespective of whether she has any atomic power at all.

I hope this statement by me will clarify any misunderstanding regarding my intent which may have arisen by virtue of various inquiries which have been made today.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I renew my motion that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 29, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate August 28 (legislative day, July 20), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Raymond A. Hare, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 28 (legislative day, July 20), 1950:

DIRECTOR, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Walter Bedell Smith, lieutenant general, United States Army, to be Director of Central Intelligence.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

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

Edgar A. Hawk	Paul M. Duffy
Clyde H. Steffee, Jr.	George F. Cameron, Jr.
Thomas J. Kennedy, Jr.	William van Herick
Paul H. Ohliger	Robert C. Jackson
Marvin Lillian	Everett C. Sutter
Charles F. Naegle	H. Wayne Glotfelty

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Donald E. Love	John D. Goss, Jr.
Robert N. Philip	Harry F. Brumbach, Jr.
Ira L. Myers	
Byron C. Hollenback	

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

Robert C. Likins	Oswald Spence
Quentin M. Smith	Fredric A. Ledward
Robert W. Bonds	Hubert Fields, Jr.
Charles G. Sleichter, Jr.	John W. Heck
	Harry V. Borg

To be assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Richard L. Hayes	Harold R. Stanley, Jr.
Paul C. Reid	Norman W. Littleton
William D. Sterrett, Jr.	Viron L. Diefenbach
	James E. Kelly

Dorrance I. Anderson

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 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. Abdallah	Helen L. Roberts

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

Nina A. Ra.nacciotti

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

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

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

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

John J. Walsh
Joseph A. Gallagher

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

Clovis E. Martin
James O. Blythe, Jr.

To be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Joseph H. Coffey

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

Paul H. Honda

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to Army rank of captain)

Alice M. Driscoll
Phyllis B. Kyte

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE GRADES AND CORPS SPECIFIED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 381, 80TH CONG.), TITLE II OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 5, 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 365, 80TH CONG.), PUBLIC LAW 625, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, PUBLIC LAW 36, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, AND PUBLIC LAW 36, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 514, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

To be majors

Robert J. Bernucci, MC, O1686859.
Frederick M. Jacobs, MC, O397758.
Jose A. Willie, MC, O490267.
H. Haskell Ziperman, MC, O423565.

To be captains

John R. Arbucci, DC, O1692363.
John W. Collard, DC, O937810.
David J. Ellis, DC, O1775628.
James K. Foster, Jr., DC, O985463.
Russell J. Gale, MC, O1705085.
Roger M. Mitts, MC, O1786788.
Loren E. Mott, MC, O495266.
Jacob F. Schirmer, MC, O937207.
Frank J. Shannon, Jr., MC, O1726524.
Francis O. Stalker, DC, O976464.
Douglas A. Zimmerman, MC, O1756905.

To be first lieutenants

Glen K. Arney, MC, O978749.
Loren R. Baumgartner, MC, O965211.
Robert A. Dietzschold, DC, O960387.
Stella G. Duc, ANC, N802383.
Austin J. Gerber, JAGC, O523223.
Harold R. Hayes, Jr., DC, O965056.
Bertha J. Hoehn, ANC, N779773.
Harry Levin, DC, O965209.
Martha E. Mayfield, ANC, N764689.
Thomas H. Morton, JAGC, O982159.
Wallace S. Murphy, JAGC, O974892.
Mary J. Olssen, ANC, N754136.
Agnes J. Ratcliff, WMSC, R2517.
Waldemar E. Santiago, MC, O963246.
Faye R. Sullivan, ANC, N785300.
Earl C. Thomas, JAGC, O980761.
Billie G. West, DC, O965610.
Edward J. Whalen, JAGC, O969761.
Warren N. Wheeler, DC, O1284068.

To be second lieutenants

Margaret M. Brosmer, ANC, N804086.
Elizabeth A. Chapman, WAC, L1010077.
Marian R. Christensen, ANC, N804273.
Martha J. Eason, WMSC, M2862.
Irma L. Jaakkola, WMSC, M2856.
Jane E. Jacoby, ANC, N792972.
Mary H. Koenig, ANC, N792857.
Claire V. LeBlanc, ANC, N792320.
Ethel Liebowitz, ANC, N792175.
Katherine M. Marta, ANC, N792742.
Hanssen Schenker, MSC, O407736.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MEDICAL CORPS, REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 381, 80TH CONG.), SUBJECT TO COMPLETION OF INTERNSHIP, AND SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

To be first lieutenants

Edgar L. Cook, O975704.
Edwin G. Eklund, Jr., O975711.
Ralph H. Forrester, O971615.
Harvey J. Galloway, Jr., O975085.
David E. Johnson, O976275.
William A. Williams, O975088.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 381, 80TH CONG.), SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

To be second lieutenants

Louis G. Broad, Jr., O1341072.
Charles J. Buchanan, O2202641.
Joseph P. Carniglia, O954410.
Cosimo L. Cataldi.

Alfred J. deLorimier.
Samuel S. Dugan.
John C. Eargler, Jr.
Lee V. Frazier.
Nicholas George.
Robert L. McClure.
Allan M. Sheets, O2202656.
Charles E. Strigle.
Charles C. Stringfellow.
James R. Woodall, Jr., O2207186.

DISTINGUISHED MILITARY STUDENTS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 381, 80TH CONG.), SUBJECT TO DESIGNATION AS DISTINGUISHED MILITARY GRADUATES, AND SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

To be second lieutenants

Carroll G. Allen.
Daniel O. Fox.
Rodney P. Harrington, O2202533.
John F. Harris.
Richard H. Jacobs.
Richard E. Lethiser.
George A. McClellan, Jr.
James E. Price, Jr., O972126.
James B. Stewart, O2206904.
John P. Sullivan, Jr.
Whitfield F. Woodhead.
Thomas W. Worthington.

DISTINGUISHED MILITARY STUDENT FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS, REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 506 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947 (PUBLIC LAW 381, 80TH CONG.), SUBJECT TO DESIGNATION AS A DISTINGUISHED MILITARY GRADUATE, AND SUBJECT TO PHYSICAL QUALIFICATION

To be second lieutenant

Dan C. Cavanaugh, O971021.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. E. Butler Abington, pastor, Trinity Baptist Church, Lake Charles, La., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou who art everlasting, without beginning and without end; upon whom we all are dependent. However, Father, Thou who art in heaven we bless Thy name for every privilege and every manifestation of Thy love and mercy. Thou hast kept us, providences of God have followed us like the lovely, beautiful stream, life-giving and refreshing. All we are individually and collectively we acknowledge all that is good comes from God. We invoke Thy benedictions upon this session today of the House of Representatives of our country.

May the Lord give wisdom and strength and guidance to all these noble men. May we understand that every good and perfect gift cometh from heaven above and may we give more time and attention to the things of God, the things of heaven, the things that are eternal, those things that do not pass away.

Hear our prayer this morning and have mercy upon us as we pray in the name and for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 26, 1950, was read and approved.

CUSTOMS DUTIES ON ARTICLES COMING INTO THE UNITED STATES FROM THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6343) relating to customs duties on articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands, 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 2, line 7, after "duty", insert "generally."

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this going to permit merchandise to come in from the Virgin Islands without duty?

Mr. DOUGHTON. This is a bill that was unanimously reported by the committee and passed by the House. This is only a minor amendment and does not change the general legislation in any way.

Mr. RICH. Since we are the guardians of the Virgin Islands there may be some merit to this. But they are talking about reducing the tariffs by the reciprocal trade agreements route on things coming in from foreign countries, thus putting the people of this country out of business.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This amendment really limits the scope of the bill as it passed the House, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. I hope you may do everything you can to keep the tariff-making body in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee instead of the State Department from now on. If the gentleman will do that he will be doing the country a great good.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit free entry of articles coming into the United States or its possessions from the Virgin Islands when such articles contain foreign materials which may be imported directly into the United States free of duty. The Senate amendment merely adds the word "generally" at the end of the bill in order to limit its application to articles which are generally free of duty, regardless of the country of origin. The bill would not apply, therefore, in the limited area of articles given preferentially free admission, such as ar-

ticles from Cuba or the Philippine Islands, for such articles would not be admitted free of duty when imported from all other countries.

EXEMPTING FROM DUTY SOUND RECORDINGS FOR NEWS BROADCASTS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8726) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to exempt from duty sound recordings for news broadcasts, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 6, after "States", insert "or suitable for use in reproducing sound in connection with moving-picture news reels."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to exempt from duty sound recordings for news broadcasts and in connection with moving-picture news reels."

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

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the bill as passed by the House would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 by providing for the free entry of sound recordings transcribed or recorded abroad for radio or television news broadcasts in the United States. As explained at the time of original consideration of this bill by the House, the bill would merely extend treatment to sound recordings for news broadcasts similar to that accorded to dispatches sent back to the United States by news correspondents.

The Senate amendment would extend this same exemption to sound recordings transcribed or recorded abroad which are suitable for reproducing sound in connection with moving-picture news reels in the United States. A similar provision was included in H. R. 7447, the bill amending the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to sound-recording materials for use in connection with moving-picture exhibits and news reels, but the Senate struck the provision from H. R. 7447 and added the substance of that amendment to H. R. 8726.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7447) 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, 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 2, strike out lines 10 to 19, inclusive. Amend the title so as to read: "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."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to simplify the present administration of customs collection for sound recordings by establishing a specific rate of duty per linear foot for recordings suitable for use in reproducing sound in connection with motion-picture exhibits. As passed by the House, the bill would also have provided that such recordings should enter duty-free if suitable for use in connection with moving-picture newsreels. The Senate amended this bill by striking out the provision with respect to the duty-free entry of sound recordings for use in connection with newsreels, the substance of which has been added to another bill, H. R. 8726, which exempts from duty sound recordings for news broadcasts.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATING ADDITIONAL INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8992) to eliminate the additional internal-revenue taxes on coconut oil coming from the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by 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 DOUGHTON, COOPER, MILLS, REED of New York, and WOODRUFF.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment restores to the bill the language of section 2, as originally introduced, which was deleted by the House upon recommendation of the Committee on Ways and Means. It also includes amendatory language intended to comply with a recommendation of the

Department of State believed to be defective in certain respects.

AMENDING TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1838) to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of the United States marshals, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2994)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1838) to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same.

SAM HOBBS,
PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT McCARRAN,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
JAMES EASTLAND,

By McCARRAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1838) to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals, submit the following explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House passed the Senate bill after amending it by striking out the first section, which proposed to make the fee chargeable by marshals for the sale of property uniform in all judicial districts, and to make applicable to all sales the fees presently authorized for the sale of property under process in admiralty. The Senate recedes.

SAM HOBBS,
PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERIODIC CENSUS OF GOVERNMENTS

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7265) to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2969)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7265) to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

TOM MURRAY,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
EDWARD H. REES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
WILLIAM LANGER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7265) to provide for the conduct of a periodic census of governments, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill requires that the Secretary of Commerce take a periodic census of governments. The Senate amendment provides that the Secretary of Commerce may at his discretion take such a census. The Senate recedes.

TOM MURRAY,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
EDWARD H. REES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERFORMANCE-RATING PLANS

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7824) to provide for the administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. MURRAY of Tennessee, DAVIS of Georgia, and REES.

ITALIAN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6804) for the relief of certain Italian aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Nini" and insert "Mini."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Angela Fellini" and insert "Angelina Fellini."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Baccielli" and insert "Bacchielli."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Caterina" and insert "Catherina."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Ginevra" and insert "Ginevia."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHOKO NISHIDA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6832) for the relief of Choko Nishida, 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 1, strike out all after the enacting clause down to and including "War II" in line 11 and insert: "That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Choko Nishida, the Japanese fiancée of Clifford Mr. Sergeant, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Choko Nishida may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TADEUSZ HERKA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8219) for the relief of Tadeusz Herka, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Tadeusz Herka shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRITISH AID TO RUSSIA

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I know it is not the policy of our country to dictate or delve into the sovereign rights of other countries; but there is no doubt that many of us, upon reading Churchill's charges that a British factory is turning out tools for the Soviets, became alarmed and bewildered. Just what is this? It may be politics—but I believe in the old adage: "Where there is smoke, there is fire."

It is unbelievable that, in these critical times, an ally receiving economic and military aid would deliberately permit delivery of strategic materials to the U. S. S. R. Our boys in Korea, our young men called to service, surely must wonder what a world we are living in. The Kremlin knows no compromise, respects no agreements, violates treaties left and right, instigates sorties in the various ominous areas of this troubled world; and the British Ministry of Supply must shamefully confess that manufacturers are turning out strategic materials for the Soviets. We would expect to be betrayed by our enemies—but is there no ethics among our allies? The United States banned delivery of strategic materials to Russia and the satellites; surely our allies should comply in like manner. An explanation is in order—and it better be good. The American public is friendly, kind, generous, humane; but it expects a little decency.

POLICY-MAKING WOMEN OF AMERICA

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues of the House: The Washington Post says that the Gallup Poll indicates that people in these United States are interested in a citizens committee being formed to assist United States foreign policies. Those interviewed by the poll suggested names of prospective members.

I was thrilled to see the name of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt listed with men of wide experience in industry, education, and security; but I was amazed that there was an omission of other women's names.

Do not you and I know by now that a prime interest of the women of this country—yes, and the whole world—is eternal peace? Do we not realize yet that the mothers and the sisters and the wives of men are interested in the security of those they love dearest? It is just about time that men in high office and throughout the Nation realize that women have a contribution to make in permanent security, because of their vital interest. Do not tell me there are not qualified women who have succeeded in industry,

education, human welfare and security—do not tell me that the women of this Nation who head national groups do not express that which is in the hearts of the women of this Nation.

I hope the heads of the various important women's groups—the mothers of men—are not going to be forgotten any longer when it comes to making policies in the United States.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

APPEARANCE OF LEE PRESSMAN BEFORE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I came from the Committee on Un-American Activities, after witnessing what to me was a sickening performance. In calling the lying rascal, Lee Pressman, before the committee, the committee simply provided a forum for him to justify his membership in the Communist Party before the American people. At the beginning he was permitted to make a preliminary statement, by which he was able, in effect, to take the play away from the committee, and when I left the hearing he was naming the conditions under which he would agree to answer questions propounded by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, just left the hearing being conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and I find myself in violent disagreement with my beloved friend from Georgia. I am quite certain that Mr. Pressman, by appearing before that committee and making a straightforward statement, in which he admitted his membership in the party and in which he described how he had been recruited into the party by Mr. Ware, who was an adviser in the Department of Agriculture from 1925 to 1932, should encourage others who realize now that communism and nazism are one and the same thing to come forward and contribute something to the inquiries being conducted by that committee. Mr. Pressman named others who were members of the same group with which he was associated.

Mr. COX. Four.

Mr. WALTER. Four. The committee knew the names of those four people, and by repeating those names nothing

was contributed, but I think he made a great contribution to the work of that committee and of this Congress by appearing before the committee, thereby encouraging others to come forward and make the same kind of statement. I am sure the Voice of America will make good use of the fact that Mr. Pressman appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities this morning.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the reprimand of General MacArthur by the President because it was a reprimand, commanding him to withdraw his statement to VFW, is reminiscent of the reprimand and ouster of Admiral Louis Denfeld when he dared to tell the country what we needed to win the war, the demotion of Admiral Boone, the demotion and ouster of a young naval officer, for daring to speak also are very reminiscent of this case. I trust that General MacArthur will not be removed because of his statement. Certainly no one has done so much with so little as has General MacArthur in defense of Korea, and if he should be removed, America could have no assurance that freedom of speech would continue here. We would then no longer be a free country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I am surprised that the lady did not also refer to the persecution of General Billy Mitchell when he was destroyed in the twenties which resulted in the destruction of our air force. Pearl Harbor was the result.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have talked very much about that in the past; I am known all over Massachusetts for talking about it.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in today's Record following the last special order of the day.

SAMUEL URZETTA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there no objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a great day for the family and host of friends of Sammy Urzetta, for the village of East Rochester, his home town, and for America. The new United States amateur golf champion returned home in triumph.

Golf was once known as the sport of the wealthy, of bankers and occasionally Congressmen. That illusion has been shattered once and for all.

Sammy Urzetta is the son of hard-working, God-fearing parents, both of Italian extraction. He was a caddy at one of the Rochester country clubs and because of his attractive personality and fine character was asked to become a member.

He graduated last year from St. Bonaventure College, where he displayed the qualities of a natural athlete and true sportsmanship. He is a pleasant, modest young man, altogether the embodiment of the finest traits which all American sports lovers have learned to admire.

The destiny of this great country is assured so long as it remains open to the Sammy Urzettas to rise to the top through sheer ability in their chosen vocations.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST VETERANS

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, with all the mail that comes across my desk, nothing has been so revolting to me as the information conveyed in a new release from the Information Service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the State of Connecticut, stating that veterans have been dropped from jobs as war looms. This release refers specifically to two instances where bakery route salesmen lost her positions due to the present crisis. It is self-explanatory, completely voices my resentment both as a member of the Congress and a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I bring this protest to the attention of my colleagues, adding to it my hope that other employers will not take such drastic action without checking applicable laws and considering the great contributions made by their veteran employees.

The release follows:

Two young veterans, one with wounds, both with families, were fired from their bakery route salesman jobs here this week because they might be called again to serve their country.

The firm which has discharged the two is Mrs. Kavanagh's English Muffins, with a main plant in Dorchester, Mass., and a distributorship here. The veterans affected are John E. Tierney, of 9 Plane Place, and Edward Clark, of 809 Main Street, East Hartford. Both have built up a route here for the muffin company.

Tierney is married, has one child, and is a Navy veteran with 3 years' service. Clark is

married, served 6 years in the 101st Airborne, and was wounded in action.

It was stated that a short while ago two men were sent from the Dorchester bakery to survey the route. These men were instructed to take over as the local veterans were fired. Both the latter have laid their stories before the Manchester (Conn.) Veterans Service Center.

The letter discharging Tierney was signed by A. M. Kavanaugh, and is addressed:

"DEAR FRIEND: Under present conditions, and the uncertainty of our war condition, which may call both Clark and yourself, I feel better to let the two men driving with you and Clark to take over starting this coming Monday. The last war left me high and dry without help and a bakery in Manchester idle. If things clear up in the near future, I feel you can be sure of a position and with new products make much more money."

Department Commander P. A. Testa, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, vigorously protests the action taken by Mrs. Kavanaugh's English Muffins in the firing of these two veterans.

The action by Mrs. A. M. Kavanaugh is ridiculous and un-American. It was these same two veterans and millions of others who have made it possible for her to continue in business in America. Her action is a direct insult to our flag, country, and those who have fought and died for America.

Commander Testa calls on all veteran organizations to file a protest. A copy of his protest will be mailed to press, radio, both Senators and Congress.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, not only as a Representative in the United States Congress, not only as a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, but also as an average American citizen I have been deeply disturbed by the events of the past 24 hours. From my earliest childhood I have been taught that in this American Republic, a representative constitutional republic, if the American public were told the truth they make the right decisions, and that the truth would make—and keep them free. The orders which have manifestly gone forward muzzling MacArthur and directing that he cannot tell the truth on far-eastern conditions, the Formosan situation, is an attempt to keep from the American public the truth. If the truth is kept from them this Nation cannot long remain free.

I am glad the story will be printed despite the fact that the statement will not be read at the VFW convention in Chicago.

We should—we must—know the facts as only General MacArthur can know them.

HON. FRANCIS P. MATTHEWS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I think that the statement, attributed by the press, to the Secretary of the Navy, Francis P. Matthews, that this country should be willing to pay any price, even the price of instituting a war to compel cooperation for peace, was both unwise and un-American.

If we should do such a thing, who would make the awful decision? Under our Constitution, Congress alone could do so and if it should, would not the process be such as to give the enemy every advantage? What would be the effect on world opinion? Would we not lose the greatest force we have, a force even more powerful than the atomic or hydrogen bomb, the moral force of America? Would we not set a precedent that would give any nation from then on an excuse for attacking any other nation in the name of peace?

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as long as the Congress sits idly by and lets a few misguided fanatics try to run this country from what is called the United Nations, America will be headed for destruction.

I am not willing to see my country subordinated to the domination of a gang of crackpots who do not have sense enough to run their own countries.

It is about time the Congress of the United States woke up and resumed its prerogatives of legislating for the American people, as the Constitution provides, and not let a gang of international high-binders destroy this country.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that no craft that sails the sea of public opinion is mighty enough to carry Dean Acheson. He will sink any boat upon which he rides.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a dispatch from China:

The War Department received a cable from Tientsin, China, stating that American forces were repulsed late yesterday in a battle at Tientsin.

How many of you saw that? Mighty few, I am sure; because the date of it is July 17, 1900.

We now seem to be getting back to where we were 50 years ago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF THE PROFESSION OF ENGINEERING

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 1188) defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

SECTION 1. Short title: This act shall be known and may be cited as the "Professional Engineers' Registration Act."

SEC. 2. Definitions: As used in this act—

(a) The term "practice of engineering" shall mean the performance of any professional service or creative work requiring engineering education, training and experience, and the application of special knowledge of the mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences to such professional services or creative work as consultation, investigation, evaluation, planning, design, and supervision of construction for the purpose of assuring compliance with specifications and design, in connection with the utilization of the forces, energies, and materials of nature in the development, production, and functioning of engineering process, apparatus, machines, equipment, facilities, structures, works, or utilities, or any combinations or aggregations thereof employed in or devoted to public or private enterprises or uses. The term "practice of engineering" comprehends the practice of civil engineering, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, chemical engineering, and mining engineering, the pursuit of any of which affects the safety of life, health, or property, or the public welfare. Said practice includes the doing of such architectural work as is incidental to the practice of engineering.

(b) The term "professional engineer" shall mean a person who, by reason of his special knowledge of the mathematical and physical sciences and the principles and methods of engineering analysis and design, customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study and practical experience, is qualified to engage in the practice of engineering as attested by his certificate of registration as a professional engineer.

(c) The term "engineer-in-training" shall mean a candidate for registration as a professional engineer who has been granted a certificate as an engineer-in-training after successfully passing the first stage of the prescribed examination in fundamental engineering subjects, and who, upon completion of the requisite years of training and experience in engineering under the supervision of a professional engineer or similarly qualified engineer and satisfactory to the Board, shall be eligible for the second stage of the prescribed examination for registration as a professional engineer.

(d) The term "responsible charge" shall mean such degree of competence and accountability gained by education, training, and experience in engineering of a grade and character sufficient to qualify an individual to engage personally and independently in and be entrusted with the work involved in the practice of engineering.

(e) The term "institution" shall mean a school, college, university, department of a university, or other educational institution granting baccalaureate degrees in engineering, reputable, and in good standing in

accordance with the rules prescribed by the Board.

(f) The term "Board" shall mean the District of Columbia Board of Registration for Professional Engineers.

(g) The term "Commissioners" shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 3. Practice of engineering declared to be subject to regulation: In order to safeguard life, health, and property, and promote the public welfare, the practice of engineering in the District of Columbia is hereby declared to be subject to regulation in the public interest. It is further declared to be a matter of public interest and concern that the profession of engineering merit and receive the confidence of the public and that only qualified persons be permitted to engage in the practice of engineering. All provisions of this act relating to the practice of engineering shall be construed in accordance with this declaration of policy.

Sec. 4. Practice of engineering without registration prohibited: Any person engaged in or offering to engage in the practice of engineering in the District of Columbia shall submit evidence that he is qualified to practice and shall be registered as hereinafter provided; and it shall be unlawful for any person to engage or offer to engage in the practice of engineering in the District of Columbia, or by verbal claim, sign, advertisement, letterhead, card, or in any other way represent himself to be a professional engineer, or through the use of the title including the word "engineer" or words of like import, or any other title, imply that he is a professional engineer, unless such person is registered under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 5. Board of registration; appointment of members; qualifications; terms; removal of members. There is hereby created the District of Columbia Board of Registration for Professional Engineers, whose duty it shall be to administer the provisions of this act. The Board shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the Commissioners. Each appointment to the Board shall be from a list of three eligibles submitted by the representative organizations of the engineering profession in the District of Columbia. A person to be eligible for appointment to the Board shall be a citizen of the United States, shall have been engaged in the practice of engineering for 12 or more years, of which at least 5 years shall have been in responsible charge of important engineering work, and at the time of appointment shall have been actively engaged in the practice of engineering in the District of Columbia for a period of at least 5 years next preceding this appointment. The Board shall at all times include one representative for each of the chemical, civil, electrical, and mechanical branches of engineering. The members of the first Board shall be appointed within 3 months after the effective date of this act to serve for the following terms: One member for 1 year, one member for 2 years, 1 member for 3 years, 1 member for 4 years, and 1 member for 5 years from the date of their appointment, or until their successors are duly appointed and qualified. Each member of the Board shall receive a certificate of his appointment from the Commissioners, and before beginning his term of office shall file with the Secretary of the Board of Commissioners his written oath for the faithful discharge of his official duty. Each member of the Board first appointed hereunder shall be registered as a professional engineer under this act. On the expiration of the term of any member of the Board, the Commissioners shall appoint for a term of 5 years a professional engineer to take the place of the member whose term on said Board is about to expire. Each member shall hold office until the expiration of the term for which such member is appointed or

until a successor shall have been duly appointed and shall have qualified. The Commissioners may remove any member of the Board for incompetency, misconduct, neglect of duty, or for any sufficient cause. An appointment to fill an unexpired term on the Board shall be made within 3 months after the vacancy occurs, and shall be for the period of such unexpired term.

Sec. 6. Compensation of members of Board: Each member of the Board shall be entitled to receive such reasonable compensation for his services as may be determined by the Commissioners not to exceed \$25 per day for each day he may be actually engaged upon business pertaining to his official duties as such Board member.

Sec. 7. Board meetings and organizations: The Board shall hold a meeting within 10 days after its members are first appointed and thereafter shall hold at least two regular meetings each year. The Board shall elect annually from its members at least the following officers: A Chairman and a secretary-treasurer. A quorum of the Board shall consist of not less than three members, and no action shall be taken without three members in accord.

Sec. 8. General powers of Board: The Board shall have power:

(a) Approval of institutions: To investigate and to approve those institutions that provide and maintain satisfactory standards for the education of students desiring to engage in the practice of engineering.

(b) Registration of professional engineers: To register as a professional engineer any person of good character and repute who is a citizen of the United States, at least 25 years of age, and who speaks and writes the English language, if such person—

(1) holds a license or certificate of registration to engage in the practice of engineering issued to him by proper authority of a State or Territory of the United States in which the requirements and qualifications for obtaining such license or certificate of registration are reasonably equivalent in the opinion of the Board to the standards set forth in this act. A person may be registered under this subdivision without examination; or

(2) holds a certificate of qualification issued by the National Bureau of Engineering Registration of the National Council of State Boards of Engineering Examiners: *Provided, however,* That the requirements and qualifications of said body for obtaining such certificate are reasonably equivalent, in the opinion of the Board, to the standards set forth in this act. A person may be registered under the provisions of this subdivision without examination; or

(3) has had 4 or more years' experience in engineering work of a grade or character satisfactory to the Board, and indicating that he is qualified to assume responsible charge of the work involved in the practice of engineering and either holds a certificate as an engineer-in-training issued to him by the Board or by proper authority of a State or Territory in which the requirements and qualifications of said bodies for obtaining such certificate are reasonably equivalent, in the opinion of the Board, to the standards set forth in this act, or is a graduate in engineering from an institution having a course in engineering of 4 or more years, and who, in either event, successfully passes a written, or written and oral, examination prescribed by the Board of engineering subjects. In the case of the examination of an engineer-in-training, his examination shall be directed and limited to those matters which will test the applicant's ability to apply the principles of engineering to the actual practice of engineering. In the case of an applicant who is not an engineer-in-training, the examination shall be for the purpose of testing the applicant's knowledge

of fundamental engineering subjects, including mathematics and the physical sciences, and those matters which will test the applicant's ability to apply the principles of engineering to the actual practice of engineering; or

(4) has completed an approved secondary-school course of study or equivalent and has had 12 or more years of combined education and experience in engineering of a grade and character satisfactory to the Board and indicating that he is qualified to assume responsible charge of the work involved in the practice of engineering, and who successfully passes a written, or written and oral, examination prescribed by the Board for the purpose of testing the applicant's knowledge of fundamental engineering subjects, including mathematics and the physical sciences, and those matters which will test the applicant's ability to apply the principles of engineering to the actual practice of engineering; or

(5) submits evidence that he is an engineer of established and recognized standing in the engineering profession and that he has been lawfully engaged in the practice of engineering for 12 or more years, of which at least 5 years shall have been in responsible charge of important engineering work of a grade and character satisfactory to the Board. A person may be registered under this subdivision without examination; or

(6) submits evidence that he was a resident of the District of Columbia, or that he was engaged in the practice of engineering in the District of Columbia, prior to the date this act was approved and for 1 year immediately preceding the date of his application, and submits evidence of experience in engineering, of a grade and character satisfactory to the Board, indicating that he is qualified to assume responsible charge of the work involved in the practice of engineering. Registration shall not be granted under the provisions of this subdivision unless the application therefor is filed with the Board within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. A person may be registered under this subdivision without examination.

The requirement of this subsection of residence or practice of engineering in the District of Columbia for one year immediately preceding the date of application shall not be applied to applicants who were on active duty in the armed forces of the United States during such year, and who entered on such duty after October 16, 1940, but any such applicant for license under this subsection must have been a resident or engaged in the practice of engineering in the District of Columbia for at least one year prior to the effective date of this act.

(c) Certification of engineers-in-training: To provide for and to regulate the certification and to certify as an engineer-in-training any person of good character and repute who is a citizen of the United States, at least 21 years of age or has graduated from an institution, and who speaks and writes the English language, if such person—

(1) is a graduate in engineering from an institution having a course in engineering of four or more years and who successfully passes a written, or written and oral, examination prescribed by the Board for the purpose of testing the applicant's knowledge of fundamental engineering subjects, including mathematics and the physical sciences. A person may be certified as an engineer-in-training under this subdivision without a written, or written and oral, examination: *Provided, however,* That the application therefor is filed with the Board within 1 year after enactment of this act; or

(2) has completed an approved secondary school course of study or equivalent, and has had eight or more years of combined education, training, and experience in engineering, of a grade and character satisfactory to the

Board, and who successfully passes a written, or written and oral, examination prescribed by the Board for the purpose of testing the applicant's knowledge of fundamental engineering subjects, including mathematics and the physical sciences.

(d) Registration of noncitizen professional engineers: To register as a professional engineer any person who is not a citizen of the United States, who is of good character and repute, at least 25 years of age, and speaks and writes the English language, if such person submits evidence, of a grade and character satisfactory to the Board, that he is an engineer of established and recognized standing in the profession of engineering in his own country, and who submits certification as to character and qualifications from at least two professional engineers of the District of Columbia. Such registration shall entitle the holder to engage in the practice of engineering only for the duration of and in connection with a specific project for which it was granted, and shall be subject to annual renewal and to suspension or revocation as registration granted as otherwise provided in this act. Engineers to whom such temporary registration has been granted shall be separately listed in the roster.

(e) Application form: To require all candidates for registration as professional engineers to file with the secretary-treasurer of the Board a written application on a prescribed form and accompanied by the required fee. Such application shall contain statements made under oath, showing the applicant's education, detailed summary of his experience in engineering work, and the general field or fields of engineering in which he has his principal activity, and shall contain not less than five references, of whom three or more shall be engineers having personal knowledge of his engineering training and experience.

(f) Investigation of applications. Determination of qualification and competency of applicants: To investigate the allegations contained in any application for registration as a professional engineer in order to determine the truth of such allegations, and to determine the competency of any person applying for a registration to assume responsible charge of the work involved in the practice of engineering, such competency to be determined by the grade and character of the engineering work actually performed. Any person having the necessary qualifications prescribed in this act to entitle him to registration or certification shall be eligible therefor, although he may not be practicing his profession at the time of making his application. Evaluation of experience in engineering shall be based upon the applicant's knowledge of the fundamental engineering subjects, which shall be broad in scope and of a nature to develop and mature the applicant's engineering knowledge and judgment. In considering the qualifications of an applicant who has graduated in engineering from an approved institution; each year, but not exceeding 2 years, of successful post-graduate study in engineering, and each scholastic year, in excess of 4, of an approved 5- or 6-year engineering curriculum, and each year of teaching engineering subjects, in an approved institution may be considered as equivalent to 1 year of experience in engineering. In considering the qualifications of an applicant who is an undergraduate in engineering, or who has graduated in a curriculum other than engineering, from an approved institution; each equivalent year of approved engineering education, as determined by evaluation by the Board of the educational records submitted, may be considered as equivalent to 2 years of combined education and experience in engineering. Experience in engineering gained under the supervision of a professional engineer or similarly qualified engineer, and experience in engineering gained subsequent to the attaining of an equivalent of the minimum re-

quirements for certification as an engineer-in-training, of a grade and character satisfactory to the Board, shall be given full credit. In any case when the evidence presented in the application does not appear to the Board conclusive nor warranting the issuance of a certificate of registration or a certificate as engineer-in-training without examination, the applicant may be required to present further evidence for the consideration of the Board, and may also be required to pass an oral or written examination, or both, as the Board may determine. Whenever the Board determines otherwise than by examination that an applicant has not produced sufficient evidence to show that he is competent to assume responsible charge of the work involved in the practice of engineering, and shall refuse to examine or to register such applicant, it shall set forth in writing its findings and the reasons for its conclusions, and furnish a copy thereof to the applicant.

(g) Examinations: To prescribe the scope, manner, time, and place for the examination of applicants for registration as professional engineers, to provide for the conduct of and to conduct such examinations, and to make written reports of such examinations. The prescribed examinations shall be written, or written and oral, and designed to permit an applicant for registration as a professional engineer to take the examination in two stages. The first stage of the examination shall be designed to test the applicant's knowledge of fundamental engineering subjects, including mathematics, physical and applied sciences, properties of materials, and the principles of engineering design. Satisfactory passing of this portion of the examination shall constitute a credit for the life of the applicant or until he is registered as a professional engineer. The second stage of the examination shall be designed to test the applicant's ability to apply the principles of engineering to the actual practice of engineering in the field of engineering in which he has indicated his principal activity. An applicant failing to pass an examination may apply for reexamination at the expiration of 6 months and will be reexamined upon payment of the prescribed fee.

(h) Certificate of registration; form and execution; expiration; duplicate certificate; biennial renewal of registration; renewal fee; penalty for delayed renewal: To issue a certificate of registration and a pocket registration card to each professional engineer granted registration under the provisions of this act. The certificate of registration shall authorize the registrant to practice as a professional engineer, show the full name of the registrant, have a serial number, and be signed by the members of the Board under the seal of the Board. The pocket registration card issued with the certificate shall show the full name and registration number of the registrant, state that the person named therein has been granted registration to practice as a professional engineer for the period ending on the 31st day of October in the second year of the then current biennial registration renewal period, and be signed by the Chairman and secretary-treasurer of the Board; to provide for and regulate the renewal of registration of professional engineers registered under this act. On or before the 1st day of August 1950, and biennially thereafter, the secretary-treasurer of the Board shall mail to every professional engineer registered under this act a blank application for biennial renewal of registration, addressing such application to the last known post-office address. Upon receipt of such application blank, a registrant shall execute and return the application for his biennial registration renewal card to the Board together with the biennial registration renewal fee of \$2. Upon receipt of such application and renewal fee the Board shall issue a pocket registration renewal card

which shall show the full name and registration number of the registrant, be signed by the Chairman and secretary-treasurer of the Board, and state that the person named therein has been granted registration to practice as a professional engineer for the period beginning November 1 in the year of issue and expiring on the 31st day of October in the second year following. Application shall be made biennially on or before the 1st day of November and if not so made an additional fee of \$1 for each 30 days delay beyond the 1st day of November, and up to the 1st day of March following shall be added to the current biennial registration renewal fee to be paid upon renewal; to issue a duplicate certificate of registration to replace a certificate lost, destroyed, or mutilated, subject to the rules of the Board, and upon payment of the prescribed fee. The issuance of a certificate of registration by the Board shall be presumptive evidence in all courts and places that the person named therein is entitled to all the rights and privileges of a registered professional engineer while said certificate remains unsuspended, unrevoked, or unexpired.

(i) Certificate of registration to a noncitizen; form and execution; expiration; renewal of registration; renewal fee: To issue a special certificate of registration and pocket registration card to every noncitizen professional engineer granted registration under the provisions of this act. The special certificate of registration shall authorize the registrant to practice as a professional engineer in connection with a specific project, show the full name of the registrant, have a registration number, and be signed by the members of the Board under the seal of the Board. The special pocket registration card issued with such certificate shall show the full name and registration number of the registrant, state that the person named therein has been granted temporary registration to practice as a professional engineer, state the specific project in connection with which the special registration is granted, the period for which it is granted, not to exceed 1 year from the date of issue, and be signed by the Chairman and secretary-treasurer of the Board. Temporary registration may be renewed at the discretion of the Board for periods not in excess of 1 year upon application therefor and payment of the annual renewal fee.

(j) Certificate as engineer-in-training: To prescribe and to issue a certificate, attested by its seal and signed by the members of the Board, to any applicant who in the opinion of the Board has satisfactorily met all the requirements of this act for certification as an engineer-in-training.

(k) Roster of registrants: To keep a roster of all professional engineers registered under this act, showing the registrant's name, place of business or employment, registration number, and the general field or fields of engineering in which registrant qualified to practice, and a roster of engineers-in-training certified under this act. These rosters, together with other information deemed to be of interest to the engineering profession, shall be published in booklet form by the Board on the 1st day of March of each even year, beginning with 1950, or as soon thereafter as practicable. The Board shall also, upon the 1st day of March of each odd year, beginning with 1951, or as soon thereafter as practicable, publish a supplemental roster of all registered professional engineers and certified engineers-in-training. Such published rosters shall contain at the beginning thereof the words: "Each professional engineer receiving this roster is requested to report to the Board the name and addresses of any persons known to be engaged in the practice of engineering in the District of Columbia whose names do not appear in this roster. The names of persons giving such information shall not be divulged." Copies of these ros-

ters shall be mailed or otherwise sent to each registered professional engineer and engineer-in-training and be furnished to other persons upon request.

(l) Official seal; minutes and records: To adopt and have an official seal, and to keep minutes and records of all its transactions and proceedings, and a complete record of the credentials of each applicant and registrant. A transcript of an entry in such minutes and records, certified by the secretary-treasurer under the seal of the Board, shall be prima facie evidence of the original entry in such minutes and records.

(m) Member of National Council of State Boards of Engineering Examiners; dues: To become a member of the National Council of State Boards of Engineering Examiners; and to pay such dues as said council shall establish, and to send a delegate to the annual meeting of said council and to defray his reasonable and necessary expenses.

(n) Administrative rules and regulations; employees: To adopt, amend, rescind, promulgate, and enforce such administrative rules and regulations not inconsistent with this act, as are deemed necessary and proper by the Board to carry into effect the powers conferred by this act. To employ such clerical or other assistants as are necessary for the proper performance of its duties. The regular annual employees of the Board shall, for the purpose of laws relating to compensation, classification, retirement, and leave, be employees of the District of Columbia. The Board may at its discretion fix and change from time to time, without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the compensation of employees of the Board employed on a temporary or part-time basis.

(o) Enforcement of laws; investigations; attendance of witnesses; production of books and papers; subpoena procedure; witness fees: To enforce the provisions of this act; to investigate for unauthorized and unlawful practice, to employ such persons as it may deem necessary to assist in the investigations and prosecutions incident to enforcement, to require the attendance of witnesses and the production of books and papers, and to require such witnesses to testify as to any and all matters within its jurisdiction. The Chairman and secretary-treasurer of the Board shall have power to issue subpoenas, and each shall have authority to administer oaths. Upon the failure of any person to attend as a witness, when duly subpoenaed, or to produce documents when duly directed by said Board, the Board shall have power to refer the said matter to any justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, who may order the attendance of such witness, or the production of such documents, or require the said witness to testify, as the case may be, and upon the failure of the witness to attend, to testify, or to produce such documents, as the case may be, such witness may be punished for contempt of court as for failure to obey a subpoena issued or to testify in a case pending before said court. Witnesses who have been subpoenaed by the Board, and who testify if called upon, shall be paid the same fees that are paid witnesses in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

(p) Refusal, suspension, and revocation of certificates: To refuse to issue a certificate to any person, or to suspend or revoke the certificate of registration of any professional engineer or the certification of any engineer-in-training issued hereunder if such person—

- (1) has been convicted of a felony;
- (2) has been found guilty of deceit, misrepresentation, violation of contract, fraud, or gross incompetency, in his practice;
- (3) has been found guilty of fraud or deceit in obtaining his registration or certification;

(4) has aided or abetted any person in the violation of any provision of this act;

(5) has violated any provision of this act;

(6) has been declared insane by a court of competent jurisdiction and has not thereafter been lawfully declared sane.

(q) Reissuance of revoked certificates: To reconsider the application of any person whose application has been refused or to reissue a certificate of registration to any professional engineer or a certification to any engineer-in-training whose certificate has been revoked for reasons the Board deems sufficient, upon payment of the prescribed fee for such reissuance.

SEC. 9. Complaints; hearings; proceedings; appeals: (a) The Board may upon its own motion, and shall upon the sworn complaint in writing of any person setting forth charges which would constitute grounds for refusal, suspension, or revocation of a certificate, as set forth in section 8 (p) of this act, investigate the acts of any person holding or claiming to hold a certificate. All charges, unless dismissed by the Board as unfounded or trivial, shall be heard by the Board within 3 months after the date on which they shall have been filed.

(b) The Board shall, at least 30 days prior to the date set for the hearing, notify the accused in writing, of any charges made, and shall afford him an opportunity to be heard in person or by counsel in reference thereto. Such notice may be served by its delivery personally to the accused licensee by the United States marshal in the manner prescribed for service of original process in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, or by mailing it by registered mail with return receipt demanded, to the place of business last theretofore specified by the accused in his last notification to the Board. At the time and place fixed in the notice, the Board shall proceed to hearing of the charges and both the accused and the complainant shall be accorded ample opportunity to present in person or by counsel, such testimony, evidence, and argument as may be pertinent to the charges or to any defense thereto. The Board may continue such hearing from time to time and shall give notice in writing to all parties in interest of the date and hour to which the hearing has been continued, and the place at which it is to be held.

(c) The Board shall preserve a complete record of all proceedings at the hearing of any case wherein a certificate is refused, revoked, or suspended. The notice of hearing, complaint, and all other documents in the nature of pleadings and written motions filed in the proceedings, the transcript of testimony and the orders of the Board shall be the record of such proceedings. The Board shall furnish a transcript of such record at cost to any person interested in such hearing.

(d) If, after completion of the hearing, the Board shall be of the opinion that the accused is guilty of the charges, or any of them, the Board shall issue an order refusing, suspending, or revoking the certificate. Such order shall be served upon the accused person either personally or by mailing it by registered mail to the address specified by the accused person in his last notification to the Board.

(e) Any person aggrieved by the action of the Board in refusing, suspending, or revoking a registration or certification or by any other action of the Board, which is alleged to be improper, unreasonable, or unlawful may appeal from such action of the Board to the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

(f) Appeals from suspension or revocation of registration and certification must be taken within 30 days after such refusal, suspension, or revocation. In the case of appeals from other actions of the Board, the appeal may be taken at any time by the

person aggrieved by such action. No such action shall act as supersedeas unless specially allowed by the court.

(g) Proceedings shall be conducted according to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States and the appeal shall be heard by the judge or judges of the court without a jury. The court shall affirm the decision of the Board, unless it shall find the same is in violation of the constitutional rights of the appellant, or is not in accordance with law, or was made upon unlawful procedure, or that any finding of fact made by the Board and necessary to support its adjudication is not supported by substantial evidence. If the adjudication of the Board is not affirmed the court may set aside or modify it in whole or in part, or may remand the proceeding to the Board for further disposition in accordance with the order of the court.

(h) Either party may appeal from the decision of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to the United States Court of Appeals of said District. Any appeal on behalf of the Board may be filed without bond. The decree of the United States Court of Appeals shall be final and conclusive.

SEC. 10. Exemptions: Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect or prevent the following:

(a) The practice of engineering by any person who, within 1 year after the enactment of this act, has filed with the Board an application for registration under this act. This exemption shall continue only for such time as the Board may require for consideration of said application.

(b) The practice of engineering for not exceeding 30 days in the aggregate in one calendar year by a nonresident not having a place of business in the District of Columbia, if such person is licensed or registered to engage in the practice of engineering in a State or Territory in which the requirements and qualifications for obtaining a license or registration are reasonably equivalent to those specified in this act.

(c) The practice of engineering for more than 30 days by a nonresident not having a place of business in the District of Columbia, or by a person who has recently become a resident of or has recently entered the practice of engineering in the District of Columbia, and who has filed with the Board an application for registration, if such person is registered or licensed to engage in the practice of engineering in a State or Territory in which the requirements and qualifications for obtaining a license or registration are reasonably equivalent to those specified in this act. Such practice shall be permitted only for such time as the Board requires for the consideration of the application.

(d) The performance of engineering work by any person who acts under the supervision of a professional engineer, or by an employee of a person lawfully engaged in the practice of engineering, and who, in either event, does not assume responsible charge of design or supervision.

(e) The practice of engineering as a consultant, officer, or employee of the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia while engaged solely in such practice for said governments.

(f) The practice of any other legally recognized profession.

(g) The practice of engineering exclusively as an officer or employee of a public-utility corporation (act March 4, 1914, 37 Stat. 974, ch. 150, sec. 8, par. 1) by rendering to such corporation such service in connection with its facilities and property which are subject to supervision with respect to safety and security thereof by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and so long as such person is thus

actually and exclusively employed and no longer: *Provided, however*, That each such public-utility corporation shall employ at least one registered professional engineer who shall be in responsible charge of such engineering work.

(h) The practice of architecture by a person authorized to use the title of architect or registered architect under the provisions of the Architect's Registration Act, approved December 13, 1924, and as amended, and his doing such engineering work as is incidental to his architectural work.

(i) The execution of construction work as a contractor, or the superintendence of such construction work as a foreman or superintendent, or the work performed as a salesman of engineering equipment or apparatus.

(j) The operation or maintenance of boilers, machinery, or equipment when the operators are duly licensed under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate steam engineers in the District of Columbia", approved February 28, 1887, as amended.

Sec. 11. Seal of registrants: (a) Each person registered under this act may obtain a seal of a design authorized by the Board which shall bear the registrant's name and registration number, the legend "Registered professional engineer", and such other words or figures as the Board may deem necessary. Such seal, or a facsimile imprint of same, shall be stamped on all plans, specifications, and reports by the registrant responsible for the accuracy and adequacy of such plans, specifications, and reports, when filed with public authorities.

(b) It shall be unlawful for a registered engineer to affix or permit his seal to be affixed to any plans, specifications, or drawings for which he does not assume full responsibility for the adequacy and accuracy thereof.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person to use such seal during the period the registration of the holder thereof is expired, suspended, or revoked, or to use a seal of any design not approved by the Board.

Sec. 12. Display of certificate of registration: Whoever engages in the practice of engineering shall keep displayed in a conspicuous place in his established place of business the certificate of registration granted him under this act, and evidence of current renewal.

Sec. 13. Fees; payment of expenses; audit: Each application for registration as a professional engineer shall be accompanied by the appropriate prescribed application fee and the registration fee. A person desiring certification as an engineer-in-training shall pay the prescribed application fee for such certification with his application and shall pay the additional application fee and the registration fee upon filing his application for registration as a professional engineer.

Should the Board deny the issuance of a certificate of registration to any applicant, the registration fee deposited with the application shall be refunded.

The amount of the fees prescribed in this act is that fixed by the following schedule:

(a) The application fee for professional engineer with first- and second-stage examination is \$20.

(b) The application fee for professional engineer without examination is \$10.

(c) The application fee for engineer-in-training with examination is \$7.50.

(d) The application fee for engineer-in-training without examination is \$5.

(e) The application fee for professional engineer with second-stage examination is \$12.50.

(f) The fee for reexamination shall be determined by the Board not to exceed \$10.

(g) The registration fee for professional engineer is \$5.

(h) The biennial registration renewal fee for professional engineer is \$2.

(i) The fee for reissuance of a revoked certificate of engineer-in-training is \$7.50.

(j) The fee for reissuance of a revoked registration certificate is \$20.

(k) The fee for issuance of a duplicate certificate of registration is \$5.

(l) The penalty for delinquency is \$1 for each month after the date upon which the biennial renewal fee became due: *Provided, however*, That the total shall not exceed \$4.

The secretary-treasurer of the Board shall receive and account for all money derived from the provisions of this Act and shall keep such money in a separate fund to be known as "Professional engineers' fund," such fund to be disbursed only by the secretary-treasurer, upon itemized vouchers approved by the Chairman and attested by the secretary-treasurer of the Board. The secretary-treasurer shall furnish bond for the faithful discharge of his duties, in such form and amount as the Commissioners shall require. The premium on such bond shall be regarded as a proper and necessary expense of the Board. The secretary-treasurer of the Board shall receive such salary as the Commissioners shall determine, in addition to the compensation provided for in section 6. The Board may make expenditures from this fund for any purpose which, in the opinion of the Board, is reasonably necessary for the proper performance of its duties under this Act: *Provided, however*, That such expenditures shall in no event exceed the total of receipts. It shall be the duty of the Auditor of the District of Columbia to audit annually the accounts of the Board and make a report thereof to the Commissioners. For the purpose of performance of such duty the Auditor shall have free access to the books of account, records, and papers of the Board.

Sec. 14. Penalties: Whoever shall engage or offer to engage in the practice of engineering without being registered, or exempted, as provided in this Act, or by verbal claim, sign, letterhead, card, or in any other way represent himself to be a professional engineer or through the use of any title including the word "engineer" or words of like import, or any other title, imply that he is a professional engineer without being registered as provided in this Act, or shall present or attempt to use as his own the registration certificate of another, or shall give any false or forged evidence of any kind to the Board, or to any member thereof, in order to obtain registration as a professional engineer, or shall use any suspended or revoked registration, or shall otherwise violate the laws relating to the practice of engineering shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 15. Prosecutions: (a) All violations of laws relating to the practice of engineering in the District of Columbia shall be prosecuted in the municipal court for the District of Columbia by the corporation counsel. The corporation counsel shall render such other legal services as may from time to time be required by the Board.

(b) The Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police Department shall detail such members of his force as may be necessary to assist the Board in the investigations and prosecutions incident to the enforcement of this Act.

(c) The corporation counsel is hereby authorized to apply for relief by injunction to restrain a person from the commission of any act which is prohibited by this Act. In such proceedings it shall not be necessary for the corporation counsel to allege or prove either that an adequate remedy at law does not exist, or that substantial and irreparable damage would result, from the continued violation thereof.

Sec. 16. Annual report: The Board shall submit an annual report to the Commis-

sioners on the first Monday in August, containing a statement of moneys received and disbursed and a summary of its official acts during the next preceding fiscal year, and recommendations for such further legislation relating to the practice of engineering as may be necessary in the public interest.

Sec. 17. Saving clause: If any section or sections, clause or clauses, of this Act, or any regulations promulgated thereunder, be declared unconstitutional or invalid, that shall not invalidate any other sections or clauses of this act, or any other regulations promulgated thereunder.

Sec. 18. Repeal of conflicting legislation: All laws or parts of laws and regulations promulgated thereunder in conflict with the provisions of this act shall be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike all of lines 14 and 15 and insert in lieu thereof "those branches of engineering."

Page 6, line 1, strike the words "effective date" and insert the words "date of enactment."

Page 17, line 14, strike figures "1950" and insert "1952."

Page 20, line 7, strike figures "1950" and insert "1952."

Page 20, line 9, strike figures "1951" and insert "1953."

Page 21, lines 23 and 24, strike "1923" as amended and insert "1949."

Page 22, line 16, following the word "the", insert the words "United States."

Page 22, at end of line 16 and beginning of line 17, strike the words "of the United States."

Page 22, line 16, following the word "the", insert the words "United States."

Page 22, at end of line 16 and beginning of line 17, strike the words "of the United States."

Page 23, line 1, following the word "the", insert "United States."

Page 23, line 2, following the word "court", strike the words "of the United States."

Page 24, line 19, following the word "the", insert the words "United States."

Page 24, line 20, following the word "court", strike the words "of the United States."

Page 26, line 3, following the word "the", insert the words "United States."

Page 26, line 4, strike the words "of the United States."

Page 27, line 2, insert the words "United States" before the word "District."

Page 27, line 2, following the word "court", strike the words "of the United States."

Page 29, line 12, following subsection (h), insert the following subsection (i):

"(i) The construction or alteration of a building that does not cover over one thousand square feet of ground area and does not have a height of over 20 feet above to the uppermost ceiling, or two habitable floors above a basement."

Page 29, line 16, strike identifying letter "(i)" and insert identifying letter "(j)."

Page 29, lines 25 through line 3 page 30, insert new subsection as follows:

"(1) The usual supervision of construction or installation of equipment within a plant under his immediate supervision by a person ordinarily designated as supervising engineer or chief engineer of power."

Page 35, following line 16, add:

"Sec. 19. This act shall take effect 90 days after its enactment."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the chairman of the Committee on District of Columbia please explain this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to define the practice of professional engineering; regulate the practice and to license persons engaged in the practice.

Section 2 defines terms used in the bill.

Section 3 declares the practice of engineering a subject of regulation for the purpose of safeguarding life, health, property, and in the interest of public welfare.

Section 4 prohibits the unlicensed practice of engineering.

Section 5 creates a board of registration for professional engineers of five members to administer the act. The District of Columbia Commissioners are authorized to appoint persons with certain qualifications who will serve for a term of 5 years.

Sections 6 and 7 provide for semi-annual meetings and annual election of officers and requires a quorum of three to transact business. Compensation is limited to \$25 per day when actually on duty.

Section 8 outlines the general powers of the Board as—

(a) Approval of institutions of learning.

(b) Registration of engineers, both by examination and without examination.

(c) Certification of engineers in training.

(d) Registration of noncitizen professional engineers.

(e) Application form.

(f) Investigation of applications, determination of qualifications and competency of applicants.

(g) Examinations—scope, manner, and time.

(h) Certificate of registration form and execution; expiration; duplicate certificate; biennial renewal of registration; and renewal fee, penalty for delayed renewal.

(i) Certificate to noncitizen, form and execution; expiration, renewal of registration and renewal fee.

(j) Certificate as engineer in training.

(k) Roster of registrants.

(l) Official seal, minutes, and records.

(m) Member of National Council of State Boards of Engineering Examiners—send delegate to annual meeting.

(n) Administrative rules and regulations with respect to employees.

(o) Enforcement of laws; investigations, attendance of witnesses, production of books and papers; subpoena, witness fees.

Section 9, complaints, hearings, proceedings, appeals.

Section 10, exemptions:

(a) Applicants while application is pending.

(b) Licensed nonregistered engineers for 30 days.

(c) Thirty days for person recently become resident.

(d) Performance of work under supervision of a person lawfully approaching engineering.

(e) Consulting engineer of Government in practice for Government.

(f) Practice of any other legally recognized profession.

(g) Practice of engineering as an officer or employee of public utility corporation under the direction of a licensed engineer.

(h) Engineering work when it is incidental to the practice of architecture.

(i) Construction of small building.

(j) Execution of construction work as contractor, and so forth.

(k) Operator licensed under act to regulate steam engineers.

(l) Supervision of construction or installation of equipment within a plant by supervising engineer or power engineer.

Section 11, licensed engineer to obtain seal.

Section 12, display of certificate of registration required.

Section 13, covers fees to be charged, payment of expenses, audit.

Section 14, outlines penalties.

Section 15, prosecutions and procedure:

(a) Prosecution in municipal court by corporation counsel.

(b) Superintendent of police to detail members to assist in investigations and prosecutions.

(c) Corporation counsel authorized to apply for injunction to restrain commission of act prohibited.

Section 16, annual report.

Section 17, saving clause.

Section 18, repeal of conflicting legislation.

Section 19, effective date—90 days after enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' LEAVE ACT OF 1949

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9524) to supplement the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective July 1, 1949, the days of leave with pay provided for by the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, approved October 13, 1949, shall mean days upon which teachers and attendance officers would otherwise work and receive pay and shall be exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, and vacation periods authorized by the Board of Education.

Sec. 2. In any case during the period beginning July 1, 1949, through October 12, 1949, where any teacher or attendance officer was absent from duty under the rules of the Board of Education then in force and a substitute was employed in place of such teacher or attendance officer and such substitute was paid by the absent teacher or attendance officer, the District of Columbia is authorized to reimburse such teacher or attendance officer the amount or amounts paid to such substitutes at the rates approved by the Board of Education. The appropriation for "General supervision and instruction, public schools," contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1950 shall be available for such reimbursements.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is necessary because of the fact that a recent ruling by the District of Columbia Auditor made it necessary that the Board of Education must include Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays in computing leave periods with pay for teachers and attendance officers.

This ruling discriminates against the personnel of the Board of Education because Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays and other nonworking days are not included in computing the leave periods with pay for classified employees and school officials, who are subject to the provisions of the annual and sick leave act of March 14, 1936.

The provisions of this legislation have the approval of the Board of Education, the auditor, the budget officer, and the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN NATIONAL PARK LAND SITUATED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9362) to provide for the exchange of certain national park land situated in the District of Columbia for certain lands owned by the New Temple Committee, Inc., and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to accept, on behalf of and without cost to the United States, conveyance by the New Temple Committee, Inc., of a full and clear title to two parcels of land situated in the District of Columbia and more particularly described as follows:

(1) Eastern parcel: Starting at the intersection of the center line of former public alley and west line of Thirty-ninth Street at a point twenty feet north of lot eight hundred and fourteen, thence due south a distance of approximately sixty-two feet along west line of Thirty-ninth Street, thence due west, a distance of approximately one hundred and thirteen feet to the north line of lot sixteen, thence in a northeasterly direction, north sixty-nine degrees fifty-two minutes forty-two seconds east a distance of approximately seventy-four feet, thence in a northerly direction, north seven degrees forty-eight minutes forty-two seconds east (being the center line of former public alley) a distance of approximately thirty-nine feet, thence in an easterly direction, south eighty-two degrees eleven minutes eighteen seconds east, a distance of approximately thirty-three feet to point of beginning, and containing three thousands and eighty square feet; and

(2) Western parcel: Starting at the northwest corner of parcel numbered 32/13 and running in an easterly direction, south eighty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes forty-eight seconds east a distance of fifty feet along the northern property line of said parcel, thence in a southwesterly direction south twenty-eight degrees fifty-nine minutes eight seconds west a distance of one

hundred two and ninety-six one hundredths feet to the west property line of said parcel, thence north no degrees three minutes twelve seconds west a distance of ninety feet along west property line of said parcel to point of beginning, and containing two thousand two hundred and fifty square feet.

Upon acceptance of such title to such parcels the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, without cost, to the New Temple Committee, Inc., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain national park land in the District of Columbia more particularly described as follows:

Starting at a point on the north property line of parcel 32/13 located forty feet east of the northwest corner of said parcel, thence in a northeasterly direction north twenty-eight degrees fifty-nine minutes eight seconds east a distance of seventeen and sixteen one-hundredths feet, thence in an easterly direction south eighty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes forty-eight seconds east, a distance of approximately three hundred and ninety-one feet to northern property line of lot sixteen, thence in a southwesterly direction south sixty-nine degrees fifty-two minutes forty-two seconds west a distance of one hundred thirty and forty-five one-hundredths feet, thence in a northeasterly direction, north fifteen degrees fifty-one minutes thirty seconds east a distance of thirty-one and twenty-two one hundredths feet, thence in a westerly direction, north eighty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes forty-eight seconds west (along northern property line of parcel 32/13) a distance of two hundred thirty-two and forty-eight one-hundredths feet to point of beginning, and containing five thousand two hundred and eighty square feet.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to accept, on behalf of and without cost to the United States, conveyance by the New Temple Committee, Incorporated, of a full and clear title to two parcels of land situated in the District of Columbia and more particularly described as follows:

"(1) Part of lots 13 and 16 in block 8 of Fairview Heights, as per plat recorded in the office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in Book County 6, page 72; and part of alley closed, as per plat recorded in the office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in Book 131, page 48, described in one parcel, as follows:

"Beginning for the same at a point on the west line of Thirty-ninth Street, said point of beginning being one hundred ninety-two and sixty-seven one-hundredths feet north of the intersection of the northerly line of Macomb Street and the west line of Thirty-ninth Street, and running thence due west one hundred thirteen and two-tenths feet to a point on the northerly line of said lot 16; thence along said northerly line of said lot 16 north sixty-nine degrees fifty-two minutes forty-two seconds east seventy-nine and forty-four one-hundredths feet to the center line of said alley closed; thence along said center line of said alley closed north seven degrees forty-eight minutes forty-two seconds east forty and ten one-hundredths feet; thence south eighty-one degrees twenty-four minutes thirteen seconds east thirty-three and fifty-four one-hundredths feet to the said west line of Thirty-ninth Street; thence along said west line of Thirty-ninth Street due south sixty-two and five one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing three thousand four hundred seventeen and ten one-hundredths square feet; and

"(2) Part of a tract of land numbered for the purpose of assessment and taxation as parcel 32/13, described as follows:

"Beginning for the same at a point on the westerly line of a tract of land numbered for the purpose of assessment and taxation as parcel 32/13, said point of beginning being the two following courses and distances from the intersection of the northeasterly line of Massachusetts Avenue and the northerly line of Macomb Street: (1) South eighty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes, forty-eight seconds east one hundred three and nine-tenths feet to the said westerly line of a tract of land numbered for the purpose of assessment and taxation as parcel 32/13; (2) thence along said westerly line of parcel 32/13 north no degrees four minutes twelve seconds east exactly sixty feet to the point of beginning of the parcel herein intended to be described; thence along said westerly line of parcel 32/13 north no degrees four minutes twelve seconds east exactly ninety feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes forty-eight seconds east exactly fifty feet; thence south twenty-nine degrees seven minutes thirty-two seconds west one hundred two and ninety-six one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing exactly two thousand two hundred and fifty square feet.

"Upon acceptance of such title to such parcels the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey without cost, to the New Temple Committee, Incorporated, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain national park land in the District of Columbia more particularly described as follows:

"Part of lot 17, of block 6 of Fairview Heights, as recorded in the office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in Book County 6, page 72; part of Massachusetts Avenue closed, as recorded in the office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in book 88, page 17; and part of a tract of land numbered for the purpose of assessment and taxation as parcel 32/10, described in one parcel, as follows:

"Beginning for the same at a point on the northerly line of said lot 16, said point of beginning being the three following courses and distances from the intersection of the northerly line of Macomb Street and the west line of Thirty-ninth Street: (1) Due north along said west line of Thirty-ninth Street one hundred ninety-two and sixty-seven one-hundredths feet; (2) thence due west one hundred thirteen and twenty one-hundredths feet to the said northerly line of lot 16; (3) thence along said northerly line of lot 16 south sixty-nine degrees fifty-two minutes forty-two seconds west eighty and nine one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning of the parcel herein intended to be described; thence still with the said northerly line of lot 16 and a continuation thereof south sixty-nine degrees fifty-two minutes forty-two seconds west one hundred twenty-two and ninety one-hundredths feet; thence north fifteen degrees fifty-one minutes thirty seconds east twenty-eight and forty-nine one-hundredths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes forty-eight seconds west two hundred thirty-two and forty-eight one-hundredths feet; thence north twenty-nine degrees seven minutes thirty-two seconds east seventeen and sixteen one-hundredths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes forty-eight seconds east three hundred thirty-one and seventy-five one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, containing five thousand six hundred forty-eight and eight-tenths square feet.

"All land descriptions set forth in this act are in accordance with a Plat of Computation recorded in the office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in Survey Book 155, page 166."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit the New Temple Committee,

Inc., to exchange approximately 5,667 square feet of property owned by the committee for approximately 5,648 square feet of property owned by the United States Government National Park Service.

The New Temple Committee has completed plans for the construction of a synagogue in the vicinity of Macomb and Thirty-ninth Streets and after plans had been made for the construction of this project it was learned that the United States Government National Park Service had future plans for condemning a portion of the committee's property for use in building a clover leaf at the corner of Macomb Street and Massachusetts Avenue.

So that this difficulty might not arise in the future the United States National Park Service has agreed to exchange that portion of their property described in the bill for that part of the property owned by the New Temple Committee, Inc., so that this organization might proceed with the building of a synagogue at an early date.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the United States Government National Park Service, and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission which are both under the Interior Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2028) 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 and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Education of the District of Columbia is authorized to participate in the teacher foreign exchange program in cooperation with the United States Office of Education.

Any employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia who is subject to the provisions of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 (Public Law 163) shall, with the approval of the Board of Education, be eligible to participate in such program, and shall if accepted for such foreign assignment serve for a period not to exceed one calendar year, and shall at the conclusion of such service be returned to the position which he held before the exchange was effected.

Sec. 2. The Board of Education of the District of Columbia is authorized to pay the full salary of the educational employee of said Board during the time such employee is performing teaching duties in a foreign country under such exchange program, in the same manner and to the same extent as if such educational employee were actually performing his teaching duties in his regularly assigned position in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and any such educational employee participating in such

program shall for purposes of promotion, computation of annual increment, computation of service for pension credit, including salary contributions to the pension fund, and leave of absence credits, be considered as performing teaching duties in the schools of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. (a) Each professionally qualified person from a foreign country exchanged under the provisions of this act with an educational employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall during the period of such exchange serve as a substitute for the exchanged teacher and shall be assigned in the public schools of the District of Columbia as the Board of Education shall determine. Such exchange teacher shall serve without compensation for such service from the District of Columbia or any agency thereof: *Provided further*, That the term of such assignment or exchange shall not exceed one calendar year.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any foreign teacher, instructor, or professor assigned to duties in the public schools of the District of Columbia under the provisions of this act shall not be required to take an oath of office or any oath of allegiance or loyalty to the United States, but shall satisfy the Board of Education of the District of Columbia as to his personal, moral, and professional fitness to teach in the public schools of Washington, District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: On page 2, line 5, after the word "effected", strike out the period and insert a colon and add the following language: "Provided, That in any one calendar year not more than 10 such employees shall participate in such program."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize 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.

Under this legislation any employee who is subject to the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1947 would be eligible for participation in the program upon the approval of the Board of Education. Any such participation would be for a period not exceeding one calendar year and at the end of the foreign assignment the employee would be returned to the position which he held before the exchange was effected.

Under section 2 of the bill the employee is paid the full salary during the time he is performing teaching duties in a foreign country as if he were actually performing such duties in the public schools of the District of Columbia.

The bill has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and was recommended by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

The legislation proposed under this bill gives the Board of Education of the District of Columbia practically the same authority as that now given to 46 States to enter into the exchange program.

In a meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia on August 24 the Committee reserved the right to offer an amendment from the floor to the bill which would restrict the number of teachers that might participate in this program at any one time. The clerk

of the committee was instructed to discuss the matter with the Superintendent of the schools of the District of Columbia and in so doing and upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools it was determined that a total of not more than 10 teachers should be permitted to participate in the program at one time. An amendment for this specific purpose probably will be offered from the floor at the time the bill is considered.

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.

ARCHITECTS' REGISTRATION ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2887) to amend the Architects' Registration Act for the district of Columbia in order to safeguard life, health, and property, and to promote the public welfare, 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 6, line 4, after "practical", insert "architectural."

Page 11, after line 12, insert:

"SEC. 8. This act shall take effect 90 days after its enactment."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEALERS' IDENTIFICATION TAGS

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 3659) to amend title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the issuance of dealers' identification tags for use on trailers, to provide for the revocation and suspension of dealers' registration and identification tags, to change the fee for dealers' identification tags, to provide for the issuance of special use identification tags, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (e) of section 1 of title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read:

"(e) The term 'dealer' means any person engaged in the business of manufacturing, distributing, or dealing in motor vehicles or trailers."

SEC. 2. That section 1 of such title, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such section the following:

"(j) The terms 'operate' and 'operated' shall include operating, moving, standing, or parking any motor vehicle or trailer on a public highway of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 3. That section 2 of such title, as amended, is amended to read:

"(a) No motor vehicle or trailer shall be operated (except motor vehicles or trailers operated by nonresidents, except under the provisions of section 8 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, motor vehicles or trailers covered by a dealer's registration as provided in subsection (b) (1) of this section, and motor vehicles or trailers covered by a special use certificate as provided in subsection (b) (4) of this section) unless registered in the department of vehicles and traffic of the District of Columbia by the owner thereof. Upon receipt of an application from the owner of a motor vehicle or trailer and (except in the case of a motor vehicle or trailer covered by subsection (b) (2) of this section) payment of a registration fee computed as provided in section 3, and if there is in force with respect to such motor vehicle or trailer a valid certificate of title issued under the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, the director shall issue to such owner a registration certificate and identification tags for such motor vehicle or trailer.

"(b) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia by regulation shall provide for the issuance by the director—

"(1) annually to any dealer, upon payment of the fee prescribed in section 3, of a registration certificate and identification tags bearing a distinguishing dealer's mark, for interchangeable use on motor vehicles and trailers in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioners;

"(2) annually, without charge, of certificates of registration and identification tags for all motor vehicles and trailers owned by the United States or by the District of Columbia, or officially used by any duly accredited representative of a foreign government;

"(3) of duplicate registration certificates or duplicate identification tags, upon proof satisfactory to the director of loss, mutilation, or destruction thereof, upon payment of a fee of \$1 for each set of duplicate tags or 50 cents for each duplicate registration certificate; and

"(4) to any person, upon payment of a fee of \$1, of a special use certificate and special use identification tags bearing a distinguishing mark, valid for a period not exceeding 10 days, for use on a motor vehicle or trailer in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioners: *Provided*, That if any person be convicted of a violation of such regulations, the director may refuse thereafter to issue a special use certificate and special use identification tags to such person for a period of 1 year: *Provided further*, That the issuance of a special use certificate and special use identification tags for a motor vehicle or trailer shall not constitute a registration of such motor vehicle or trailer for any purpose.

"(c) Every registration made under this title shall expire at midnight on the last day of the registration year for which the registration was made, unless the time be extended by the Commissioners. Any such registration may be renewed for the ensuing registration year upon application made by the owner during the months of February and March, and upon payment of the fees required by law. During the month of March it shall be lawful to operate a motor vehicle or trailer registered for the ensuing registration year. For the purposes of this title, a registration year shall be deemed to begin on April 1 and end on March 31.

"(d) Upon the sale or other transfer to another owner of any motor vehicle or trailer registered under this title, the registration thereof shall expire. The owner selling or otherwise transferring such vehicle or trailer may register another motor vehicle or trailer for the unexpired portion of the registration year upon payment of a fee of \$1 and a sum

equal to the difference between the registration fee originally paid and the fee computed for such other motor vehicle or trailer under section 3, in case the latter is the greater. Upon the death of a joint owner of a motor vehicle or trailer registered under this title the registration thereof shall be transferred to the survivor or survivors and the fee for such transfer shall be \$1.

"(e) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and shall prescribe such forms of application for registration and for a special use certificate, such forms of registration and special use certificate, such design of identification tags, and provide for the keeping of such records of registration and issuance of special use certificates and transfers of registration as will facilitate the identification and the regulation of motor vehicles and trailers operated in the District of Columbia.

"(f) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are further authorized to prescribe regulations under which the director may revoke or suspend the registration of any dealer who shall cease to be a dealer as defined in this title, or who shall have violated the provisions of this title or the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Commissioners, and to revoke or suspend and provide for the return to the director of all dealers' identification tags issued to such dealer, subject to review by the Commissioners under rules and regulations prescribed by them. Pending such review, any such order of revocation or suspension shall be stayed unless the Commissioners shall otherwise direct. No order of the director or the Commissioners hereunder shall be set aside or suspended by any court unless such order is arbitrary or capricious."

Sec. 4. That paragraph (a) of section 3 of such title, as amended, is amended to read: "(a) There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each registration year for each motor vehicle or trailer required to be registered hereunder, the registration fee provided in this section."

Sec. 5. That so much of paragraph (b) of section 3 of such title, as amended, as reads: "Class F. For dealers' identification tags, first three sets of tags, \$25, and \$5 for each additional set." is amended to read:

"Class F. For dealers' identification tags, first three sets of tags, \$50, and \$10 for each additional set."

Sec. 6. That paragraphs (c) and (d) of section 3 of such title, as amended, are amended to read:

"(c) When application for registration of any motor vehicle or trailer or for registration as a dealer or for issuance of dealers' identification tags is received by the director on or after October 1, the registration fee, or the fee for issuance of dealers' identification tags shall be one-half the amount otherwise provided.

"(d) All proceeds from fees payable under this title and all moneys collected from the motor-vehicle-fuel tax, and fees charged for the titling of motor vehicles and trailers, including fees charged for the issuance of permits to operate motor vehicles, shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury of the United States entirely to the credit of the District of Columbia and shall be appropriated and used solely and exclusively for the following purposes:

"(1) For construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of public highways, including the necessary administrative expenses in connection therewith;

"(2) For the expenses of the office of the director of vehicles and traffic incident to the regulation and control of traffic and the administration of the same; and

"(3) For the expenses necessarily involved in the police control, regulation, and admin-

istration of traffic upon the highways: *Provided, however*, That the total amount to be expended under this item shall not exceed 15 percent of the total amount appropriated for pay and allowances of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force."

Sec. 7. That paragraph (a) of section 4 of such title, as amended, is amended to read:

"(a) It shall be unlawful—

"(1) for any person to operate any motor vehicle or trailer upon any public highway of the District of Columbia (except motor vehicles or trailers operated by nonresidents exempted under the provisions of section 8 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended) (A) if such motor vehicle or trailer is not registered or covered by a dealer's registration or by a special use certificate as required by this title, (B) if such motor vehicle or trailer does not have attached thereto and displayed thereon the identification tags required therefor, or (C) if such person does not have in his possession or in the motor vehicle or trailer operated the registration certificate or special use certificate required therefor;

"(2) for the owner of any motor vehicle or trailer knowingly to permit the operation thereof contrary to any provision of paragraph (1);

"(3) to use a false or fictitious name or address in any application for registration or for a special use certificate, or any renewal or duplicate thereof, or knowingly to make any false statement or conceal any material fact in any such application."

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the issuance of a special-use license tag. The issuance of such tag is made for the purpose of assisting a resident of the District of Columbia who buys an automobile outside of the District of Columbia in returning the automobile to the District of Columbia with these special license plates so that the car may be licensed and registered. This special-use tag would be issued for a temporary period not to exceed 10 days and at a nominal fee of \$1. The bill would also permit a dealer's license to be revoked for a proper cause. For instance where a dealer's franchise is revoked by the automobile manufacturer or where he has gone out of business and has no need for the use of dealers' tags the Commissioners have authority to revoke his registration. Under existing law the Commissioners do not have such authority.

The bill would further increase the cost of dealers' tags and provide mid-year reductions. The cost of dealers' tags would be increased from \$25 for the first three sets of plates and \$5 for each additional set to \$50 and \$10 for each additional set, respectively. The increased cost of dealers' license plates would be compensated by a mid-year reduction of 50 percent as authorized in this legislation. This reduction is now offered on other license tags.

This legislation would also authorize the use of dealers' tags by dealers who sell trailers. Under existing law no dealer is authorized to use tags for trailers. This has caused much trouble and confusion among trailer dealers and was obviously due to an oversight in drafting the present legislation.

This bill has the support of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Automobile Dealers Association.

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.

RETURN OF ITALIAN COLONIES

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to return the colonies of Italy to that nation. This is a "must" piece of legislation that I hope will be acted upon without delay. Of all the nations in Europe, Italy is the worst off with regard to population density and raw materials. Premier Alcides de Gasperi has estimated that millions must find new homes outside the country, in order that all may maintain a decent standard of living. Since other nations restrict immigration, these people are limited in where they can go. I believe it is imperative that Italy's colonies be returned to her. The Italian people carry with them the spirit of democracy. It is no accident that after World War II, Italy was the only country which was not occupied and directed by the Allies. Wherever Italians move, they carry with them individual freedom and the desire for a high standard of living. Africa will benefit as well as the forces of democracy throughout the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; to include a short theme, and a short poem.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

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

Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from one of the newspapers in his district.

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

Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a sketch of Garibaldi's life.

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and insert some facts prepared by Miss Kendall of Washington.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and insert an article which will appear in tomorrow's Look entitled "Primer for America."

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include extraneous material.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Secretary of the Air Force, Hon. Thomas K. Finletter, and an address by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, both recently made in Boston, Mass.

Mr. WHITE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ABUSES IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM OF WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 474 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the alleged abuses in the education and training program of World War II veterans, and of action taken or the lack of action taken by the responsible officers and employees of the Veterans' Administration and State approving authorities to prevent abuses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, as the reading of the resolution discloses, this is simply a proposal to set up a special committee to investigate alleged abuses in the education and training program of World War II veterans. I have had no requests for time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he desires to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have just asked for this time in a friendly way to call the attention of the Washington Post to an editorial carried on yesterday, Sunday's paper, which was absolutely incorrect. It is rather amusing, if not somewhat amazing to me, that in their Sunday edition they should carry an editorial criticizing the failure to call up this resolution when on last Friday, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows, I announced that it was going to be programmed for Monday.

Of course it is human to err, and the Washington Post, being run by human beings, of course makes errors. But I was very much amused Sunday when I read this editorial in the paper, entitled "GI School Abuses," proceeding upon the theory that an effort was being made by the leadership, and particularly the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to prevent this resolution from being programmed, when, as a matter of fact, it had been programmed 2 days before the editorial appeared.

Might I also say to the Washington Post, if the resolution had not been programmed, the fault would have been mine, and I would be the one to blame and not the Speaker of the House. But in any event, the resolution was programmed for today on last Friday.

If the Washington Post wants to do the nice thing and live up to the great principle of freedom of the press, which means a fair press, it would print an editorial of apology to the Speaker of the House, although the Speaker does not need it. Still, that would be the nice and proper and decent thing to do.

Also, it is rather comforting for us to know that even on the editorials which are supposed to be so carefully written, that after all those who write those editorials are human beings, and that they make mistakes too, as we all do now and then. So my remarks are no more than a friendly observation and a mild criticism of the Washington Post and if they had followed the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I know they do, they would have known that the resolution was programmed as of last Friday, and the editorial would never have been written.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman for a friendly observation, or any observation that he cares to make, although I hope it is friendly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am always friendly. It is impossible to be otherwise when consulting the gentleman. If my observation is not friendly, it will be due to my lack of intelligence.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I would not say that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The friendly spirit is here all right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman is both friendly and intelligent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder—are you really suggesting that the Washington Post might be wrong about something?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman can draw his own conclusion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just want to understand you. Your remarks suggest that—

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, to give the gentleman a straight answer, of course in this case "yes."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, that is too, too bad.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is too bad, but I am suggesting that they correct it in an appropriate way.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, may I say, following the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, that he is entirely correct. I know from former appearances before the Rules Committee that the Rules Committee has acted speedily in reporting the matter, and that the leadership has acted speedily in scheduling it for consideration by the House. Any statement to the contrary is certainly an error.

Mr. Speaker, may I say this resolution was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. He is unable to be here today. He asked that I help bring up this resolution if it was presented today. I am glad to do this because this is a meritorious measure. I am also glad to do it because I had introduced a similar resolution. I would have preferred that the Rules Committee report my own resolution, still I am supporting this resolution here today because it is an objective we are seeking to accomplish, rather than the passage of any individual resolution.

The purpose of the resolution is to name a special committee, to be named by the Speaker, a bipartisan committee, consisting of nine members, both Republicans and Democrats, to make a full, fair, and complete investigation and study of the veterans' education and training program under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and report to the Congress.

We know that this education and training of our veterans has been a vast program operating since the war. More than 1,000,000 veterans have received a college education under this program. More than 2,000,000 other veterans have received valuable training in trades and skills; yet more than \$10,000,000,000 has been spent on this program. According to the Veterans' Administration, the Government has spent under this program, a total of \$7,078,100,813 for subsistence; \$2,662,196,779 on tuition; and \$357,619,935 on books, supplies, and equipment, bringing the total expenditures to \$10,097,317,527.

With such a vast program, there naturally have arisen abuses and irregularities.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield.

Mr. COX. I would like to testify to the diligence of the gentleman from Tennessee in getting consideration of the question dealt with in the resolution. I have no idea as to who will be named as members of the committee, but whoever the committeemen may be, I think, to the extent that is possible, they should carry

on in cooperation with General Gray, who heads the Veterans' Administration. I am not drawing any implications from the resolution unfavorable to the head of the Veterans' Administration and I hope none will be drawn by others. This is a matter that the Administration might have handled itself, but the Rules Committee, to whom the gentleman presented an application for this rule, thought it well to recommend House consideration of the resolution.

Mr. EVINS. I agree that there should be full cooperation between the committee that is to be created and the Veterans' Administration. The Administrator of veterans' affairs, General Gray, has issued a report on the education and training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, which is printed as House Document 210, and which contains a list of some 200 schools throughout the United States in which irregularities or abuses have been widespread. We know of incidents in many States throughout the country. In my own State of Tennessee there have been recent disclosures of irregularities and some 10 top-flight VA personnel were suspended. Some of these men have resigned, others have been dismissed, some restored to their jobs, while the cases of others are still pending. I understand that in Pennsylvania a grand jury is now investigating this program. There have also been reports of irregularities and abuses in Texas and other States. There is widespread demand and need for this. The press, the public, many of the veterans and veterans' organizations themselves, and certainly the taxpayers and the public generally, are asking for action on this resolution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It occurs to me that perhaps the investigation is coming too late, after all this money has been spent and these abuses have occurred, when the investigation should have taken place earlier.

Mr. EVINS. In response to the gentleman, may I say that the program has several years yet to continue. As we all know, enrollments under the program must be begun before June 30, 1951. Thereafter training may proceed for two or three more years. The program is not over yet, although it is tapering off. There is a great need for this investigation in order that the Congress and the country may have the facts. This is public demand for this inquiry. Although there has been much good to come from the program, the bad apples in the barrel should be uncovered. In addition, the Congress needs the facts for legislating in the future.

In my mail today I had a letter from a mother who has a son in the service in Korea, and she asks that Congress enact legislation to assure the same benefits to her son as applicable to the veterans of World War II. Because of the fact that there is a possibility and a probability that there will be new veterans' legislation, certainly the Congress should have the facts. We should have the informa-

tion and we should know the successes and the failures of the program. I certainly urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and in part, to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, with reference to this particular resolution, it was my understanding that when the reorganization bill was passed we were to do away, to some extent, with special committees to investigate various matters. I cannot see why the jurisdiction for this investigation does not come within the purview of the House Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments. So much for that.

LEE PRESSMAN

All of us, I think, sometimes recall from boyhood memories, illustrations that are of benefit to us in our later days.

I can understand the position of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], who is disturbed over what he seemed to think was the welcoming reception given Mr. Pressman this morning and the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], with reference to Lee Pressman's appearance before the committee this morning. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], appeared to believe that the committee had gained a valuable assistant. That may or may not be true.

Future events will determine whether Mr. Pressman wishes to combat communism or whether he seeks protection from rising public indignation.

Mr. Pressman, in a former appearance before the committee, refused to answer many questions, one being whether he was or was not a Communist, or was or was not affiliated with the Communist Party.

Mr. Pressman, being a very shrewd individual, well versed in the law, is well aware that, if he was again subpoenaed by the committee and the same questions put to him, he would be required to either admit that he had been a Communist, for the record showing that fact is now available; or, if he refused to answer, would undoubtedly be cited and convicted of contempt.

Giving Mr. Pressman the benefit of the doubt, we should assume that he really desires to assist in exposing Communists, rather than now seeks to take advantage of an opportunity to appear and answer the committee's questions.

Communism and Communists are, if it may be stated in that way, now out of style. They are no longer receiving open public support from the administration,

The following account of the crucifixion of our Christ may be of interest:

And there were also two other, malefactors, led with him to be put to death.

And when they were come to the place, which is called Calvary, there they crucified Him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left.

And the soldiers also mocked Him, coming to Him, and offering Him vinegar.

And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on Him, saying, if Thou be Christ, save thyself and us.

But the other answering rebuked him, saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation?

And we indeed justly, for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss.

And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom.

And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, today shalt thou be with me in paradise.

The one wrongdoer was assured that, because of his repentance he was going to get to heaven.

Now, it is just possible, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] said—I will not say "just possible," maybe it should be "probable," maybe it is certain, that Mr. Pressman has seen the light, and, like Whittaker Chambers, he is going to go along now and really give us some worth-while information about his former Communist friends and co-workers.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me there?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman if he will give me 2 minutes.

Mr. COX. I will give the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is collective bargaining.

Mr. COX. The difference is that in the case of Chambers he was crucified; the poor man was crucified when he had his reformation and sought out responsible heads in the different departments of the Government to make full and complete disclosure in order that steps might be taken to protect the country against the influences with which he had been identified. In this particular case, this lying rascal, Lee Pressman, is treated as a repentant sinner coming back to the fold.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I can well understand the attitude of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], who has fought the Communists so long and so vigorously, but certain verses, perhaps more familiar in my boyhood days, occurred to me.

Those about the lamb, and I am not intimating that Mr. Pressman is a lamb, are these:

How think ye? if a man have an hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains, and seeketh that which is gone astray?

And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more of that sheep, than of the ninety and nine which went not astray.

If I get Mr. Pressman's present attitude, it is that once he was a sinner.

For sinners, the Scripture has consolation. May I quote:

I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance.

Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.

Mr. COX. Well, anyway, the one was crucified and the other glorified.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes, I get it. And I would say to the gentleman from Georgia that while none of us has the right to question the sincerity of the repentance of reformation of another, I can understand and respect the gentleman's uncertainty in view of Mr. Pressman's record and the fact that so far he—at least I have not seen anything to that effect—he has not been giving us any very valuable information.

I have met Mr. Pressman several times at committee hearings. I never saw a man whom I thought had more ability than Lee Pressman, more legal ability, or a man who was shrewder, a man who was more evasive, if you get what I mean, than was Lee Pressman in testifying before congressional committees.

I recall one instance when he was testifying at hearings before the Smith committee that had to do with the National Labor Relations Board. He was an attorney and then I think represented the CIO. Nathan Witt was there at the same hearing, as attorney for the NLRB. He was now admittedly another Communist. Those two gentlemen, Lee Pressman, and Nathan Witt were the men who were back of strikes in the steel industry in Pittsburgh, and elsewhere.

I hope that Lee Pressman has seen the light, that he will devote just a fraction of the ability, the energy, and the persistence to exposing Communists that he did before in covering up Communist-inspired strikes as disclosed by the hearings of the Smith committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. When Whittaker Chambers came before the committee and confessed his former membership in the Communist Party, he did not hesitate to give the names and addresses of every traitor that had been mixed up with him or had connived or dealt with him in giving away the secrets of this Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, as long as we hold ourselves out to be Christians, we should give Lee Pressman the benefit of any doubt while keeping an eye on him, yes, keep an eye on Lee Pressman—he is a very capable man.

Mr. RANKIN. No; make him answer the questions. That is what we ought to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly, require him to give full complete information about his own works while with the Communists and, so far as he knows, about the activities of each and every one of his coworkers.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Navy Matthews in his Boston speech last Friday night, according to the press, said, and I quote:

What Mr. Matthews said in his Boston speech which stirred up the hornet's nest was this: The United States should arm itself strongly to ward off any possible attack. In addition, we should boldly proclaim our undeniable objective to be a world at peace. To have peace we should be willing, and declare our intention, to pay any price, even the price of instituting a war to compel cooperation for peace.

Now, I want to comment on these remarks and say that in my opinion this sensational statement is merely a smoke screen to cover his past mistakes; and effort to direct the American people's thinking away from his failure to back up and support the Navy, Navy Air, and the Marine Corps after the B-36 investigation in August of last year.

I might say to the Secretary that if he had taken the same position after the B-36 investigation of last year as he takes today, and if he had assumed the responsibilities he was charged with as Secretary of the Navy to support his part of the defense set-up, rather than acting as a yes man to the economy-minded group in the Department of Defense, the Navy would not have been moth balled, cut back, and scuttled. And they would have been in a position to meet the demands made upon them brought about by the Korean war.

It has taken Secretary Matthews many months to wake up to the fact that Admiral Denfeld was right.

The Secretary's talk last Friday night was untimely and attempts to confuse the public's mind as to his past performances and mistakes. Instead of expressing his opinions about initiating a war, it would be wiser to get the Navy and its counterpart in shape to meet any emergencies that might arise. If the Secretary paid as much attention to getting Navy battlewagons, the Navy Air Corps, and the Marine Corps in shape as he does to sounding off with an ill-advised speech, the Navy and the country would be better off.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact the Secretary listened to the B-36 investigation, he heard the testimony given, he had his chance when the investigation was being conducted to back up the Navy and the preparedness program. He definitely muffed it, and I am inclined to believe his Boston speech was set up to be startling, to attract the public, to cover up for his previous action after the B-36 investigation.

At that time the Secretary was new on the job and until he found out what it was all about it was his right to fight for the Navy, but what happened? The carrier was cancelled, the fleet was moth balled, Navy air was cut back, the Marine Corps skeletonized, and Admiral Denfeld fired; and the Secretary's blind, un-

reasonable thinking is the cause for us now desperately trying to get the fleet back into action.

My recommendations are, if he remains where he is, that he stick to his job, and quit making speeches to muddy up the waters and get the Navy, Navy Air, and Marine Corps in shape to do a job when called upon, that he quit trying to make an impression on the American people after his mistakes of a few months ago.

I might say to the Members of the House that our thinking in the Armed Services Committee was sound, our program for national defense was comprehensive, but a few willful men were able to frustrate our thinking and efforts. The question is whether the will of the Congress is to be carried out after action has been taken.

The other day on this floor we heard—after we had taken a position on the Spanish loan—that we were invading territory where we had no right to intrude; and that is in the field of policy making. Now, I want to ask the Members of the House who has a better right than the 435 Members of the House and the 96 Members of the Senate, duly elected by the American people to express the will and thinking of the folks back home; particularly after the stupidity, blundering, and indecision evident during the past several years? It is about time that the Congress asserted itself to determine policies that express the will of the people. And when it has been expressed by Congress, it should be carried out and not left to a few individuals to do what they think should be done rather than what the Congress thinks should be done; especially when they have been consistently wrong.

I say that we had better wake up before it is too late because time is running out on us.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the present resolution which provides for the creation of a special committee to investigate GI training. It would be very helpful to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which was created to take care of the needs of the veterans and I believe the committee will welcome any additional information that may be received. Therefore, I am very happy to support this resolution. I have introduced a bill for the granting of GI training for world war III veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise also at this time to ask the Rules Committee if it will give me a hearing on the bill H. R. 374 to create a Committee on Psychological Warfare and Peacefare.

It was obvious listening to the debate during the supplement on appropriations bill on Saturday and on Friday that the Members of the House are very much concerned over the lack of proper, adequate, comprehensive informational broadcasts that are sent abroad and the digest of the information coming from foreign countries to this country. A special committee of this House could give a great deal of time to it. It could

constantly watch the Voice of America broadcasts, the digests, and take them to the State Department and the War Department and all of the military services, the ECA, and suggest legislation to the appropriate committees in order to secure a real voice, a real radio voice going out from this country that would be helpful in the protection of this country instead of having unwise broadcasts going out over several different "voices," as was said on the floor the other day. It is true there is an ECA voice, a Voice of America, and other "voices," and the people in foreign countries do not know which voice to listen to. I have suggested that they have a Radio Washington and everyone would know that the information going out from Radio Washington would come as authoritative information from our Government; it would come from the administration and the legislative branch of the Government. I think it would be a remarkable step forward in bringing together the different agencies interested in giving information, for instance, to Russia. It would be very helpful to us in the conduct of the war, instead of having haphazard broadcasts go out, and often very damaging information going out, as was brought out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], various Members on the majority side of the aisle, the party in power.

We are today engaged in a conflict—call it what you will—in which American boys are dying. It is the job of psychological warfare to lessen the number of fatalities. Good psychological warfare can save lives. Bad psychological warfare does not save lives. It wastes time and manpower and money which might be more gainfully employed in this crisis.

We have, therefore, a vital operation, a life-saving task to which some \$132,000,000 will be devoted. Will this House shun its just responsibility? Will this House trust haphazard liaison methods which have failed in the past? Will this House neglect to keep constant contact with the means which may save the life of a son of a man within the range of my voice?

My faith in my colleagues as lawmakers, as fathers, as Americans leads me to believe you will side with me in this my firm resolve.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if the Committee on Rules would grant a hearing and report out my resolution which would enable a select committee of the House to meet our common responsibility toward psychological warfare, just as you have a Select Committee on Un-American Activities which has proven very valuable, you would find it well worth while, and I believe the heads of the Defense Department, the Department of State, and the President himself, would approve such a very valuable committee. They could meet much more often than any special committee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or the Committee on Appropriations. It was obvious on Saturday that those two committees have not been able to accomplish very much; in fact, very little, if anything has been done.

The Rules Committee has just reported out this bill for a special investigating committee. House bill 374 is certainly just as important, and it may well mean the saving of many lives, even America itself.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, those of us whose duties have brought us into intimate touch with the affairs of the Panama Canal must very early come to recognize the importance of our relationship with the Republic of Panama.

Our task in maintaining the Canal with its tremendous importance to ocean commerce and to the defense of the Western Hemisphere is made much less difficult because we have the friendship of the courageous people of our neighboring Republic. The sincerity of this fine friendship was demonstrated by the President of the Republic of Panama in a message to his people and to the world on August 3. He pledged "moral and material cooperation with the Nations of which Panama is one of the charter members."

I was so impressed with the significance of his message that I placed the full text of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 22. On August 25, the President of the Republic of Panama sent me a cablegram which also impresses me very greatly and which moves me very deeply. In accordance with his request and my own desires, I have the honor to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a translation of the cablegram which President Arnulfo Arias of Panama sent to me.

[Translation]

PANAMA, August 25, 1950.

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to express to you my most sincere thanks for the gracious phrases of your recent address in the august House of Representatives of the United States of America regarding the attitude taken by my government on behalf of my country in relation to the defense of the Panama Canal and of democracy, treacherously attacked in Korea by communism.

I beg you to place on permanent record in the legislative annals the point I reiterate to you and to the noble North American people: the assurance that Panama will faithfully carry out her pacts with the United Nations and with the United States. We will give all aid and assistance in defense of liberty and international justice menaced by tyranny.

ARNULFO ARIAS,
President of Panama.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISSEMINATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND ENGINEERING INFORMATION TO AMERICAN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 808) provid-

ing for the consideration of S. 868, a bill to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, 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 (S. 868) to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, 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 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. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule making in order the consideration of the bill S. 868. The bill, briefly, has a fourfold purpose. One, it would establish a clearinghouse in the Department of Commerce for the dissemination of information obtained from foreign and domestic sources of value to American business, particularly small business, with limited research facilities and technical staffs. Two, it would provide immediate reference sources of technical information for all American business. Three, the Department estimates the cost of the service is less than a million dollars a year. The fees for the publications and services will make it at least partially self-sustaining.

I understand the bill was unanimously reported out of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has explained the main provisions of the bill. I do not know of any objection on this side.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], and I ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in prefacing the remarks I am about to make in relation to the Department of Defense and related subjects, I want to go back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 3, 1949, and quote from my remarks in support of the stand I took against so-called unification of the Armed Forces.

Here is what I said, in part:

I voted against this legislation for several reasons, but chiefly because I am convinced

It is virtually a moral betrayal of the democratic processes of this Republic to place almost unlimited military power in the hands of one man in peacetime.

Continuing, I said:

In my brief experience in Congress I have never listened to more qualified statements in behalf of a measure of such vast importance than those offered apparently in support of this so-called unification bill.

The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. VINSON], in setting forth the objectives of this legislation, time after time resorted to the qualification of, we hope this measure will do thus and so. Seldom did we hear positive statements as to the positive effects that could reasonably be expected.

Another speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], ranking minority member of the committee, said this:

I do not like the vast powers granted to one man.

Here were the two ranking members of the committee approaching revision and continuance of the Unification Act with doubt and misgiving. They hoped for the best, yet feared the worst. May I suggest that at least some of their fears were confirmed.

Continuing my remarks on that August day a year ago, I submitted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with a minimum of implementing legislation, could resolve their problems and yet maintain their separate entities so vital to the well-being and morale of all the Armed Forces.

Under the guise of unification, I said at that time, the public is being led to believe that the dumping of vast, undreamed-of power into the hands of one man is going to solve these problems, and I predict a sad awakening.

The first awakening as to the meaning of unification in the hands of political favorites and yes-men came with the opening of hearings by the Armed Services Committee into the bitter quarrel over scrapping of the super aircraft carrier and the B-36 investigation. If you need proof and enlightenment read the printed hearings that evolved from the testimony given before the Armed Services Committee during October and early November. Through the courtesy of the committee, I sat in on several of those hearings and remained in Washington last October after the adjournment of Congress for that purpose and to attend a series of conferences at the Pentagon Building. I do not deal in hearsay when I say that I heard not once but at least two dozen times the now ignominious statement that "if the Reds strike at 4 a. m. we'll be ready at 5 a. m."

Important is the testimony of Gen. Clifton B. Cates, commandant of the Marine Corps, to which all too little publicity has been given.

On Monday, October 17, 1949, General Cates said this:

There does exist, within our corps, a continuous feeling of apprehension and annoyance sometimes bordering on outright indignation. We know that we exist solely as an element of the national defense. That is our business. We understand it and we know there is much to be done. Yet, during the past 2 years, the time, energy, and attention of our leadership has been steadily con-

sumed by the effort necessary to resist the inroads and incursions of those who appear unwilling to accept the verdict of Congress. A constantly increasing effort is required to withstand those who would circumvent the plain provisions of the law or extend its terms toward ends repeatedly denied by Congress.

It follows that, at a time when the great requirement within the services is for a continuous integrated effort, uncertainty and instability are the rule. As long as this persists and the services are kept off balance * * * there can be no effective organization of the Nation's military potential in the manner envisaged by the National Security Act.

To you Members of Congress who are asked what was wrong in the Military Establishment when the blow fell in Korea there is your answer. It is the old and sordid story of politics as usual; of wanton disregard by Secretary of Defense Johnson for the intent of Congress if not for the specific provisions of the law; of a military commander who was forced to spend his time, not in making secure the defense of this Nation, but to ward off the lust for power and prestige by ambitious politicians.

General Cates, for his sheer courage and candor, is worthy of all the fine tradition of the Marine Corps. Not a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he did not have even the questionable protection of a provision, written by this House in 1949 into the National Security Act, which provided that a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff could, on his own volition, testify before a committee in Congress and be protected in that right by law. Of course, it is now a matter of record that Secretary of the Navy Matthews and President Truman thumbed figurative noses at Congress and made a mockery of that provision of the law when Admiral Denfeld was forced to "walk the plank."

Yes, the President and his naval expert, Secretary Matthews, rigged the plank for Denfeld while the invisible hand of Louis Johnson provided at least some of the momentum that skidded him out of the Navy.

But let us return for a few more words of testimony before the Armed Services Committee from General Cates. He said:

The Marine Corps emerged from the last war feeling it had performed creditably. With the Navy, it had pioneered and developed the field of amphibious warfare for the use of the entire Allied world. This new technique proved to be the key to victory on every major front in the war. * * * In addition, our own field forces played a decisive role in the reduction of the island fortresses held by the Japanese.

And then this statement from the marine general:

Thus, it came as a great surprise to find ourselves at the war's end placed almost in the capacity of a culprit or a defendant.

Let it be remembered that General Cates was giving this testimony one short year ago; not only fighting before a committee of this Congress for an already decimated Marine Corps, but for even the continued existence of that specialized fighting force. And he was risking on the political executioner's block his rank and a long and honorable record,

In that hour, two short months ago, when the Defense Department's dismal failure was stripped of all its political gloss by the rip-tide of events in Korea, it would be interesting to know whether Louis Johnson, and others constituting the layers of political fat in the Pentagon Building, could share the deep sense of public satisfaction that there was still in existence at least the nucleus of a Marine Corps.

And public satisfaction would have been even greater had there been more admirals, sarcastically referred to as Fancy Dans in some quarters, walking the decks of more aircraft carriers and battleships near the Korean coast line, their planes and heavy guns raking the North Korean lines of communications in those first days of the war.

This Nation suffers from a unification act that was doomed to failure from its inception because of administration by those who believed and undoubtedly still believe that the Military Establishment offers the same political happy hunting ground that is found in the Post Office Department, the Department of Agriculture, and other agencies of government.

It was an alleged unification program that promoted disunity; that played a part in the wastage of billions of dollars, provided by the taxpayers; billions of dollars which the taxpayers and Members of Congress had every reason to believe was bringing into being a powerful military force.

Something was said here Saturday by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] concerning the failure of Central Intelligence.

I have in my possession a publicity release from the Korean-American Council, located in the Columbian Building in Washington, D. C. I have confirmed that this Council holds semi-official status with the Korean Embassy, which has offices in the same building.

This release is dated May 21, 1950, and I assume it was sent to all Members of Congress. I further assume it was easily available to the Department of Defense and Secretary of State. Listen to the information that was provided in this release more than a month before the southern Korean roof caved in:

The northern [Korean] force—

Said the release—

is exerting greater and greater pressure on the thirty-eighth parallel. * * * Behind their heavy garrisons already on the line, they are stacking up bigger units of combat power. With Communist artillery possessing greater range than ours, with the Chinese Communists contributing rifles to the northern Korean force, we defend the parallel under severe handicap. And we live with a sense of something worse.

Continuing, this release warns that—

Arms, uniforms, and other material needed no longer by the victorious Chinese Communists, including American rifles furnished to the Chinese Army during the Japanese war, are flowing into north Korea. * * * In other indications lies evidence that the north is undergoing nearly total mobilization.

I saved and filed this publicity release because I knew it came from a source close to the Korean Embassy and because

of the ominous warning contained therein. But I had no way of giving it evaluation. I trusted Central Intelligence just as I voted every dollar requested for the Military Establishment and trusted the Department of Defense to spend it wisely and well; just as I hoped and silently prayed that somehow there would be evolved by the State Department a sound and firm foreign policy which would be in balance with our military capacity.

I am bitterly disappointed and disillusioned.

If we are to keep faith with the men and boys we are sending forth to be killed and maimed in the cauldron of fire in Korea, we can do no less than demand an accounting here at home. And the first step in that accounting should be a demand now, on the part of President Truman, for the resignation of Secretary of Defense Johnson, Secretary of State Acheson, and Secretary of the Navy Matthews.

There is no reasonable excuse for their tragic blundering, and if their resignations are not forthcoming they should be fired immediately.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. 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. 868) to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, 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 S. 868, with Mr. WHITTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, S. 868, passed the other body just about a year ago. The purpose of the bill is to establish a clearinghouse in the Department of Commerce for the collection, compilation, and dissemination of technological information obtained from domestic and foreign sources. Such a clearinghouse would make readily available to American business and industry, particularly to the small and independent businessman, the results of Government-sponsored and Government-financed research, the technological discoveries which were brought back from Germany after the last war, and such information emanating from private sources as may be voluntarily made available for that purpose.

This information would be of inestimable value to all American business and industry, particularly the small businesses which have limited research facilities and technical staffs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that point for just a moment. The large industrial corporations, or most of them, have their own research labora-

tories and their own research staff. Whether they have a research laboratory or not, they have a staff that can gather for the larger corporations such technological and scientific information on patents, processes, and formulas that they need. Small business is not in position to do that. This bill should greatly assist small business all over the country.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. How small must a business be? The gentleman refers to small business.

Mr. PRIEST. There is no limitation either as to bigness or smallness insofar as the benefits of this bill are concerned. A little one-man operation is entitled to the information just the same as, we will say, General Motors, using a much larger corporation.

Mr. SADLAK. I am in full agreement with the gentleman. I was just wondering whether it might be based on the number of employees.

Mr. PRIEST. No. There is no limitation whatsoever.

In recent years, hundreds of millions of dollars have been appropriated annually for Government research. Usually the results of research are compiled in reports which go into the files of the Government agency sponsoring the work. Even reports on nonclassified research are filed away and rarely, if ever, reach the industrial community. If this information could be carefully cataloged and centrally recorded, both the Government and industry could use it and would not waste time and money in fruitless duplication.

Our Government recently spent approximately \$3,000,000 to collect industrial and scientific discoveries of I. G. Farben, Krupp, and other great German laboratories. This information has not been organized in a form suitable for utilization by small business. Much of it still lies crated up in warehouses. Some large companies have profited because they sent engineers to Europe along with our Government scientists and participated in the collection. However, small businesses have not had equal access to it. This \$3,000,000 investment could be made to yield manifold if small business firms are given an opportunity to utilize this rich deposit of technological knowledge.

During the last war, the Department of Commerce instituted a program of collecting, compiling, and disseminating technological information. This activity was found to be needed and demanded by our business, industry, and Government. In deference to this demand, the Department continued the program subsequent to the end of hostilities. In 1947 and 1948, however, the Department's requests for appropriations to carry on this activity were stricken by the House of Representatives on points of order.

They had been carrying on this particular function under appropriation language. In those 2 years that was stricken on a point of order. Of course, it was subject to a point of order,

The Department then took the view that such activity was authorized by the organic act of the Department which provides, among other things, that it shall be the duty of the Department to "foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce" of the United States. That is in the act of February 14, 1903.

Accordingly, the Senate authorized the appropriation, and it was included in the Appropriation Act as finally passed. Nevertheless, to avoid continued uncertainty as to authority for this activity and to facilitate the continued operation and planning of the program, the Department is of the opinion that express statutory authority should be granted. This bill would satisfactorily accomplish two major objectives sought by the Department, and the first one of these is that it will provide the Department with explicit authority to search for, to collect, and to compile scientific, technical, and engineering information; and, in the second place, to disseminate such information to American business, industry, and the general public.

The Department has estimated that the cost of administering the program proposed by the bill will be less than \$1,000,000 a year, since the bill makes the function to a considerable extent self-sustaining in the form of fees for publications and services, and with the deletion of section 3 of the bill as proposed by the committee, the cost will be less than \$1,000,000, even for the first year of operation, and it is believed by the Department that after the bill has been in operation for a year or two it will be entirely self-sustaining.

I might say that this bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I now yield to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman. On the last point the gentleman made I think it would be useful not only in terms of outlining the scope of the bill, but particularly in terms of indicating the unanimous desire of the committee that this program should become just as far as possible self-sustaining in the future; to point to the language in the bill itself: "It is the policy of this act, to the fullest extent feasible and consistent with the objectives of this act, that each of the services and functions provided herein shall be self-sustaining or self-liquidating, and that the general public shall not bear the cost of publications and other services which are for the special use and benefit of private groups and individuals."

The latter part of that particular paragraph does point out that there are some services in both the agencies and the instrumentalities of the Federal Government that might well be carried on where the general public is benefited, and it is my understanding that that is the reason for the use of the words "feasible and consistent with the objectives of this act."

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. HESELTON. I believe the committee does not have an estimate of how

much less than \$1,000,000 this might be as the result of the elimination of the original section 3, but I also feel that the members of the committee would want to impress on the Department of Commerce that by the use of a realistic schedule of fees they could aim toward practically eliminating anything except what is necessary for intergovernmental service, and for the benefit of the public as a whole. Am I right about that?

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is right. And I am glad the gentleman emphasized that so that it will be a part of the record and the legislative history of the bill at this point, because I believe as the matter was discussed in our committee it was the sense that emphasis should be placed on that particular point. I am glad the gentleman brought it up at this time.

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

Mr. Chairman, the explanation which has just been given by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that had this legislation under consideration, has been able, clear, and forceful. It will not be necessary for me to take any considerable time to emphasize the importance of the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to make the results of technological research and development more readily available to industry and business and to the general public through a central clearinghouse.

The Secretary of Commerce is directed to establish a clearinghouse within the Department of Commerce for the collection and dissemination of scientific and technical information obtained from foreign and domestic sources. For this purpose he is directed to take necessary steps to search for, classify, and integrate such information, and to make it available through preparation of abstracts, translations, and so forth, either directly or in trade and other publications. Within the limits of national security and his authority, and with the consent of competent authority, the Secretary is to effect the removal of restrictions on the dissemination of such information. However, he shall respect security classifications certified by the President or his designee as essential to national defense.

The Secretary is authorized to make the rules necessary to carry out the provisions of the act, and to establish a schedule of fees for services and publications furnished under the act. Fees received for publications are to be deposited in a special Treasury account available to reimburse the current appropriation chargeable with the cost of furnishing such copies. These services are to be as fully self-sustaining as possible so that the general public does not bear the cost of publications for the special use or benefits of private groups.

In carrying out this act the Secretary is authorized to utilize the personnel and existing facilities of the Department of Commerce, and he may call on other Government agencies to provide available services which are helpful.

The Secretary is directed to refer information of immediate or potential

military significance to the armed services, and other information to the appropriate Government agency.

There is in the possession of the Government million of dollars' worth of technological and scientific information which was obtained by our Armed Forces during the last war from Germany and elsewhere. At the present time it is packed away in cases, and piled up in warehouses and of no use to anyone. Undoubtedly that information would be of great value and very useful to the business interests of America if it were made available to them. It would be particularly valuable to small business, although it will be available to industry in general, both big business and little business. It was unanimously reported by the committee.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Does this bill contemplate an additional bureau with additional personnel and additional expenses, so far as the Department of Commerce is concerned?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Of course, to effectuate the full purpose of the service to be rendered under the bill, it may require some additional help. As to that I do not know—I assume that to be the case because it has been represented to the committee that at the beginning, that is, during the first year, the cost might be as much as a million dollars. But that is to set the thing up. But the Secretary of Commerce is directed to fix fees and charges to be paid by those who utilize the service. This will produce enough revenue, so we are told, to be sufficient to carry the entire cost.

Mr. JONAS. Assuming that the Department of Commerce takes on this responsibility, does this bill contemplate that big business which carries on its own laboratory research must pay for that work from its private funds, but that small business will get this benefit from the Government at the expense of the taxpayers? How is this bureau to be self-sustaining? What is to be its income, its source of income?

Mr. WOLVERTON. This bill draws no distinction between big business and little business. The information is available to each. It will undoubtedly be particularly helpful to small business. Big business is financially well able to search out this information on its own, as it does at the present time, and as it has done in the past. But in any event, whether it is big business or little business which will avail itself of this information, the information will be gathered together in a clearinghouse, so to speak, by the Department of Commerce, and the charge will be made to whomever uses it.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman for the information. What, in detail, is the source of income? The gentleman has explained that this is to be a self-sustaining bureau. From what sources will this bureau obtain funds, thereby becoming self-sustaining?

Mr. WOLVERTON. It will come from those who utilize the service, the abstracts, booklets, and other publications

to be issued by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. JONAS. Is there provision in the bill which establishes a schedule or a program whereby the Government can make certain fixed charges?

Mr. WOLVERTON. The bill does not set forth a schedule of charges; that is left entirely to the Secretary of Commerce. He determines what fees shall be charged.

Mr. JONAS. In other words, when you say it might be self-sustaining, the basis of it is in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce to establish a schedule or table whereby he fixes the rates which will ultimately meet the expense?

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The underlying purpose of the bill is good. It was originated and put in practice during the last war. Since the conclusion of the war it has been carried on but always subject to a point of order on the appropriations bill. This bill fixes the statutory authority to do in the future more effectually what has been done in the past. I hope it has the support of the House.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I think a complete explanation has been given by my colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. I simply want to add to what they have said by stating that there was a great deal of interest in this bill by the so-called small-business people.

The need for the authorization for the legislation was, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] has emphasized, that a great deal of work is necessary to separate, catalog, and gather this information, which is in bales, uninvestigated and uncataloged, in the Department of Commerce, containing various scientific and technological information which has largely been obtained from Germany.

I would like to express my own deep interest in this bill. There was one controversial feature of the bill, namely, section 3, the so-called patent section, which drew some objections from some of those interested in the bill. That has been stricken by the committee, and I think removed the only matter of controversy in the bill.

Personally, I would like to say that I think the two gentlemen who have preceded me have so fully explained the provisions of this bill that I merely want to express to them my own appreciation of their deep interest which both the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] have given to this legislation.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. REES. Approximately how many additional employees do you expect will be put on the payroll on account of this proposed legislation?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. In fairness to the gentleman, I must say I do not know and I refer the question to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield to me to answer the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Yes, I gladly yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say that it is not contemplated that any additional personnel will be required. There is already in the Department of Commerce the Office of Technical Services. That office has, in a sense, been doing this thing, and did it for 2 or 3 years. Then it was stopped because of a point of order made on an appropriation bill. It is my best opinion that additional personnel will be required, but, if so, it will be a very small number to do the uncrating, the assembling, and classifying of this information that is piled up in boxes in warehouses. It may, for a period, require some additional persons to get that work done. But the Office of Technical Services is already there. They have already done this thing to the best of their ability under appropriation language. Then they had to stop it because of a point of order. But I do not believe it will require any additional permanent staff.

Mr. REES. As I understand this proposal, it will cost approximately \$1,000,000. That is the figure suggested by the author of the bill. Assuming that the employees in the Department of Commerce have all they can do, otherwise they would not be employed. Otherwise, somebody is going to have to do some extra work. If there is going to be additional work done it will cost money. I believe you will have to have additional employees, unless the gentleman infers that some employees do not have work to do at present.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. May I reply to the able and distinguished gentleman from Kansas that I know full well in the important Post Office and Civil Service Committee he is assiduously watching and working for economy in our National Government, and I have every confidence that he will see to it that the taxpayers of this country are fully protected.

Mr. REES. My reply to the distinguished gentleman is just this: I am going on the assumption that those presently employed have all the work they can do. This legislation may have merit. I am persuaded it may have some merit because of the very strong statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], but my notion is that we should curtail all unnecessary employment in the departments and use it in the war effort. If, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] has suggested, the present employees can do this work, then why the extra \$1,000,000 that you are asking for in this bill?

Mr. PRIEST. If the gentleman will yield, I stated originally that it would

cost less than a million dollars, and that was an estimate even with section 3 in the bill. Section 3 was eliminated. I do not have the exact figure. I do know that only \$200,000 was requested in the budget for the Office of Technical Services for the next fiscal year. That is considerably less than a million dollars.

May I say to the gentleman from Kansas that a great deal of the additional expense will not involve personnel, but the question of printing and making copies of this information to be mailed out. That is the expense which, in turn, will become self-sustaining as the fees for the service are paid for, but it has to get started. There is a tremendous amount of information, a lot of Farben processes and formulas in great bulk. They want to reduce it to where the little-business man, say, in the State of Kansas, can use it. They have to go into it and make printed excerpts. That costs a little money. I am sure, however, that the expense will not be very great and that in the end it will be self-sustaining.

Mr. REES. You have reduced the estimate from \$1,000,000 to \$200,000. There is quite a difference between an estimate for a million and an estimate for \$200,000.

Mr. PRIEST. Just to keep the record straight on that fact, my statement was that it would be a little less than a million. Then I stated that in the current budget the Office of Technical Services which is already in the Department of Commerce asked for only \$200,000.

Mr. REES. It is my view that we should hold down expenses as much as possible and not engage in unnecessary activities that do not relate directly with this war—and we are in a war whether it is admitted or not. I am calling attention to the additional expense by reason of this new activity. If it is very necessary and the people of the country really want to expand this activity and spend the additional funds. I am not in position to criticize. I hope the objective of this legislation may be reached without unnecessary expenditure of funds.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

May I say to the gentleman from Kansas that I compliment him and I know he is sincere, for I know his record in supporting economy.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. But I believe that under this bill there will probably have to be some additional temporary employees in order to unbalance and catalog this information. I do not want to see this made a job-handout proposal and a lot of new people employed. I believe it should be run efficiently and economically. On the other hand, I do not want a lot of employees put on; and I am sure the Department is going to have to justify its request to the Appropriations Committee for money to carry this out, and we know the Appropria-

tions Committee is very cautious about these matters.

Mr. REES. That is right. I want to be assured this activity is really necessary at this time, and no unnecessary funds will be required.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. But I do say to the gentleman from Kansas that I believe this expenditure is necessary to make this technological information available to our people. I believe this information will prove to be of a great deal more value than the cost of the operation. I believe, as do others who have expressed themselves, that this venture will prove to be self-liquidating when this information is available to be sold to the public.

Mr. REES. I know about the watchfulness of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. If he were in charge of the operation of this legislation I know the expense would be held down as low as possible.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], only works 15 hours a day. I do not see why he cannot work a little longer and go into this thing more thoroughly.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I understand the gentleman from Kansas gets down here around 7:30 in the morning and does not go home until late.

Mr. REES. The gentleman's statement is appreciated. I should say that the gentleman from Kansas is glad to work for a few extra hours when there is work to be done.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the purpose of this act is to make the results of technological research and development more readily available to industry and business, and to the general public, by clarifying and defining the functions and responsibilities of the Department of Commerce as a central clearinghouse for technical information which is useful to American industry and business.

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR TECHNICAL INFORMATION

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby directed to establish and maintain within the Department of Commerce a clearinghouse for the collection, dissemination, and exchange of scientific, technical, and engineering information, and to this end to take such steps as he may deem necessary and desirable—

(a) To search for, collect, classify, coordinate, integrate, record, and catalog such information from whatever sources foreign and domestic, that may be available;

(b) To make such information available to industry and business, to State and local governments, to other agencies of the Federal Government, and to the general public, through the preparation of abstracts, digests, translations, bibliographies, indexes, and microfilm and other reproductions, for distribution either directly or by utilization of business, trade, technical, and scientific publications and services;

(c) To effect, within the limits of his authority as now or hereafter defined by law, and with the consent of competent authority, the removal of restrictions on the dissemination of scientific and technical data

in cases where consideration of national security permit the release of such data for the benefit of industry and business.

RECORDING OF TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENTS

SEC. 3. Any invention, product, or scientific or technical process devised, created, or developed by any person (including any department or agency of the Federal Government, or any employee thereof), may be filed with the Secretary in such manner and upon such conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, and the Secretary shall make a record of each such invention, product, or process. When certified, under the seal of the Department of Commerce, by the Chief Clerk of the Department of Commerce, or by such other official as the Secretary may designate, such record or a copy thereof, shall be admissible in any patent or other proceedings, and in suits and actions in the courts of the United States, as evidence as to the date of filing of such invention, product, or process.

RULES, REGULATIONS, FEES

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to make, amend, and rescind such orders, rules, and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and to establish, from time to time a schedule or schedules of reasonable fees or charges for services performed or for documents or other publications furnished under this act: *Provided*, That all moneys hereafter received by the Secretary in payment for publications under this act shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, such account to be available, subject to authorization in any appropriation act, for reimbursing any appropriation then current and chargeable for the cost of furnishing copies or reproductions as herein authorized, and for making refunds to organizations and individuals when entitled thereto: *And provided further*, That an appropriation reimbursed by this special account shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be available for the purposes of the original appropriation.

It is the policy of this act, to the fullest extent feasible and consistent with the objectives of this act, that each of the services and functions provided herein shall be self-sustaining or self-liquidating and that the general public shall not bear the cost of publications and other services which are for the special use and benefit of private groups and individuals; but nothing herein shall be construed to require the levying of fees or charges for services performed or publications furnished to any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government, or for publications which are distributed pursuant to reciprocal arrangements for the exchange of information or which are otherwise issued primarily for the general benefit of the public.

REFERENCE OF DATA TO ARMED SERVICES

SEC. 5. The Secretary is directed to refer to the armed services all scientific or technical information, coming to his attention, which he deems to have an immediate or potential practical military value or significance, and to refer to the heads of other Government agencies such scientific or technical information as relates to activities within the primary responsibility of such agencies.

GENERAL STANDARDS AND LIMITATIONS

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Secretary shall respect and preserve the security classification of any scientific or technical information, data, patents, inventions, or discoveries in, or coming into, the possession or control of the Department of Commerce, the classified status of which the President or his designee or designees certify as being essential in the interest of national defense, and nothing in this act shall be construed as

modifying or limiting any other statute relating to the classification of information for reasons of national defense or security.

UTILIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary may utilize any personnel, facilities, bureaus, agencies, boards, administrations, offices, or other instrumentalities of the Department of Commerce which he may require to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The Secretary is hereby authorized to call upon other departments and independent establishments and agencies of the Government to provide, with their consent, such available services, facilities, or other cooperation as he shall deem necessary or helpful in carrying out the provisions of this act, and he is directed to utilize existing facilities to the full extent deemed feasible.

RELATION TO OTHER ACTS

SEC. 8. Nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or amend any other legislation pertaining to the Department of Commerce or its component offices or bureaus.

Mr. PRIEST (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "collection, dissemination, and exchange" and insert in lieu thereof "collection and dissemination."

Page 2, strike out beginning with line 23 down through line 12, on page 3.

Page 3, line 14, strike out "4" and insert in lieu thereof "3."

Page 4, line 21, strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof "4."

Page 5, line 5, strike out "6" and insert in lieu thereof "5."

Page 5, line 17, strike out "7" and insert in lieu thereof "6."

Page 6, line 5, strike out "8" and insert in lieu thereof "7."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and Mr. MILLS having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WHITTEN, 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. 868) to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 808, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in 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 en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 256]

Anderson, Calif.	Green	Multer
Angell	Gwinn	Murphy
Arends	Hale	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Hall	Nelson
Barrett, Pa.	Edwin Arthur	Nixon
Barrett, Wyo.	Hall	Norblad
Bentsen	Leonard W.	Norton
Blackney	Hand	O'Konski
Boggs, La.	Hart	Pace
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	Pfeifer,
Bolton, Ohio	Hébert	Joseph L.
Bonner	Hefferman	Pfeiffer,
Boykin	Heller	William L.
Brown, Ohio	Herlong	Philbin
Buckley, N. Y.	Herter	Phillips, Tenn.
Bulwinkle	Hinsshaw	Plumley
Burleson	Hollifield	Powell
Burnside	Jackson, Calif.	Quinn
Burton	James	Ramsay
Cannon	Javits	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Jenison	Regan
Chatham	Johnson	Riehlman
Chiperfield	Kean	Rivers
Clemente	Kearney	Roosevelt
Cooley	Kearns	Sabath
Corbett	Keefe	Sadowski
Coudert	Kelly, N. Y.	Scott, Hardie
Crawford	Kennedy	Scott,
Crook	Keogh	Hugh D., Jr.
Davenport	Kerr	Shelley
Davies, N. Y.	Klein	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Wis.	Lane	Smith, Ohio
Dawson	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Delaney	Latham	Stanley
Dingell	Lichtenwalter	Taylor
Dollinger	Lodge	Teague
Donohue	Lynch	Thomas
Durham	McCulloch	Van Zandt
Engel, Mich.	McGrath	Wadsworth
Engle, Calif.	McGregor	Weichel
Fogarty	McMillen, Ill.	Werdel
Fulton	Macy	Whitaker
Furcolo	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Gamble	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Gillette	Miller, Calif.	Winstead
Gilmer	Morgan	Withrow
Gore	Morrison	Wolcott
Granahan	Morton	Yates

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). On this roll call 287 Members have responded to their names; a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HIGHWAY ACT OF 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 7941), the Highway Act of 1950, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 807), 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. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. 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. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and at this time I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of a bill to prohibit interstate shipment of slot machines. For 2 years I have undertaken to assemble information and data on this subject. I have long since felt that there was not any real justification for the existence of a device or for the use of a device that took from the pockets of the American people \$3,000,000,000 each year. I felt that the use of this device, which is never in any way fair, simply drained from the economy of the various communities of the States large sums of money which trickled into the pockets of racketeers and gangsters in most cases.

I was thinking this morning in connection with the bill that at the other end of the Capitol they are considering a tax bill to raise about \$4,000,000,000 to meet the war emergency. The operation of slot machines is illegal except in four States and two counties of a fifth State. Yet, these slot-machine operations take almost that amount of money out of the pockets of the people annually, usually from the people least able to lose it. It does not come from the wealthy or the rich people, but usually from the fellow who has only a dollar in his pocket, but who thinks he can take a chance and double it. I am satisfied that at one time or another there is not a Member on the floor who has not contributed some of his money to these devices. Some of them are set as high as 90 to 10 against the player.

I want to call your attention to the history of this business. In the year 1885 when various States of the Union formed a national lottery policy and called on Congress to prohibit the interstate shipment of lottery tickets, Congress did so. The slot machine was invented in the same year and doubtless to take the place of the lottery business. Six years later it was improved upon. In 1891 a man by the name of Mills invented the same type of machine that we use today, and the largest company in America today manufacturing these machines bears the name of Mills in the State of Illinois,

They have tried to regulate this evil; various States have undertaken to legalize it and control it, but in almost every instance they have found they could not do it. They have tried in Florida. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], who has taken a great deal of interest in this bill in the committee, and who will be the floor manager for it today, will tell you what happened in his State. They tried it in Louisiana under the administration of Huey Long and they soon abolished the law because the result was more racketeering and gangsterism. They legalized them in Idaho on a local option basis and four of the principal cities in that State did likewise. They soon revoked the law making it legal in those cities. It is true that in the State of Washington it is legal only in private clubs. It is entirely legal in the State of Montana, the State of Nevada, and in two counties in the State of Maryland. Elsewhere it is absolutely illegal.

Despite the existence of these statutes they are operating almost freely throughout the United States. There are some exceptions. The State of Wisconsin has done a fine job in controlling and regulating them. They perhaps have done more than any other State in the Union. But generally speaking they operate almost unhampered.

Why is this possible? How can they do it in these places and operate when it is against the law of the land or certainly of the States? The answer is corruption. In every crime report that has been submitted on gambling in the United States they have charged again and again that the corruption of public officials has resulted in the free operation of slot machines. It is no secret that wherever they operate at least 20 percent of the gross take from these machines usually falls into the hands of the law-enforcement officers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman wish one or two additional minutes?

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, but I will secure additional time later.

Certainly we should adopt the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, this bill (S. 3357) which is to be debated if the rule is adopted came to our body from the Senate where it was passed without very much discussion. It came from the Senate committee and insofar as I know very meager hearings were held on the bill on the other side of the Capitol.

The bill was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and there, I must say, it received very serious consideration and lengthy hearings. It should be understood what this bill provides.

This is not sumptuary legislation in the sense that it prohibits the use of slot machines or other gambling devices. This prohibits the transportation of slot machines in interstate commerce to those States where the use of such device

is prohibited by State law. That is all the bill does, that is all it is designed to do.

I presume a good many constitutional authorities will say that an attempt to outlaw slot machines in the various States by Federal legislation would be unconstitutional. Such legislation if it were passed most emphatically would be subject to attack on constitutional grounds. But I repeat, this bill does not attempt to outlaw slot machines in the various States. It merely prohibits the transportation of slot machines to those States where their use is prohibited or limited by local law.

The background for this legislation stems back to a meeting of law enforcement officers, which was held some months ago in the city of Washington, and I believe another meeting of State attorneys general.

There was at those meetings a good deal of discussion about interstate gambling rackets. Both those meetings asked the Congress to pass this kind of legislation. That is the reason the Senate passed the bill, and should be very persuasive to the Members of the House of Representatives.

There is a real need for it, too. In my own State of Iowa, there has been a definite effort, and I think a very successful effort, to eliminate the use of slot machines in that State. That has come about by the enforcement of the State laws by State and local authorities. Of course, that is the crux of this problem.

This bill will give the local and State authorities assistance in getting the job done. That is all it proposes to do.

I am not revealing any secrets—I am sure I am not—when I say that the attorneys general of the various States very much desire this law. It has a very good analogy when we remember it is a violation of Federal law to transport stolen automobiles across State lines. This is an exact analogy in those States where slot machines are illegal. Accordingly, as the motor-vehicle law did, this law will assist the State authorities in enforcing the law.

We had before us a representative of the State attorney general in the person of Mr. Hammond, attorney general of the State of Maryland, who came before our committee and testified on behalf of his organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, at this hearing the following colloquy took place. I did the questioning:

Mr. DOLLIVER. The passage of a law by the Federal Government prohibiting gambling in any of the States would not be constitutional, would it?

Mr. HAMMOND. Not in my opinion; no sir.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Because of the provision of the Constitution that the Federal Government is a Government of delegated powers, and all residual powers rest in the State governments. Or in the people? Is that correct?

Mr. HAMMOND. Correct, sir.

Mr. DOLLIVER. So, accordingly, what is attempted here, and the thing that the at-

torneys general resolved upon, was merely an assist on the part of the Federal Government, rather than any primary legislation on the subject of gambling.

Mr. HAMMOND. And an assist which is within their control; to call upon, or not to need, as they determine.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this rule will be adopted and that the bill will be passed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an article appearing in Collier's.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those who have paid any attention of late to vice as controlled by the national racketeers in the cities realize that many times elections are swayed by the money that comes from slot machines.

Sometimes, too, those who have been convicted and are serving time in Federal and other prisons are liberated because of the corrupt use of the funds which come from slot machines.

I recall that in a previous Congress, when the Capone gangsters had been sentenced to prison terms of 10 years each, their attorneys had pleaded for a short term of 10 years. Those attorneys said that because of the character of the offense—conspiracy to extort a million or more from members of a union—there was no possible hope of any of those men being released on parole or pardoned before the expiration of their terms.

Nevertheless, money enough was collected from slot machines in the city of Chicago so that influence enough was purchased—and the hearings show that—to obtain paroles for those men. Later some of them were sent back to prison and some were not.

The point is this, that all over the country in the cities of this land, those operating slot machines collect funds running sometimes into the hundreds of thousands, sometimes approaching nearly a million dollars, which they use to buy up, if I may use that expression, the law-enforcing officers. They buy protection.

I hold in my hand an article from Collier's, dated September 2, which I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A careful reading of this news story will show that someone is paying for, is getting, protection. It is captioned: "They get away with murder in Pittsburgh." The article reads as follows:

THEY GET AWAY WITH MURDER IN PITTSBURGH—THE RECORD SHOWS THAT THE CITY'S POLICE DEPARTMENT, HAMSTRUNG BY POLITICS, IS INCREDIBLY INEPT

(By Howard Whitman)

On the night of last November 25, Pittsburgh had a murder which made its citizens' hair stand on end. It was a shocker. In fact, the only thing about it which was more shocking than the crime itself was the incredible way the police handled it.

An attractive young woman, Jean Brusco, who worked as a sales girl in a dress shop, was on her way home between 11:15 and 11:30 p. m. She was almost home. Another 200 feet and she'd have been safely in her house at 5532 Howe Street, in the Shadyside section of Pittsburgh. Then, seemingly out of nowhere, a rape-killer came up behind her and cracked her over the head, probably with a hatchet or cleaver, splitting her skull.

On the third floor of a house at 5530 Howe Street, next door to the Brusco residence, Mrs. Ellen Flanagan gasped in horror and incredulity. Looking out through a venetian blind, watching for friends to return from the movies, she had witnessed the appalling scene. It was lighted, like some melodrama on a Broadway stage, by the shimmering rays of a street lamp. Mrs. Flanagan saw Jean Brusco go down, saw the attacker start to drag her away. She told her husband.

He telephoned No. 6 police station and told the desk sergeant what had happened. But, Mr. Flanagan was informed, No. 6 was the wrong station; the scene of the crime was in No. 11's territory. So (as often happens in Pittsburgh's antiquated communications system, where there is no central headquarters for receiving calls and dispatching police) Flanagan's call had to be relayed to No. 11 station.

This time the station was right. But the desk sergeant got the address wrong. He told three plain-clothes men, who happened to be walking into the station house at the time, to go to 5503 Howe Street instead of 5530.

The plain-clothes men drove off—to the wrong address—in a private car belonging to one of them and not radio-equipped. Naturally, they found nothing wrong at 5503, but they hung around, without contacting the station, while precious time slipped by.

Flanagan and two neighbors went outside and found a puddle of blood and a purse on the spot where the woman had been hit. From papers in the purse they learned with consternation that she was Jean Brusco, their next-door neighbor. Still without aid or intervention of police, they informed the Brusco family.

Nearly 45 minutes passed, and the police still had not shown up. Jean Brusco's brother frantically phoned again. This time, since No. 11 station's radio cars were busy on a hold-up, a patrol wagon was sent to the scene from No. 6. Eyewitnesses who had been in the Flanagan house told me the patrol wagon hove up between 12:30 and 12:35 a. m.—a full hour after the police first had been summoned.

The plain-clothes men, meanwhile, were still down the street on their wrong-address mission. They saw the two wagon cops pull up at 5530 Howe Street and, at last, joined them at the right address.

Acting on the neighbor's theory that Miss Brusco had been taken away in an automobile, the police then proceeded to commit two more boggles hardly imaginable outside of a Keystone comedy. In kindergarten logic, the neighbors' theory must have been (A) right, or (B) wrong. If it were right—that is, if Miss Brusco had been dragged into a car and driven away—an immediate radio alarm should have gone out alerting every police car and foot patrolman (as well as police in adjacent municipalities and counties—to spread a net for a car involved in kidnaping and possible murder. If the neighbors' theory happened to be wrong—which it was—then Miss Brusco or her dead body, and possibly her assailant, too, were somewhere in the neighborhood. It should have been searched from gutters to rooftops.

Neither step was taken.

Another desk sergeant, who came on duty at the shift of turns in No. 11 station, failed to inform headquarters or the police radio for a full hour after he got his report from the scene. It was a total of 2½ hours after

the crime was reported to the police that the first teletype or radio message went out.

The neighborhood was not searched at all.

It was left for a milkman, making his deliveries the next morning, to find Jean Brusco's body. She lay in a horrible grotesquerie of rape and murder, bloody, partly nude, in a back yard right across the street from where she was struck.

It was evident that the killer spent some time with his dying or dead victim after he had dragged her into the back yard. It may have been anywhere from a few minutes to half an hour or more. Indeed it is possible that he was right there in the back yard at the time when police should have been scouring the neighborhood.

If the police can't swing into action in a case like that, when they have an eyewitness, then when on earth can they?

What kind of police force is it that cannot even find the body of a woman when she lies murdered a few hundred feet from her own front door?

CITIZENS ARE INDIGNANT—AND AFRAID

A good many honest folks in Pittsburgh want to know. They are fed up with having murders and sex criminals roam at large in their town because of the police department's classic ineptitude. They are tired of hearing the taunt, "Murder is safer in Pittsburgh"—safer for the murderer. They are sick unto death of a bureau of police so hamstrung with politics that an inexperienced hack can be picked off the street today and sworn in as a detective tomorrow, if a ward chairman so decrees. They are afraid—for themselves, for their wives and kids—in a city where the police chief is reduced to a puppet, where the war against crime is under the generalship of bungling politicians, where the police force is the grab bag of a political machine.

"We hate to see our city smeared over this. But I'm afraid truth is our only weapon. It is the only way good will come."

The speaker was Dean N. R. H. Moor, of the Trinity (Protestant Episcopal) Cathedral. He is chairman of Pittsburgh's new Citizens Crime Committee, 30 leading citizens who realize their town's predicament and have the courage to do something about it. Like many another Pittsburgher, Dean Moor is proud of his town—its remarkable industries, its smoke-control program, its new Point Park development.

But he raises the question, "What good are grand civic improvements if you can't walk out among them without fear of getting knocked over the head?"

Besides the Brusco case, two other unsolved murders have left a virulent blight on Pittsburgh's peace of mind:

Carole Lee Kensinger, a pretty little girl of 12, was sadistically set upon—stabbed 39 times—in the kitchen of her home on Brushston Avenue the evening of December 10, 1948. In her red T-shirt and pink apron, the child had been mixing a cake for her mother and father, who were due home shortly from an outing with their neighborhood bowling league. After the attack, with blood pouring from her body, she crawled with her last strength to the dining room and was found there—her hands clutching out for the telephone.

The tragedy is over. But Pittsburghers don't like the thought that the sadistic killer at this writing is still at large.

Last March 26th, just 4 months after the Brusco murder, another young woman, Josephine, San Filippo, was shot to death in a mysterious assault as she walked down Reedsdale Street, just a block from her home. Police have no idea who fired the .32 bullet which smashed into the right side of her head.

That killer is still at large, too.

But murder tells just part of the story.

Last December 13 an employee of Pitt University's Psychiatric Institute and Clinto

was shot down (fortunately not killed) by a hoodlum who accosted her as she went for her car in a parking lot behind the institute. Eight days later a woman was assaulted on the street in East Liberty by a gunman who choked her, and rasped, "Keep quiet—or you'll get what the Brusco girl got."

On January 3 a woman was slugged in her own house in Squirrel Hill, then held captive while two hoodlums pillaged her home. A week later an 18-year-old girl was beaten over the head, her scalp laid open, as she walked near her home in Mount Washington. Four days after that a young mother with a 3-month-old baby in her arms was grabbed in the hallway of her home in Oakland. "If you scream, I'll kill the baby," her assailant threatened.

On April 8 a mother of four children was set upon as she was returning to her Mount Washington home from a shopping trip. A man dashed out of an alley, yoked her from behind, then—in a mad, psychopathic attack—rammed a wood chisel into the back of her neck. He darted off as she collapsed to the sidewalk.

So goes Pittsburgh's calendar of crime.

Storekeepers in some parts of town have taken to closing up early. They remember, with an icy chill, the attack on Harry Friedman, a 67-year-old tailor, and his wife on February 23. Five hoodlums invaded Friedman's shop on Dinwiddie Street, beat him over the head with an iron pipe, stripped and threatened to attack his 66-year-old wife, then tied and locked up the aged couple while ransacking the shop.

Mrs. Arnica Macfarlane, who runs a children's apparel store on South Highland Avenue, started something new in shopkeeping. After a thug invaded her store, knocked her down and locked her in the washroom, she decided that if the police couldn't protect her she's protect herself. She kept the door of her shop locked all day long, unbolting it only for customers.

"A fine way to do business in a big, modern city," one Pittsburgh merchant remarked.

Pittsburgh, for the year 1949, reported to the FBI a total of 23 murders, 587 robberies, 322 aggravated assaults, 2,528 burglaries, 945 grand larcenies and 1,506 auto thefts. These figures—as figures—do not shape up badly. In fact, if one ventured a comparison with other cities (which one should not venture) they would reflect a pretty pure town. But it is best to read these figures in conjunction with another document of the FBI, to wit, a report on the record keeping of the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police, made by FBI investigators:

"There is no headquarters control over police business," states the FBI report. "The recording of complaints is scattered throughout the precincts and various divisions of the bureau. There is no method of insuring that all complaints and requests for police service are recorded. As a result of this decentralization and lack of administrative control, the tabulations and recapitulations prepared from compilations forwarded to the headquarters records room do not present to the administering officials or the public a true or complete picture of the police problem of the city * * *. For example, only 60 percent of the crimes were reported by one precinct (picked at random) whose records were examined. The city crime reports are 40 percent incomplete on this basis."

Later the FBI report was specific:

"Officers assigned to complaints or requests for police service report verbally to their precinct desk officer, who either prepares a letter-size complaint report for furnishing to headquarters or enters the information in a miscellaneous book. Crimes are apparently listed in the miscellaneous book when it is 'thought' there is nothing to the crime. However, an examination of the miscellaneous book (veriously referred to as the 'butcher book' and the 'undercover book') will show that, when an arrest is made, an

entry in the miscellaneous book then reaches the dignity of a matter worthy of reporting to headquarters and the item is crossed out of the miscellaneous book and a complaint report prepared."

In bygone days it was common fakery in police departments to hide crimes in the bottom drawer and pull them out only when an arrest was made. The FBI has worked hard to change this and so has the International Association of Chiefs of Police. So have the people who pay the salaries of policemen—you and I, the citizen taxpayers.

At a citizens' meeting in Pittsburgh's Liberty School last October, Kennedy Smith, an attorney, rose to his feet and asked Police Superintendent Harvey J. Scott how he could justify the hiding of crime reports—the "butcher book" procedure. Scott's reply was that other cities do it too and he didn't want to give Pittsburgh a black eye.

"I don't care about other cities," Attorney Smith persisted. "Is it good police method?" There was no reply.

One after another, our major cities have overhauled their crime reporting in recent years and most of them today are giving the citizens an honest count. Today the bigger "black eye," as Scott called it, is to phony up the statistics. For we live in a new era of crime against people, wherein the depredations of the hoodlum, the rapist, the child molester, the mugger, cutthroat, and slugger are visited upon our own neighborhoods. The terror in our cities cannot be hidden away in "butcher books" or bottom drawers—it is in the streets. The people know about it, feel it.

Two hundred Pittsburgh women marched on the city council last December 13 in vociferous protest against street terror. Their leader, Mrs. R. Templeton Smith, president of the Allegheny County League of Women Voters, declared:

"The women of the city of Pittsburgh are afraid—and mad. They're afraid to be out alone at night on the streets of Pittsburgh; they're afraid, not only for themselves, but for their children. * * * We want no more clutching hands to reach out and grab us when we step out of our doors at night."

Nurses at West Penn, Shadyside, and Mercy Hospitals have been accosted, molested, and terrorized going to and from evening shifts. Girls from Carnegie Tech and Pitt—even while riding in streetcars—have been affronted by exhibitionists driving in automobiles alongside. At Carnegie Tech's Morewood Gardens dormitory, 450 coeds voted in their council to go abroad after darkness only in groups of three or more. Salesgirls in department stores, afraid to go home alone, dipped into their hard-earned funds to take taxis. In the East End and North Side, car pools were formed—as in war days—to take women to and from streetcar stops.

Girls who came to wait on table at Shadyside Presbyterian Church dinners were afraid to walk home. They had to be sent home in cars. The Help of Christians Church, which customarily held a 2-week Easter mission—1 week for men, 1 week for women—condensed it to 1 week this year because women wouldn't attend without their men for protection. The Sts. Peter and Paul Roman Catholic Church curtailed all evening activities, except on Fridays, after street attacks upon its parishioners.

How great was the feeling of insecurity? The Reverend Wilburn C. Campbell, then of Pittsburgh's Episcopal Church of the Ascension, and now Bishop Coadjutor of West Virginia, epitomized that feeling when—in an admittedly unusual request—he called upon Pennsylvania Gov. James H. Duff to turn out the National Guard. "The National Guard should be used to patrol the city and pick up criminals running loose on our streets," he exhorted.

It was probably too drastic a move to be considered seriously. But off in Washington, D. C., Pennsylvania Congressman HARRY J.

DAVENPORT also felt that the situation was probably too much for Pittsburgh to handle alone. He pressed for national legislation—something like the Lindbergh law—to protect women and children from attack and ravishment. Congressman DAVENPORT knew the score. His home is in Shadyside, just a block from where Jean Brusco—one of his constituents—was murdered. It was also in his district that little Carole Kensinger was done to death.

What's wrong in the fine, outstanding city at the confluence of the Allegheny and Monongahela? You don't have to go further than the nearest Pittsburgher to find the answer. The cabdriver will tell you. So will the lawyer, merchant, teacher and newspaper reporter. In fact, a good many honest cops will tell you too—if you don't quote them.

Mrs. Smith put her finger on it the day she and her women voters marched on the city council. "The only way that this problem can be solved is for the mayor and the council to remove politics from the police force. If you are going to make the streets of Pittsburgh safe for women and children, this is a must," she said.

To get the impact of this statement you have to know something about the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police. You have to know that police promotions are made without regard to standings in civil service examinations, that a man who makes a miserable 75 on a lieutenants' exam can get the job over a man who makes 98. You have to know that the job of detective in the Pittsburgh Police Department is like those jobs Grandma took during World War II—"No experience necessary." A man doesn't even have to be a cop to become a Pittsburgh detective. You have to know, too, that no one above the rank of lieutenant is protected by civil service. The detectives, inspectors and Superintendent Scott himself can be sacked at a moment's notice by the same political satraps who okayed their jobs in the first place.

To knowledgeable observers of American police systems this is what is known plainly and simply as a political police department. There are a few of them still around. Most have long since been fumigated.

BOSSSES RUIN POLICE MORALE

As Mrs. Smith put it to the city council—"It is common gossip that if you wish to be on the police force, a ward chairman or someone powerful in politics has to be your sponsor * * *. We realize that the largest police force in the world would continue to be inefficient as long as ward chairmen are permitted to exercise any control over the police department.

"When ward chairmen abuse their political power by bringing pressure to bear on policemen, forcing them to toe the line or be relegated to undesirable beats or shifts, forcing them to pitch in and round up the vote at election time, demanding that they turn a deaf ear to the rackets profitable to political bosses—then only a hard-hitting cleanup campaign, backed by the administration and citizens, determined to strip unscrupulous ward bosses of all control over police, can give us efficient, dependable police protection in Pittsburgh."

A number of police, in past years, have gone in for politicking on their own. It was common to find members of the police force doubling as ward chairmen, city committeemen or constables. A count early this year showed that 47 police officers were also members of the powerful Democratic City Committee. Four detectives doubled in the elective job of constable, and two detectives and an inspector were ward chairmen.

In April, red-faced at the political involvements of its police force, the city council passed an ordinance forbidding policemen to hold political office. While this would seem

elementary and obvious in most cities, in Pittsburgh it qualified as reform. Cops couldn't run for office any more; all they could do was finish out their terms, which, in the case of some cop-constables meant nearly six more years of political tenure.

I visited the headquarters of a combination cop-and-ward-chairman on primary day. He wasn't in.

"Where is he?" I asked another officer.

"He's out electioneering," the officer replied.

"But I thought cops couldn't hold office any more—"

The officer laughed. "Don't worry about that."

"But the cops are out of politics," I persisted, quoting a fine Mayor David L. Lawrence had said to me that morning.

"Yeah, sure," the officer replied with a grin. "If they're out of politics, they're out of a job."

When the citizens' crime committee was organized last winter, two of its leaders went to Mayor Lawrence, the generalissimo of Pittsburgh's Democratic machine, and asked him some straight-from-the-shoulder questions. The interview was not recorded nor was either of the crime committee representatives able to take it down verbatim. But both of them are ministers of the gospel, and they transcribed the proceedings immediately afterward.

THE MAYOR ANSWERS QUESTIONS

Here is a revelatory selection:

"Question. The ward chairman sponsors the men to be appointed or promoted in the police force. Do you believe that is right?"

"Answer (by Mayor Lawrence). Yes. They know the needs of their direct community and the men who could most ably do the job.

"Question. Would you be willing to make the (position of) superintendent of police a nonpolitical job?"

"Answer. No. The present system is more in keeping with the democratic process. A mayor should have the right to place men in positions that will help carry out his program."

Perhaps this is what the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette meant when it referred to the bureau of police as "a political auxiliary of the Democratic Party."

Certainly Mayor Lawrence knows that under the American system political parties do not have police auxiliaries. True, Lawrence is the Democratic national committeeman for Pennsylvania, but that doesn't make him the gaulter for Pittsburgh.

What kind of police service do the taxpayers get from Mayor Lawrence's political auxiliary?

One Pittsburgh woman tells of a bottle being thrown through her bedroom window at night, apparently by a prowler. Badly frightened, as any woman would be, she called the police. In an utter travesty on police work, they told her, "As soon as you find out who did it, we'll go out and arrest him."

Waiting lengthily for Pittsburgh's cops to show up, once they are summoned, is a common and rankling experience. The dilly-dally and delay in the Brusco case brought the matter to a shocking climax, and there was an ephemeral change for the better. But 3 months later, Ray Sprigle, hard-hitting reporter for the Post-Gazette, again wanted to know, "Why does a citizen with murder on his doorstep, or armed prowlers breaking into his home, have to wait interminably for police to answer his call?"

Fed up with the police, some Pittsburgh citizens have hired their own private protection. In the fine neighborhoods of Schenley Farms and Breeze Point, residents pay special guards to give their homes and families some measure of security. A businessman and members of the Citizens Crime

Committee, living in Squirrel Hill, remarked, "If I were to leave my home on vacation, I would inform the private guards. But I wouldn't bother telling the police—I don't think that would do any good."

The detective division, which Pittsburghers depend upon to solve their crimes, hardly adds to their confidence. The fantastic fact that no experience is necessary has resulted in a force of headquarters detectives in which only 12 men out of 35 have had any previous service whatever on the police force. Others have been appointed smack out of civilian life, their previous vocations including that of truck driver, barber, pugilist, hotel clerk, and sidewalk pitchman.

Sprigle reported in the Post-Gazette, "Neither Superintendent of Police Harvey Scott nor Director of Safety George E. A. Fairley ever has had a hand in appointing a detective. Appointments come directly from city hall at the behest of ward chairmen."

Inspector Adam A. Geisler, Pittsburgh's new chief of detectives, instituted a few reforms since his appointment in February. He will suspend any man who is caught drinking while on duty. What's more, he doesn't want detectives pursuing criminals by streetcar any more—he thinks it's high time they use automobiles. In Pittsburgh, this too is reform.

Willard Schauer, formerly a sergeant of the Pennsylvania State Police and now a reporter for the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, is constantly agog at local police operations. Well trained by the troopers, he marvels at the city's Keystone coppery. Schauer recalls the murder of a jeweler in 1948 which, despite the fact that 6 shots were fired, the police at first labeled a suicide. Apparently they went on the theory that the jeweler was a bad marksman—he missed himself 4 times, then hit himself twice.

When eventually they agreed that this had obviously been an exchange of bullets with a holdup man (the showcases were shot up and there was a blob of blood near the door), Schauer suggested, "Why not cut out this strip of linoleum with the blood on it? That's the blood of your murderer. It should be tested."

A police official replied, "I can't test it. I don't have the facilities."

The Pittsburgh Bureau of Police has neither of the two essentials of modern crime detection—a crime laboratory and a ballistics bureau. Recently, in response to popular clamor, it was announced that the county chemist's laboratory, wherein a major activity has been the testing of cement, would do some lab work for the police. And as for ballistics, Inspector Geisler said, "I use the ballistics man at the district attorney's office—when I can."

When he can't, Geisler has to pack a man off to Washington to get ballistics help from the FBI. Recently two men—an extra one from the coroner's office—went to Washington as escorts for 2 bullets. (Keep this up and the costs of transportation alone could equip a ballistics bureau.)

The police record bureau operates on what one official described with a straight face as "the 1-man system." Edward V. McFadden, a civilian carried on the police payroll as a messenger, does all the work single-handed for \$2,538 a year. Lucky that McFadden is a competent, hard-working citizen or Pittsburgh crime recording would be even more miserable than the FBI found it.

From top to bottom, the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police is run on a pinch-penny basis. Its 1950 budget is \$4,606,639, which even Director Fairley acknowledges is extremely small. Compare it to other cities' budgets—San Francisco, \$6,500,000; Boston, \$10,268,000; St. Louis, \$8,526,000; Washington, \$7,420,000. All you have to do is ride in a Pittsburgh police car to know how run-down the bureau's equipment is. I rode in one car in which it was almost impossible to shift

gears. I was glad we weren't chasing any bandits when the perspiring cop at the wheel tried to put it in high.

A NEW CAR—BUT NOT FOR COPS

Next morning I learned that the city of Pittsburgh had just bought a new car. For the cops? No, for the mayor. It cost \$5,384. When a newspaperman compared it to the personal carriage of the King of England, Mayor Lawrence delivered the classic retort, "It's just a regular custom-made machine."

The police radio station, WPIM, is in the dilapidated garage of the old Municipal Hospital. It is on top of Herron Hill, remote from any police station, and is manned by two dispatchers who are not policemen. They spell each other at the microphone. "Once I dozed off and woke up to find a rat staring me in the face," one of them related.

When I visited WPIM, late at night, the door downstairs was open and there wasn't a soul in the old garage except the two dispatchers upstairs in what is called the hayloft. Neither of them was armed. Suppose the visitor had been a thug? With just a sawed-off shotgun he could have held the dispatchers at bay, ordering them to send the radio cars on wild-goose chases while his buddies looted the town.

There is another horrifying consideration. Pittsburgh, called the "industrial heart of America, would be a prize plum for wartime saboteurs and subversives. Page 1 of the Nazi-Communist handbook reads, "Seize the radio stations—spread confusion." What a job could be done in that dilapidated old hayloft.

Upon the insistent demand of its newspapers and its Citizens Crime Committee, Pittsburgh has gone through some motions of reform in the past 9 months. Mayor Lawrence, a big gun in Pittsburgh politics long before he donned the robes of the mayoralty, knows just how to lower the public's temperature.

With much éclat, 100 policemen were added to the force after the Brusco murder. But the city still is 400 cops short.

Dramatically, the mayor doubled the night foot patrol. But what kind of patrol is it? At one police roll call, I heard a cop gently chided for selling newspapers on the corner when he was supposed to be walking a beat.

The city has been promised a new police communications center, modeled after the one in St. Louis. But a mere \$45,000 has been appropriated—and the St. Louis center cost at least a quarter of a million. Anyway, politicians have been promising Pittsburgh a modern police communications system since 1937.

OFFICIALS ARE BAWLED OUT

As a final blow for reform, Mayor Lawrence personally read the riot act to Director Fairley, Superintendent Scott, and all the inspectors and lieutenants on the police force. "We will not tolerate any further slovenly work anywhere in the department," he said in well-publicized bawlings out. Pittsburgh insiders chuckled.

"Here was the puppeteer, bawling out the puppets," one of them remarked.

The Post-Gazette called it window dressing to obscure the main job—the need for top-to-bottom excision of politics out of the police bureau. The citizens want a responsible police department. They want a police chief with the power to run his own department, to win praise if he runs it well, to get the ax if he botches it. They don't want the hidden hands of politicians pulling the strings.

A nucleus of good cops within the department are up in arms themselves. They are fed up with browbeating from cigar-chewing politicians. As one of them put it, "I'd give anything in the world to throw a ward chairman in the clink—instead of having to lick his boots."

The Fraternal Order of Police has sponsored legislation, vainly so far, to get what any self-respecting police department must have: promotions in order of merit, appointment of detectives from the ranks, and independence from politics. Only then will a policeman put his heart in his work—and make Pittsburgh safe.

The Citizens Crime Committee, proceeding with delicacy, wants to give Mayor Lawrence himself a chance to free the police bureau before the citizens unlimber any big guns. "Our first objective is to get the city administration to do its own house cleaning," Dean Moor stated.

Less delicately, but to the same purpose, the Post-Gazette declared, "The police bureau will never be worth a darn until its members know * * * that their assignments and promotions will be based upon merit alone, and that they and their superiors will not be subject to the dictates of the city's 32 ward chairmen. The mayor and only the mayor has it in his power to make these reforms."

It would seem—if you want to take Pittsburgh's word for it—that Mayor David L. Lawrence has his work cut out for him.

The situation up there was so serious that the Congressman from that district, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT], felt called upon to protest, and on the first page of this article there is a photograph which, of course, cannot be printed in the RECORD, showing the gentleman from Pennsylvania appearing with some of the officers there evidently making a protest. The photograph is at the spot where this young woman was murdered just a few steps from the door of her home.

There is undoubtedly need for Federal legislation, and I might suggest that while the House Committee on Lobbying is investigating the organizations which advocate constitutional government, the right of petition, the right to a free press, the right to a free speech—and I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], who is a strong advocate of those rights, here—that while they are investigating the sources of the income of those groups the committee claims are lobbying, the committee might well turn its activities toward the city of Pittsburgh—I understand one of their counsel, or one who formerly was counsel, came from the city of Pittsburgh; I understand he has resigned since or his services dispensed with—that the committee turn its attention to the city of Pittsburgh and ascertain who it is that is doing the lobbying and who is doing the collecting of the funds in the city of Pittsburgh where robbery, rape, and murder are prevalent—lobbying and fund raising which buys the protection which the rapists, the robbers, the murderers, according to this news story enjoy. Take a look up that way, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], whose district is close to Pittsburgh, and see who is collecting the money and what lobbying is being carried on as a result of those collections and which, according to Collier's, enables the criminals to "get away with murder in Pittsburgh."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, my objection to S. 3357, when it came up on the

Consent Calendar 2 weeks ago, was not based upon the moral standpoint of the issue, but rather upon the fact that the State of Nevada has legalized gambling, and I had a legal and legitimate reason for objecting to the bill.

Personally, I believe that this is a measure which should be legislated upon by each individual State, and not by the Federal Government. We can all remember only too well the effects that the Volstead Act had upon this country, and the enactment of this present legislation would be a repetition of those results. You cannot legislate morals. I should like to quote from a letter which came to me from someone in the State of Texas, which reads as follows:

Just as so-called prohibition increased drinking, so the hide-out for slot machines increases gambling. Being a rather regular visitor to your fine country of Nevada, I have been impressed with the orderly conduct of both drinking and of gambling, as against our bootleg methods down here. Would that my friends, TOM CONNALLY and BOB POAGE, could go along with you and put a stop once and for all to such silly agitation as slot-machine fights.

However, as I said before, I objected to the bill to protect Nevada's legalized gambling interests. I should like to quote from a telegram which I received from the president of the First National Bank in Reno, Nev.:

Gambling is a legalized business in Nevada and you are to be complimented on your action in opposing S. 3357, since this bill as drawn would seriously affect the owners of coin machines and cripple this industry within our State. You have my support and I have asked our chamber of commerce to voice their approval of your action. We trust that the bill now being reviewed by the Rules Committee may be so amended that it will not affect transportation of gambling devices including coin machines and parts either into Nevada or to points outside of the State and return following repairs. Final bill should be so drawn as not to require enabling legislation by Nevada. Your efforts appreciated.

I am also acting upon the advice of the Reno Chamber of Commerce and the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce, from whom I have received telegrams, as well as many individual concerns who will be hurt by this measure.

AUGUST 18, 1950.

HON. WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman from Nevada,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Board action taken by this chamber commends you for initiative in sponsoring amendment to S. 3357 regulating interstate shipment of slot machines. Unless amendment is adopted permitting interstate transit between the points of origin and Nevada, operators face serious operating handicaps. Respectfully urge your usual vigilance and continued efforts toward passage this amendment. Kindest regards.

J. M. McQUILKIN,
Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce.

AUGUST 17, 1950.

HON. WALTER S. BARING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We desire to thank you for your vigilance in trying to protect Nevada's interests in connection with S. 3357. Your amendment most certainly should be a part of the bill

and we have asked Senators McCARRAN and MALONE to give all possible support.

RENO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
WILLIAM BRUSSARD, *Manager*.

I have other telegrams here from the various political parties in my State which I will not read at this time. But I want to point out a few of the issues at stake here. The supplemental report of the committee says that they had no public hearings. That was the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the other body. I do not think any bill should come up on the floor of the House without any public hearings. Nearly every one of you gentlemen have slot-machine interests in the States which which you represent, such as officers' clubs in the camps, the Moose, Elks, American Legion and various other organizations which sponsor such good organizations as the Girl Scouts and the Boy Scouts with the proceeds made from these machines.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARING. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. I think the gentleman need not be too concerned about this because it is really superficial. As I look at the bill, they can still manufacture the parts and send the parts over the State line without being in violation of the law. Is that not correct?

Mr. BARING. I do not believe that is so. I take exception to that interpretation of the bill.

Mr. LYLE. I would say it is entirely superficial because they can manufacture the parts wherever they please and send them wherever they please, and as I read the legislation, the parts could be assembled at any place, is that not correct? Therefore, it is purely a matter of sending the parts across the State line.

Mr. BARING. I appeared before the committee and tried to put in an amendment to that affect, which they refused to accept. I do not think that is in the bill. Perhaps some of you Members who are lawyers may be able to point out where that is.

Mr. LYLE. The point I am getting at is do you think the bill says that they cannot manufacture the parts and ship them across the State lines?

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

Mr. BARING. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe the gentleman will find that his interpretation of the language is a little different because it specifically states that the drum-type machines, or any parts thereof, cannot be shipped in interstate commerce or into a State where the machines are prohibited by law. I believe the gentleman will find the interpretation that he has placed on it is incorrect.

Mr. BARING. That is what I have been trying to find out.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to find out, too, may I point out to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. I have not found it in the bill.

Mr. BARING. I should like to say that after 3 months work by the committee and after 303 pages of testimony, there was still a doubt as to the lan-

guage of the bill. I refer you to the testimony of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT], which appears on page 303 of the committee report:

I would like to get an answer to that question because we do not agree on the interpretation of this language. I think from the questions that have been asked here, there are doubts in the minds of every member of the committee as to what this language means.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARING. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I believe the purpose of the committee was to make it possible to send into a State a part of a machine, if that machine is legal in a given State. I think the language of the bill very definitely provides that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. On the other hand, if a given machine is illegal in a State, that is, a gambling device, as is described in this legislation, then the parts to that particular machine likewise would be illegal.

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

Mr. BARING. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Referring to page 3 of the bill, paragraph 3, of section 2, where it says:

Any subassembly or essential part intended to be used in connection with any such machine or mechanical device—

That would be prohibited?

Mr. BARING. That is prohibited, yes.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARING. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. I understand the Federal Government collects a tax on each slot machine used.

Mr. BARING. Yes. The Government gets \$100 from every machine. Up to this time the Government has not been too "choosy" as to where they got this tax money. We are sparring around for new avenues to raise additional taxes. There is one concern in Nevada which pays nearly a million dollars in gambling taxes every year. The Government has the opportunity to collect revenue from all of the machines throughout the country. This year's tax bill increased the amount on each machine from \$100 to \$150.

Mr. HUBER. If this resolution is passed, then would the Federal Government collect a tax from machines in Nevada and not from the machines in other States?

Mr. BARING. That is a question of doubt. They could in Nevada, but presumably not in other States. However, you know there are thousands of machines in every Elk's Club and every other beneficial organization right now.

Mr. HARRIS. This bill does not repeal any provision of the tax law; so, consequently, if they are operating machines in a State where it is not prohibited, that would not prohibit the

Government from collecting the \$100 tax.

Mr. BARING. I still think it should be left up to the individual States. We are talking about socialized legislation. This is another chance of centralizing control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

There is a great deal of merit in what the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] has had to say. However, the question that is troubling him it appears to me might better be handled when the House goes into the Committee of the Whole. This measure is something in the nature of a blue-sky law and it is little respect or patience that I have ever had for such laws. The whole thing is hardly more than a piece of foolishness. However, public opinion has indicated it wants legislation, and I think the House should be given an opportunity to work its will upon the measure.

I therefore move the previous question on the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARING) there were—ayes 76, noes 3.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. 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. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

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. 3357) prohibiting transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, with Mr. JACKSON of Washington 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 Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is entitled to 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] to 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief in making a statement on this bill, for I think we all know what it is.

This is a bill that arose out of a meeting of the Attorney Generals' Conference on Organized Crime that met here in Washington in February of this year. The meeting was attended by the prosecuting officers of the States and their political subdivisions. They passed a resolution asking and demanding this particular legislation.

A bill prepared by the Department of Justice was introduced in the Senate and that bill passed the Senate within a very

brief period of time. It was then sent over to the House and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which I am a member. Your committee gave serious consideration to this bill. A similar bill was introduced in the House by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON]. When the Senate bill reached us the committee considered the two bills together, and inasmuch as the Senate bill had already passed that body we took the Senate bill and amended it in certain particulars, and those particulars are definitely set out in the report, which I hope the membership has read.

The gentleman from Nevada has misunderstood this bill entirely. This is not a matter of interfering with States' rights; it particularly reserves to the States the rights to have these one-armed bandits if they want them; there is no question about that. The legislatures of the various States of the Union, if they want to make the one-armed bandit, the slot machine, or any gambling device, if they want to make them legal, this bill does not interfere with them. This is only a policy of this Government which has been invoked for years and years. The Federal Government, so to speak, is the father of the children, the various States, and says that we will give them cooperation, that we will give them a little help when they want to enforce the criminal laws of their States. That is all it does.

Let me read an excerpt from the letter of the Attorney General, Mr. McGrath, written to the committee in connection with this bill. There is not a man within the sound of my voice who can object to this bill, as I see it, because it does not take any rights away from the States at all. It leaves in the State the right to control gambling. Here is the purpose and purport of the bill; here is what the Attorney General says:

In this approach your committee has complete agreement with the views of the Attorney General with respect to the purpose of the recommended legislation as stated by the representatives of the Attorney General in the course of the hearings.

The only thing that the Federal Government is being asked to do under this bill is to stop in the channels of commerce the shipment of these machines which the States are powerless to keep out of the channels of interstate commerce. Actual enforcement against those people who gamble or use these machines wrongfully in the States is left to the States, and with the legal officials, and there is absolutely no intention on the part of the Federal Government, express or implied, or otherwise in this bill or anything that accompanies it to get us into a prohibition era.

It just lends to these States, and there are some 44 States of this Nation that prohibits them, a little aid in enforcing their laws. The prosecuting attorneys of the various States in a seminar here in Washington, acting through the Justice Department, has asked this branch of the Government, their legislative body, to give them the power to keep these one-armed bandits from the channels of commerce. That is all there is to this; that is all we are asked to do. Of

course, in those places where the Government has jurisdiction these gambling devices are prohibited.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. BECKWORTH. There has been a good deal of concern expressed by those who are interested in what might be called the simple amusement machines and vending machines whether the legislation will apply to them.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. It excepts those specifically. If the gentleman will read the definition of the word "gambling" he will see that it excludes amusement devices, vending machines, and music boxes; it excludes all those. The main purpose is to get at the slot machines. That is a racket. The Crime Commission of California says that the people each year spend some \$2,000,000,000 on the slot machines, and they are owned and controlled by criminal syndicates.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the gentleman did propound a question that perhaps needs clarifying right at this point. The gentleman from Florida made a statement a moment ago that certain types of machines were specifically excluded. The language of the bill states that "gambling" as used in this act means—then it defines slot machines or any other machine or mechanical device the essential part of which is a drum or reel with an insignia thereon. That means these others are not specifically excluded, but by nature of the definition this includes only slot machines and such other machines with drums and reels?

In Georgia they have a law prohibiting slot machines.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Consequently this bill would prevent the transportation of interstate commerce and across State lines from Florida to Georgia or vice versa.

I want to say that during 1937 I was a member of the Florida Legislature and I helped sponsor a bill at that time to make the use and the possession of slot machines illegal. I am glad to have the opportunity now to assist, if I can, to prevent the channels of interstate commerce from being used to ship these slot machines or gambling devices into States in which they are illegal. So far as the other States that legalize them are concerned such as the State represented by my friend from Nevada, the machines can be shipped into those States.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the motives behind this bill. There is, however, one section I would like to call to the attention of the committee. I have an Army camp in my district and I have had numerous requests from enlisted men as well as

officers there who run the enlisted men's and officers' clubs. They call attention to section 5 of this bill which reads as follows:

SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, transport, possess, or use any gambling device in the District of Columbia, the Territories and possessions of the United States, on any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof or within Indian country as defined in 18 United States Code 1151.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. I understand from the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] that if this bill becomes law it will prohibit the transportation of all Florida slot machines into North Carolina and Georgia, and for that reason I am for the bill.

Mr. SUTTON. What I would like to bring to the attention of the committee is this: It so happens that these enlisted men's clubs, Army and Navy camp clubs, make their money for recreational purposes in their clubs off of their own slot machines. They do not rent them from gamblers. They own their own slot machines. The money that they get from these slot machines goes toward buying all of their recreational facilities. Your officers' clubs are in the same situation, although the officers add a little additional money out of their own pockets to buy baseballs and so forth. This will prohibit the enlisted men and their clubs and the officers and their clubs from using slot machines.

I think that this will actually hinder the morale of the boys in the camps. Some may get up and say, "Well, a boy should not be taught gambling in the Army or the Navy." Regardless of what you want to teach a boy 18 years of age in the Army or the Navy, he is going to gamble if he wants to. So I think if the committee would reconsider just a little and exempt those boys in the Army and in the Navy and permit a pastime which creates their recreational funds and which, in turn, buys the equipment that they need, that it would be a big moral factor to the boys in the Army and the Navy and also would not hurt a soul in the United States of America.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I want to say that the gentleman's interpretation is correct; that it is the intention of this legislation to exclude the operation of slot machines in enlisted men's clubs where it is prohibited by State law, as well as the officers' clubs, as well as in all fraternal organizations that may have machines.

Mr. SUTTON. Of course, the fraternal organizations are exempt from their use, but this prohibits the use on United States territory which, of course, are Army camps. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Elks, and so forth, can use slot machines; this does not prohibit them, but it prohibits

the shipment for use on Army bases, and Marine and Navy bases.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. I hope that the committee will reconsider that feature and that someone on the committee will offer an amendment to exclude the Army camps and the Navy camps. It is like I say, a boy 18 years of age, who is old enough to fight for his country, knows whether he should gamble or not. He is actually not gambling; he is donating to the recreational fund, for example, of the Army and the Navy clubs there. Actually he is donating, that is right; he is not gambling. You cannot get an enlisted man to reach down in his pocket and put up \$5 to buy a baseball bat or a glove, but he will pull these one-armed bandits down and in that way donate to the fund.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I trust there will be not too much misunderstanding about the language of this legislation. It does not in any way affect any club in an Army camp or in any other place in any State from operating machines, where it is lawful.

Mr. SUTTON. Oh, yes, the gentleman is wrong there.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It prohibits the transportation.

Mr. SUTTON. The use also. Let me read it:

It shall be unlawful to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, transport, possess, or use any gambling device in the District of Columbia, the Territories and possessions of the United States, on any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof or within Indian country as defined in 18 United States Code 1151.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman is talking about Federal property.

Mr. SUTTON. That is right. In other words, in Army camps or Navy camps they cannot even use them.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I want to congratulate the gentleman in making it so clear that what most people believe is, when they put their money in, that they are actually donating.

Mr. SUTTON. That is right.

Mr. JACOBS. I am wondering whether most people understand that, or whether that is what they have in mind.

Mr. SUTTON. They find it out anyhow.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Since listening to the colloquy between the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentlemen from Georgia and Florida as what is in this bill, I hope it is plain that it is not illegal to transport race horses and dogs into the State of Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, this legislation came to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the Senate in a very unsatisfactory form. It was objectionable from many standpoints. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted long hearings and has given the bill very careful consideration. The Attorney General of the United States made known to us that his interest in the legislation was due to a resolution that had been passed by the Conference of Attorneys General held in the city of Washington some months ago. The State attorneys general of the several States discussed, during their conference, many phases of vice and crime coming within their jurisdiction. They passed a resolution requesting the Federal Government to pass legislation that would assist them in making effectual the laws of their several States against slot-machine gambling. The legislation now before the House was considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the standpoint of passing legislation that would be helpful to the several States in supplementing their laws.

It is not the first time that the Federal Government, through the Congress, has passed legislation of this type. You will remember that under the Webb-Kenyon Act Congress enacted legislation that prohibited the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors into those States that had prohibition laws.

Congress also passed legislation making it a Federal offense to transport stolen automobiles from one State to another. Congress passed the Mann white-slavery act. It has passed an act which prohibits the interstate transportation of prison-made goods into certain States. It has even passed legislation which prohibits the interstate transportation of game birds contrary to State laws. Congress has also passed legislation which would prohibit the transportation of lottery tickets into States opposed to lotteries. One of the most outstanding illustrations of the passage of laws of this character was that known as the Connally hot-oil bill, which prohibits the interstate transportation of petroleum produced in States beyond the quota fixed by that particular State. However, there is a part of this bill as has just been mentioned by the gentleman from Tennessee where the Congress is called upon to legislate beyond this theory of supporting State laws, and that relates to the definite prohibition against the use of the gambling devices described in the bill in and upon lands or territories governed by the Federal Government. That would undoubtedly eliminate their use in servicemen's clubs throughout the country.

How much will be accomplished under this law depends upon the local enforcement officer. After all, whether there is any real enforcement of the law depends upon the attitude of the local prosecuting or law-enforcement officials. Too frequently, notwithstanding the fact that there are State laws prohibiting the use of these machines, it comes back to

the question whether the prosecuting official is going to prosecute, and I believe we are all aware of the fact that, in some instances at least, they do not prosecute. There are times when this is true because the sentiment of the people in their locality is not opposed to gambling. In such instances the law officer does nothing. It is an unfortunate condition whenever there is a disposition to ignore the law by the law-enforcement officials and the people are content to let them ignore the law.

In that connection I recently read a letter which was written to the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia and published in its issue of August 12, of this present year.

It illustrates very well the thought I have just expressed to you. It is as follows:

GAMBLING PROBLEM, AND WILLIAM PENN'S WORDS

Criticism of public officials seems to be the ruling fashion these days, and we hear little or nothing about the responsibility of the average citizen for prevailing conditions. Currently popular is the attack on our police for alleged loose handling of the gambling problem.

Gambling flourishes because it is supported by great numbers of citizens. So long as people are willing to risk thousands and millions of dollars on games of chance, there will be gambling to take it from them. When citizens stop feeding their money to the gamblers, the rackets will die of starvation.

These citizens should be jolted into a deeper sense of their individual responsibilities to help maintain good government. They should realize that no law can ever be enforced to any degree higher than the support for it which exists in the collective hearts and minds of the people themselves.

When in 1682 William Penn formulated the first rules by which our city and State were to be guided, he wrote these significant words:

"Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined, too. Wherefore governments depend rather upon men, than men upon governments. Let men be good, and the government cannot be bad. If it be ill, they will cure it. But if men are bad, let the government be ever so good, they will endeavor to warp and spoil it in their turn."

Certain it is that the higher the moral and spiritual tone of a community is, the better we may expect its government to be. There is a warning in Penn's words that we may well take to heart today.

Magistrate KELLER H. GILBERT.

If you will pardon a personal reference for a moment, I would like to say that I have had the responsibility of the enforcement of State laws. While I am in favor of the passage of this bill, because it has been asked by the State attorneys general as an assistance to them in the performance of their duty, I want to tell you that as far as this law is concerned, I am fearful that it is greatly overestimated as to the results that would be obtained. I never found any necessity, during the years that I was a law-enforcement official in New Jersey, to have a law of this character. It may be that others have had different experiences. I know that if you have the mind and the will to enforce the law it does not make any difference whether the machines are brought across a State line or where they

come from. They can be taken over and put out of business if the law officers have the will to do so. I never felt the lack of a Federal law to make it illegal to transport machines into New Jersey precluded me or made it more difficult for me to enforce the law. When they were brought into my county I saw that the machines were confiscated and the violators were brought to justice for violation of the gambling laws of the State of New Jersey.

I mention this not in a derogatory way as to this legislation, because I am in favor of this bill, and believe the law-enforcement officers are entitled to have all the help and support we can give them. Certainly, the conditions that prevail today make it necessary for good citizens to uphold the law and to assist those who, under difficulty at times, seek to enforce it. If it is the opinion of the State attorneys general and the United States Attorney General that this bill will be helpful to them, then they should have it and I am in favor of it.

In drawing this law, due recognition has been given to what may be the desire of the people in those States which are not opposed to gambling, such as Nevada and some other States. The bill gives recognition to that fact. This bill does not attempt to impose upon any State any law with respect to gambling. All the bill does is to say if a State has a law against gambling, then this law makes it illegal to transport into that State a slot machine for gambling purposes. It is supplemental to the State law and within the jurisdiction that applies to a Federal law. On the other hand, if a people of a State, such as that for which the gentleman from Nevada speaks, take a different view of it, there is no intention to change the law of that State. They, as the people of a sovereign State, fix the matter of policy with respect to gambling within their own State by the act of its legislature.

In conclusion, I wish to make the following general references to the provisions of the bill:

First. Definition of gambling devise: "Gambling devise" means, first, any slot-machine type of devise which when operated may deliver or entitle the operator to receive, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property; second, any machine or mechanical device which is designed to operate by means of the insertion of a coin, token, or similar object, so that when operated it may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property; third, any subassembly or essential part intended to be used in connection with any such machine.

Second. Transporting gambling devices in interstate commerce: It is made unlawful knowingly to transport any gambling device to any place in a State, the District of Columbia, or a Territory or possession of the United States, from outside such State, District, and so forth, except that this shall not apply to such transportation to a State or to a subdivision thereof as to which this provision shall be made inapplicable by enactment of State law.

This shall not be taken to reduce the authority of the Federal Trade Commission.

Third. Registration and reports of manufacturers and dealers: Each manufacturer and dealer in gambling devices, when commencing business and yearly thereafter on or before July 1, is required, first, to register with the Attorney General; and second, to file with the Attorney General a monthly record of all sales and deliveries of gambling devices, showing the mark and number identifying each article and the name and address of the buyer or consignee thereof and the carrier. Duplicate bills or invoices may be used for this.

Fourth. Identification of gambling devices and packages: Each device, or part thereof, if shipped in unassembled form, must be made individually identifiable by the manufacturer or dealer.

All such devices and packages containing them, when transported, shall be plainly marked to show the name and address of the shipper and the consignee and the nature of the article or contents.

Fifth. Prohibition of gambling devices within Federal Territorial jurisdiction: The manufacture, sale, reconditioning, repair, transporting, possessing or using, and so forth, any gambling device in the District of Columbia, Indian lands, Federal lands, or Territories or possessions of the United States, is made unlawful.

Sixth. Penalties: A fine of \$5,000 and/or imprisonment for 2 years is provided for violations of numbers 2 to 5, above.

Any gambling device manufacturer, shipped, repaired, sold, possessed, and so forth, in violation of the above shall be seized and forfeited to the United States, and all laws relating to seizure, forfeiture, and condemnation, and so forth, for violation of the customs laws shall apply where not inconsistent with the above.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Do you not think while we are doing this, if we are going to outlaw gambling, that we are going off half cocked; that we should put in pari-mutuels and other gambling devices, as well as slot machines?

Mr. WOLVERTON. When you ask my opinion with respect to that I can answer only from a personal standpoint. My personal feeling is that I have no use for gambling. It does not do anybody any good. I have seen too many ill effects that have resulted from gambling. So that I can only answer the question you propose from a personal standpoint. I leave it to every Member to answer according to his own conscience, based upon his own experience.

Mr. SUTTON. But if we are going to regulate gambling, do you not think we should go all the way and not come up with just one little item here? The slot machine is not the big gambling item in the United States of America.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Well, I do not know anything about that myself. This bill is the result of what the Attorney General of the United States asked us

to do as a result of a conference that was held by the State attorneys general of the several States, and we are giving them what they asked for.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman said the committee was careful that no infringement would be made upon any one particular State. I refer to section 2, line 11, which definitely states that Nevada, for example, will have to pass enabling legislation when the next legislature meets, in order to fit the requirements of this bill. In other words, for the next 4 or 5 months, between now and the time the legislature meets, we will be violating the Federal law in Nevada; that is, until the next legislature meets.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Does the gentleman have any idea that Nevada would not pass such a law?

Mr. BARING. Nevada has legalized gambling and they will pass such a law; but in the meantime we would be in violation of this act.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I do not believe that you would be if you have those powers now.

Mr. BARING. Pardon me, but the bill contains the following statement:

This section shall not apply to the transportation of any gambling device to a place in any State which has enacted a law providing for the exception of such State from the provisions of this section.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think I am correct in my interpretation. I do not think that any one would seriously contend other than that, under present conditions, gambling would be approved in the State of Nevada. Gambling is being conducted there at the present time under State law. The gambling machines are operating, are they not? There is nothing in this bill that would stop the gambling machines that are there now from being used. All that is done in this bill for the time being at least so far as Nevada, is concerned, is to stop the transportation of slot machines into the State of Nevada until it passes legislation in conformity with the provisions of this bill. There are gambling machines operating there now. This bill does not interfere with them, nor take from the State of Nevada the right to operate them so long as the people of that State legalize them to do so.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would like to refer to a comment that this would be more or less an idle gesture unless it were enforced, and the gentleman has expressed himself that that depends for enforcement on the law-enforcement officer. Would the gentleman estimate how many hundreds and hundreds of United States marshals it would take to attempt to enforce this law if it were to be enforced by the Federal Government?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am not able to estimate under the present administration how many it would take.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Obviously it means that the State authorities and the local authorities would bear the brunt of carrying on the burden of the enforcement of this act. Is not that true?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think that is true. The members of the House committee in bringing this legislation to the House have recognized that the Congress does not have the authority of deciding for any State the right or the wrong of gambling. That is a matter entirely with the jurisdiction of the State. It is left entirely to the individual State to work its will in this respect. I believe the bill is good legislation and should be approved by the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the gentleman from Nevada that he is under a misapprehension as to the effect of this law. Nevada can operate all the machines within its borders and can manufacture new ones if Nevada desires without any new law. This does not affect that at all. I understand there are approximately 69,000 slot machines in existence at the present time on which they are collecting taxes.

Mr. BARING. The gentleman from Florida has made several statements here and has declined to yield to me although I yielded to him.

First of all, I care not what any other State does. I am controlled by the State of Nevada, alone, and not by the syndicates. I am acting here today under the direction of the chambers of commerce from our various sections in the State, as well as bank presidents and others who have written me, including the various political parties in the State. I am a States' rights Democrat. I believe that we should sustain our States' rights, for when the Government starts making these controls we approach a socialized form of government. These are controls which each State should handle for itself. Now, in regard to another subject, there has been a lot of talk here as to whether other machines should be included.

The language is very discriminatory. It refers only to the drum-type slot machines. The gentleman knows that there are various types of slot machines. There is the flat-top type that has a pay box on it. There are also the race-horse machines, and numerous others. They could take the pay boxes off the machines and ship them. Then they would not be gambling devices. The pay box can be shipped out in a suitcase and put on again at its destination, in whatever State that may happen to be. Therefore, the language of the bill makes this legislation discriminatory. Why should one particular type of manufacturer have to suffer at the expense of others?

There are thousands and thousands of men working in these manufacturing plants in Chicago and probably at other big cities who will be thrown out of work if this bill is passed.

Personally, I hope that the legislation will be defeated. I have several letters

here I would like to put in the RECORD just to show that I am not standing alone in this matter. Here is one from the mayor of the town of Marksville, La., and it reads as follows:

MARKSVILLE, LA., August 17, 1950.

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN,
Congressman, Eighth Congressional
District, State of Louisiana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALLEN: We understand that there is now a bill pending in Congress which, if passed, will prohibit the shipping of slot machines from State to State.

Now, we of the town of Marksville are very much opposed to this measure, since we owe all of our progress for the past 4 years directly to slot machines.

We are definitely opposed to the wording of the present bill, as it will jeopardize the future of the town of Marksville.

Please give Mr. Walter Young, vice president of O. D. Jennings & Co. an audience.

Mr. Young will call on you in the near future, at your office in Washington.

Trusting that you will give this matter your serious attention from every angle and hoping that this bill is defeated.

Thanking you in advance for what you might do in our behalf, I remain,

Yours very truly,

ALTON R. DENUX,
Mayor, Town of Marksville.

Mr. Chairman, I also have here a letter from the American President Lines reading as follows:

AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES,
Washington, D. C., August 21, 1950.

The Honorable WALTER S. BARING,
Representative at Large,
State of Nevada,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARING: I have been watching with a great deal of interest your unflinching efforts to clarify and combat some of the provisions contained in S. 3357, designed to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The shipping industry has no desire to offer opposition to legislation designed to outlaw gambling devices in areas where the individual States deem it in the best interests of their citizens, but it is concerned over the foreign-commerce position, as it places American-flag passenger vessels at a definite disadvantage to those of foreign-flag registry.

We do not believe that it is actually the intent to enact legislation that seeks to prohibit the use of slot machines on the open sea beyond the territorial limits of the United States aboard common-carrier vessels operating in interstate and foreign commerce. The transportation of these machines as cargo between two States prohibiting the use of such devices is an entirely different question and for that reason some clarification as to the actual intent is certainly desirable under the circumstances.

At this writing it is unknown just what action will result from the proposed legislation, but we do want you to know that your efforts have not gone unnoticed nor unappreciated.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE KILLION,
President.

Mr. Chairman, may I also call attention to the list of parts in these machines. There are some 300 parts which are used in making these slot machines and you can find them in any hardware store in the United States. It would put every hardware dealer in the United States under jeopardy if the provisions of this act were passed.

I have several statements in regard to that, including one from the Guardian Electrical Manufacturing Co.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I shall quote briefly from this letter of the Guardian Electric Manufacturing Co. as follows:

AUGUST 24, 1950.

J. HOWARD McGRATH,
Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has just come to our attention that description (3) under bill S. 3357, Union Calendar No. 988 of the Eighty-first Congress, an act to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, that this description in section 1 states that "any subassembly or essential part intended to be used in connection with any such machine or mechanical device" would be included in the term "gambling device."

This third description would, in our opinion, make it impossible to police our approximately 3,000 customers, many of whom make amusement devices, and some of whom make amusement as well as gambling devices, as defined in the first two sections of the bill. The parts are often interchangeable, and we will have absolutely no way of knowing whether or not these devices were for gambling or for amusement.

Also, since the end of the war, a great many of the surplus parts which we manufactured were sold by the Government, and many of these found their way to the various electrically operated devices, some of which were gambling devices. If we sold a part originally designed as a service device, it would have, under the terms of this bill, become a part of a gambling device inadvertently, in case the customer was using the part for such purposes.

To sum up, it would be absolutely impossible for this company to determine whether or not the items it manufactures would be used in gambling devices. We believe that there are a great many other companies who manufacture such parts as light sockets, wire, transformers, vacuum tubes, relays, resistors, and such similar parts, that would be in exactly the same situation. We could not assume the responsibility of the investigations that would become necessary under the terms of the bill as outlined above, because it would require us to check every customer we have, on every order they send us.

We would deeply appreciate any information from your office that would tend to right the situation so that we would not have to comply with such an unworkable ruling.

Very truly yours,

GUARDIAN ELECTRIC MANUFACTURING CO.

J. J. ROWELL, Secretary.

You are going to have a lot of manufacturers wondering whether they are actually violating Federal laws if this bill goes through.

I would like to see one amendment adopted, which would help the State of Nevada, and that would be to give us the right to send these machines back to the maker if in need of repair, or in exchange.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to refer to the statement made in com-

mittee by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT]:

I agree that the Federal Government should not concern itself with matters involving enforcement of gambling laws on a local basis.

Mr. Chairman, that is a very good statement from the standpoint that if the Government goes in and enforces this type of law, there are countless organizations throughout the country which will suffer. We have Boy Scouts, the Moose Lodge, the Elks Club, and various organizations all over the country whose clubhouses are sustained by the use of slot machines. If this law is enacted, these clubs and organizations will suffer, and I do believe that this legislation should be sent back to the committee for further study.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has again expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I feel differently about this legislation than does my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], who calls it tomfoolery. It was not tomfoolery when the Congress wrote the kidnapping law, nor when they wrote the law prohibiting the interstate shipment of stolen automobiles, or the antilobby law, and this is not tomfoolery today. The Attorney General's Crime Conference devoted much time in making a very thorough investigation before they made their recommendations for the enactment of this legislation now, with reference to the enforcement of the law if passed.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] spoke about his doubts in this connection, but I would like to say that all States do not impose upon the Attorney General the responsibility of enforcing the laws. In some States, as in my own and many others, the Attorney General is the legal adviser to the Governor and the State agencies, and he assists in carrying all cases to the appellate courts. He is not a law enforcement officer. Generally speaking, that is the responsibility of the sheriff; in some instances the State police, and in some instances the county police, and in some instances the municipal police.

Now, in answer to what the gentleman from Nevada said about parts in a hardware store: Yes, you can go into a hardware store and get a common nut or bolt or a spring, perhaps, but you do not find in any hardware store of this country these discs with the bells, the lemons, and the cherries on them. You cannot tell me that you can find such a gadget in any hardware store in the country. Why, this is one of the most ingenious devices ever made, and when you strike at the interstate shipment of parts, it would be absolutely necessary to include parts if you are going to make complete the purposes of the legislation and if you are going to effect the desired result. So, have no fear about any hardware merchant or manufacturer quaking in his boots about something that he might have on his shelf in his hardware store,

because he does not carry spare parts for slot machines; no, he does not do that.

Now, about the officers' clubs and the enlisted men's clubs that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is concerned about. In the establishment of enlisted men's clubs and officers' clubs during this present emergency on new bases and camps there will not be any cash to buy slot machines. They have no funds on hand. They have no money, so consequently they cannot at this time begin to put these machines into the enlisted men's clubs or the officers' clubs, except on a profit-splitting basis.

When the committee was considering this bill, one of the operators from Virginia came to my office and he said, "I would like to have you come with me to the officers' club in Virginia and let me show you how they are pegged up." He said, "I give them a very fair break." So, he put them in there, and they have them all over the country. Now, I have no time or sympathy with this proposition of operating slot machines on military posts. You are just helping him squander his pay, that is all. You are just helping him throw his money away when he gets about half tanked on beer in the PX, and he waddles over there and puts his money in there, money he ought to be sending home to his wife and children, the people we were pleading for here the other day, and properly so, when we passed the Family Allotment Act. No, do not let us help these boys squander their money and let the sharpies have it.

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

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. When you talk about that boy who gets souped up by buying beer in the PX, would you not rather have him put that money into a recreational fund than go across the street and spend it for foolishness?

Mr. PRESTON. I do not want some character who lives in luxury, collecting this money and taking it out of the pockets of these boys.

Mr. SUTTON. It is not always a thug who goes in and collects this money. In Fort Campbell those boys own their own slot machines.

Mr. PRESTON. There are exceptions, I grant to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Let us not get weak in the knees here today about this legislation. Let us put this law on the statute books and let us state to the Attorney General, "We are going to help you." And let not anyone say that they are not going to vote for this because they believe in States' rights, or civil rights. My friends, we are not interfering with the several States. Let every State do what they want to do on this subject. We have passed other legislation to help the various States, and this will do the same thing.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have never suffered any violence at the hands of the one-armed bandit. At rare intervals they have been tolerated in my section of the country. I support this legislation for the reason that I believe it is the supreme purpose of law

to make it as easy as possible for people to do right, and as hard as possible for them to do wrong. Old and hardened gamblers and men who have money to waste are not apt to be hurt by the one-armed bandit, but schoolboys and people who cannot afford to lose money are the victims of these machines. I can understand why the people of Nevada might favor this of means of income. I assume if the people of Nevada were the only people who played these slot machines out there, they would not reap a very good harvest. But you know it was Barnum, I believe, who said that a sucker is born every minute. I think there is a bigger output of suckers than one a minute. There is a flood of suckers born every minute; and when those suckers from somewhere else go to Nevada, that is where the one-armed bandit gets in his work.

Of course, I suppose if a fellow has money enough to get in an automobile and visit that pleasure spot, I imagine he would have money enough to get back home after he has played the slot machines. But I was especially struck by one statement made by my good friend from Nevada who said that the Boy Scouts out there could not properly function and prosper if we passed this legislation.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to correct that statement.

Mr. JENNINGS. Just what did you say about the Boy Scouts?

Mr. BARING. The American Legion and other beneficial organizations operate them so they may get funds which go to support the Boy Scouts.

Mr. JENNINGS. I understood you to say something about the Boy Scouts.

Mr. BARING. I am sorry if you got the information in that light. I meant the American Legion sponsored Boy Scout meetings.

Mr. JENNINGS. Of course I would not impute anything to my good friend which he did not say, but it just struck me with peculiar force that if the Boy Scouts are dependent for the growth and success of their organization by being attracted or lured into the organization by reason of an opportunity to put their few nickels into a one-armed bandit, that would probably have a bad effect upon the Boy Scouts.

I favor this bill because I know that the more opportunities there are for gambling the more widespread it becomes. Of course I know enough about the violation of anti-liquor laws and anti-gambling laws to know that where the State laws forbid that sort of calling—if you should designate it as such—somebody has to pay off somebody whose sworn duty it is to uphold the law.

But let us make it just as hard as possible for people to indulge in, foster, or promote gambling and carry on their nefarious practices.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Before I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, I wish to make this statement for the information of the committee. This proposed legislation has been approved in principle by the Attorney General, the Department of State, the Treasury Department, the Department of Com-

merce, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget. All of them approve of it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, in rearing my son I have always tried, and successfully, I believe, to teach him that he had no right to take anything from anyone without rendering a service or giving up something of value. The instinct that makes a man gamble is the same instinct, different in degree only, that makes a man steal. He wants something for nothing. That is why it has been made unlawful.

But the greatest objections to gambling and gambling devices, and slot machines, is that it corrupts law-enforcing machinery, as has been noticed here today. It is usually the easy money boys that finance themselves through slot machines and other forms of gambling, and they pass on to bigger things.

For example, Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the Members to the Appendix page A6103, a statement placed in the RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], in which he mentions a lobbyist by the name of Samuel P. Haines, who has contingent-fee contracts for trying to influence legislation in this Congress. I know a good deal about Mr. Haines. He is a constituent of mine. I am not always proud of my constituents, but let me say this, and I hope the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia will read the RECORD. This gentleman lives at 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., and I understand he has a battery of slot machines in his basement. He admits having one. He has got a sign up over them that says "For charity." A lot of people who operate gambling have some little bit taken out for charity. I think in this case Mr. Haines is going on the old adage that charity begins at home.

But what are we doing here? Are we not exercising the constitutional prerogative to regulate interstate commerce? The States cannot regulate interstate commerce. The Federal Government must do so. Yet, through the channels of interstate commerce flow these devices that do nothing but corrupt, in that they teach young people to try to get something for nothing. I would think they would learn mighty quick that they cannot, but they do not seem to.

As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] said, when you put money in them you are donating it to something, and it doesn't take long to donate it, either.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. JACOBS. But I understand that 44 States have outlawed slot machines, and the Federal Government has jurisdiction over interstate commerce. Shall the Federal Government be so helpless and unhelpful that it cannot and will not cleanse the flow of commerce over which

it has jurisdiction, and in aid of the 44 States that outlaw slot machines? Now, actually I think this law will have a very salutary effect.

There is one angle that has not been explained here. If it is unlawful to ship slot machines into a State, then it will be a conspiracy for anyone to participate in a scheme to bring slot machines within the State. It is a well-known fact that once in a while—perhaps not too often, but as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] mentioned—law-enforcement officials have a great deal of knowledge of these slot machines, and where they came from, and it has even been known that raids were conducted by sheriffs, and the slot machines were not used up by sledge hammers. In fact, it was a hijacking proposition, to get the slot machines into the hands of other operators. Those men will come under the conspiracy laws if they cooperate to violate this law by bringing slot machines into a forbidden State. I believe the gentleman from Tennessee will agree with that. Believe me, this ilk do not like to enter into conspiracies where Uncle Sam can move against them. In my opinion, if this law is passed it will stop the traffic in slot machines, which I understand are largely manufactured in Cook County, Ill. I think it will stop the shipment of slot machines. In my opinion, it should be stopped, and this bill should be enacted.

I would like to say with reference to slot machines in the PX's: You ask the mothers of this country whether they want those machines in the PX's to teach their sons to gamble, and you will get the answer, because the whole business of the slot machine is a great deal like the fellow who operated a restaurant and charged his customers \$2 for a ham sandwich. The customer said, "Why do you charge me \$2 for a ham sandwich?" And he said, "Because I need the money."

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

Mr. JACOBS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BARING. Will the gentleman vote for this bill if pari-mutuel machines, racing horses, and racing dogs are included?

Mr. JACOBS. I would have to see the language of the amendment, naturally. I may also say this to the gentleman, a slot machine is good for no earthly thing except to gamble. I can ride a horse; I cannot ride a slot machine.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BARING. Does the gentleman mean to say he cannot gamble on horses?

Mr. JACOBS. I can take a copy of the Scriptures and gamble on it; I can bet you that you will cut the book at a certain page with a knife. But I am talking about a device that has no earthly use in the world that anyone has ever been able to think of except as a gambling device. The Bible has other uses. I did suggest once that a slot machine would make a good piggy-bank, because it is harder to get your money out of it than a piggy-bank.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from South Carolina the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for a total of 3½ minutes to conclude general debate.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I am indebted to my colleague, Congressman ROGERS of Florida, for the privilege of thus closing the debate in favor of S. 3357. I am not surprised to find Representative ROGERS so wholeheartedly in favor of this type of legislation. It is generally known that he is one of the most adroit Members of the House, that he is constantly on the alert, either sponsoring or supporting measures that will work for the good of our great country.

Previous speakers have indicated their opposition to this measure on the ground that it impinges States' rights. I happen to be from the State which might rightfully claim to be the originator of the theory of States' rights. Of course, I am in favor of States' rights. In supporting this measure, I can see no conflict between States' rights and the provisions of this proposed law.

Surely a community has reached bottom when it publicly admits that its existence is solely dependent upon the profits from gambling. I was surprised to hear our colleague from Nevada read a letter, which I believe he said was from Louisiana, stating that all of that particular community's progress had been made from legalized gambling.

I have thought that most of us are potential gamblers. In a sense, life itself is but a gamble. I have noticed youngsters, including my own, and in fact remember from my own experience when I was much younger, have a desire to gamble. There are those of us who have weaker tendencies than others in one direction or another. I think we should try to protect at least the youth of the land from the temptation of the gambling devices set out in the provisions of this bill. The accessibility or availability of these gambling devices is a great temptation. I realize that it is difficult to improve morals by legislation. We can, however, minimize if not remove altogether some of the temptations which confront our younger people. I would not complicate the controversy by injecting whisky or dope into the discussion because the evils surrounding either liquor, dope, or gambling are sufficient for one debate. I am told, however, that, among the population of this country generally, one person in 3,000 becomes a dope addict. Whereas, among the doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and others with medical knowledge, one in every 100 becomes an addict. I do not know whether this is a correct statement or not, but the point I am trying to make is that the availability of accessibility of morphine, like that of gambling devices, constitutes a temptation to which some of our finest people yield.

It will be observed under the terms of the bill that no effort is made to control, regulate, or affect intrastate activities. The States themselves cannot legislate concerning interstate matters. Thus not only the privilege but the express duty of the Congress is to enact proper measures affecting interstate transactions. The distinguished minority member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has listed the many measures heretofore enacted by Congress on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. Time for general debate has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act the term "gambling device" means any machine or mechanical device, or parts thereof, designed or adapted for gambling or any use by which the user as a result of the application of any element of chance may become entitled to receive, directly or indirectly, any thing of value.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce any gambling device, or knowingly to take, receive, possess, or dispose of any gambling device transported in violation of this act: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to the course of unbroken interstate transportation of any gambling device into any State where the use of such device is legal, as certified by the governor of the State to the Attorney General of the United States and published by the Attorney General in the Federal Register. In the absence of such certification and publication, the use of gambling devices in any State shall, for the purposes of this act, be presumed to be illegal; and all persons and officials affected by the provisions of this act shall be entitled to act in reliance upon the presumption.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with or reduce the authority, or the existing interpretations of the authority, of the Federal Trade Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 41-58).

SEC. 3. Upon first engaging in business, and thereafter on or before the 1st day of July of each year, every manufacturer of and dealer in gambling devices shall register with the collector of internal revenue for each district in which such business is to be carried on, his name or trade name, the address of his principal place of business, and the addresses of his places of business in such district. On or before the last day of each month every manufacturer of and dealer in gambling devices shall file with the collector of internal revenue for each district in which he maintains a place or places of business an inventory and record of all sales and deliveries of gambling devices as of the close of the preceding calendar month for the place or places of business in the district. The monthly record of sales and deliveries of such gambling devices shall show the mark and number identifying each article together with the name and address of the buyer or consignee thereof and the name and address of the carrier. Duplicate bills or invoices, if complete in the foregoing respects, may be used in filing the record of sales and deliveries. For the purpose of this act, every manufacturer or dealer shall mark and number each gambling device so that it is individually identifiable. In cases of sale, delivery, or shipment of gambling devices in unassembled form, the manufacturer or dealer shall separately mark and number the components of each gambling device which a common

mark and number as if it were an assembled gambling device. It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to sell, deliver, or ship any gambling device which is not marked and numbered for identification as herein provided; and it shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, deliver, or ship any gambling device without having registered as required by this section, or without filing monthly the required inventories and records of sales and deliveries.

Sec. 4. All gambling devices, and all packages containing any such, when shipped or transported shall be plainly and clearly labeled or marked so that the name and address of the shipper and of the consignee, and the nature of the article or the contents of the package may be readily ascertained on an inspection of the outside of the article or package.

Sec. 5. It shall be unlawful to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, transport, possess, or use any gambling device in the District of Columbia, the Territories and possessions of the United States, on any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof or within Indian country as defined in 18 United States Code 1151.

Sec. 6. Whoever violates any of the provisions of section 2 or 5 of this act shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Whoever violates any of the provisions of sections 3 or 4 of this act shall be fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Sec. 7. Any gambling device transported, delivered, shipped, manufactured, reconditioned, repaired, sold, disposed of, received, possessed, or used in violation of the provisions of this act shall be seized and forfeited to the United States. All provisions of law relating to the seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of vessels, vehicles, merchandise, and baggage for violation of the customs laws; the disposition of such vessels, vehicles, merchandise, and baggage or the proceeds from the sale thereof; the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures; and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this act, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof: *Provided*, That such duties as are imposed upon the collector of customs or any other person with respect to the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, merchandise, and baggage under the customs laws shall be performed with respect to seizures and forfeitures of gambling devices under this act by such officers, agents, or other persons as may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Attorney General.

Sec. 8. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are declared to be severable.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and that it be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 10, inclusive, and lines 1 to 13, inclusive, on page 2 and insert the following:

"That as used in this act the term 'gambling device means—

"(1) any so-called slot machine or any other machine or mechanical device an essential part of which is a drum or reel with insignia thereon, and (A) which when operated may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, or (B) by the operation of which a person may become entitled to receive, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property; or

"(2) any machine or mechanical device designed and manufactured to operate by means of insertion of a coin, token, or similar object and designed and manufactured so that when operated it may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property; or

"(3) any subassembly or essential part intended to be used in connection with any such machine or mechanical device.

"Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport any gambling device to any place in a State, the District of Columbia, or a Territory or possession of the United States from any place outside of such State, the District of Columbia, or a Territory or possession: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to transportation of any gambling device to a place in any State which has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such State from the provisions of this section, or to a place in any subdivision of a State if the State in which such subdivision is located has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such subdivision from the provisions of this section."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment for clarification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida to the committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out lines 14, 15, and 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That as used in this act—

"(a) The term 'gambling device' means—

"(1) any so-called slot machine or any other machine or mechanical device an essential part of which."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment to the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida to the committee amendment: On page 3, after line 6, insert the following:

"(b) The term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"(c) The term 'possession of the United States' means any possession of the United States which is not named in paragraph (b) of this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida to the committee amendment: On page 3, in line 9, strike out "Territory or"; and in line 11 strike out "a Territory or."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 2, strike out "collector of internal revenue for each district in which such business is to be carried on" and insert "Attorney General."

Page 4, line 8, strike out "collector of internal revenue for each district in which he maintains a place or places of business" and insert "Attorney General."

Page 5, line 24, after the figure "2" insert "3", "4."

Page 6, strike out lines 1 to 3, inclusive.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Page 5, line 18, strike out "the Territories and possessions" and insert in lieu thereof "in any possession."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, lines 19 to 21, strike out "on any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof."

Page 5, line 22, strike out "18 United States Code 1151" and insert "section 1151 of title 18 of the United States Code or within the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States as defined in section 7 of title 18 of the United States Code."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, the members of my committee have asked me if I would explain this amendment, which, as those of you who heard it read know, is technical in nature in the sense that it refers to another provision of the United States Code and to the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States as defined in section 7 of title 18. What that does is broaden the coverage of the section so that it will apply to gambling devices on American vessels on the high seas or within the admiralty or maritime jurisdiction of the United States. The first part of title 18, section 7, reads the term "special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States" as used in this title includes: (1) the high seas, any other waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State, and any vessel belong-

ing in whole or in part to the United States or any citizen thereof, or to any corporation created by or under the laws of the United States, or of any State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, when such vessel is within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State.

The question arose during the consideration of this bill as to whether or not United States shipping should be exempt, and a very able representative of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., Mr. Alfred U. Krebs, came before the committee and asked that our vessels, carrying our flag, should be exempted. While he was being examined by members of the committee, and particularly by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], it developed that in certain of our States, and specific mention was made of California, there are laws which prohibit the use of those machines within the territorial jurisdiction of the States. Consequently, while they use them on the high seas, they have to put them away in special compartments and lock them up when they reach the point where the State jurisdiction comes into effect, and keep them closed until they leave and get outside of that point. I know it was my opinion and I think it was the opinion of the members of the committee that if we were going to do anything with this bill insofar as transportation is concerned, it was highly illogical for us to tolerate and exempt an operation under the American flag, where this Congress has jurisdiction and responsibility. We prohibit the use of these one-armed bandits in the District and in the Territories and possessions, with the exception of Alaska and Hawaii, so far as their legislation may exempt themselves. Then we were asked to ignore the one other place which is considered American soil, and subject to the laws of the United States, and that is American shipping. If it is bad in one instance it is bad in all. We should not go halfway in this effort. Although there may be some who feel we might be damaging the economic interests of American shipping, I, for one, do not think American shipping should rest its case upon participating in keeping alive a racket that is estimated to run close to \$4,000,000,000 a year, and in the testimony before our committee carrying with it approximately 20 percent of that amount, or \$800,000,000 a year for bribery and corruption of public officers, for graft and protection.

I hope I have been able to explain what this amendment does. I hope it will appeal to the membership.

I would like to conclude by saying that among others who testified in favor of this legislation, not before the committee but in other places, was Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who certainly knows as much as anybody does in this country as to the probable constructive effect of this kind of legislation. He said, "There is considerable merit in outlawing interstate shipment of slot machines."

I hope this bill will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARING:

Page 3, line 3, strike out "or" and insert the following new paragraph immediately thereafter: "(3) any parimutuel machine; or."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)."

Page 7, after line 4, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 8. (a) The provisions of sections 2, 5, 6, and 7 shall apply with respect to racing horses and racing dogs in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to gambling devices.

"(b) Those provisions of section 3 which relate to the registration of manufacturers and dealers in gambling devices shall apply with respect to—

"(1) dealers in racing horses or racing dogs,

"(2) owners, breeders, or trainers of racing horses or racing dogs, and

"(3) officers and employees of tracks for the racing of horses and dogs.

"(c) Every person required to register under subsection (b) shall file with the Attorney General such reports with respect to sales and deliveries of racing horses or racing dogs as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe."

Page 7, line 5, strike out "Sec. 8" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 9."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nevada desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I merely introduce the amendment for the reason that I believe that if we are going to enact discriminatory legislation against gambling, then let us go all out, and at least eliminate discrimination. I feel that this bill discriminates so far as the particular types of machines are concerned, for they throw out certain types and let others operate. Anybody knows that you can take the pay box off of a machine and post the winning combinations on the wall. The winners can then be paid off at the table or counter. For that reason, I believe that if you are going to discriminate against certain types of machines, then throw all the machines out, such as the pari-mutuel machines. I believe the amendment is in order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. JACKSON of Washington). The Chair is ready to rule.

The bill in question is an act to prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. Certain amendments have been adopted by the Committee of the Whole. The bill as now amended is not directed at gambling in general. Rather, it relates directly to prohibition against the shipment in interstate commerce of specific types of machine or mechanical gambling devices. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada

[Mr. BARING] goes beyond the scope of the legislation under consideration, and therefore the Chair holds that the point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts is proper, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 5, line 22, strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided, That this section shall not apply in the case of gambling devices owned by officers, noncommissioned officers, or enlisted men's clubs of the Armed Forces."

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, this is not in contradiction to the purposes of the bill at all. When the bill was written they provided on page 5 a prohibition against the use or possession of slot machines in all phases on land reserved or acquired for the use of the United States, which includes, of course, Army camps, Navy camps, and Marine camps. It is common knowledge to anyone who has in any way been connected with the Armed Forces that your clubs are operated by the money received from slot machines.

In view of the questions that have been raised about gamblers going in and taking their haul out of the rental fee, I want to say this: Under this amendment these machines have to be owned by the enlisted men's club, the noncom clubs, and the officers' clubs before they would be permissible. Then they are only used for amusement purposes and to equip the club where they, the enlisted men and officers, spend their spare time. I am just as opposed to gambling as anyone, but if a soldier can get his mind off of the horrors of war and still have what little money he may lose used for his own enjoyment to equip the club, the matter is somewhat reconciled.

In that way you help the morale of the boys. You will keep them on the camp, out of gambling houses, and at the same time they will be adding to the kitty with which to buy recreational facilities.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Would not that which the gentleman is having to say about people in the service apply to members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars clubs and the American Legion clubs?

Mr. SUTTON. No this does not apply to machines used in the VFW or the American Legion homes. I am talking about the Army camps.

Mr. WHEELER. I have personal knowledge in many instances where the VFW and the Legion do own the machines. Would the gentleman let me ask him this further question; that is, whether or not the gentleman has asked the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] if he would accept the amendment?

Mr. SUTTON. I have talked to several members of the committee and they

agree that this amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. How does the gentleman reconcile his amendment with upholding the constitutionality of such an act, where you single out a certain group and give them a privilege in discrimination against everybody else?

Mr. SUTTON. May I say to the gentleman that war itself is unconstitutional.

Mr. JONAS. If you will exclude a district or a certain area or territory, I can see the wisdom of that sort of an amendment, but you certainly do not contend that you can pick out a group of soldiers or sailors or marines and say that they can gamble in their own private club and the rest of the public cannot do so?

Mr. SUTTON. I do not say anything of the kind. I say they are donating for the purchase of their own recreational facilities. Whenever they put a nickel in that slot machine, they know they will not get it back but they also know they are helping to equip their club.

Mr. JONAS. But primarily they are using a gambling device to secure funds to make donations to a charitable enterprise.

Mr. SUTTON. It is not a charitable enterprise. It is just a means of raising money to buy baseballs and footballs and recreational facilities.

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

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may continue for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Of course, the gentleman realizes that the reason they need these machines is because the Congress no longer provides the money for welfare recreation, as it did at one time.

Mr. SUTTON. That is right.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. They cut down on the post exchanges and the ship's service programs. The only other recourse for them is through the slot machines.

Mr. SUTTON. That is right.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And this will automatically mean the end of most enlisted men's clubs.

Mr. SUTTON. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman said a little earlier in the debate on the rule that an American citizen who was old enough to fight for his country and be stationed at one of these military installations was old enough to know whether or not he wanted to gamble and in which manner he wanted to gamble.

Mr. SUTTON. I would not say gamble, just amusement, to keep the club equipped; we do not appropriate funds for that purpose.

Mr. WHEELER. Would not that statement hold true with regard to men who have already fought for their country and who are now members of the VFW and the Legion clubs?

Mr. SUTTON. No, sir; this amendment does not permit their use in American Legion or VFW clubs.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I interrupt to suggest that among the several reasons why I will support this bill are the reasons which have been advanced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman. I am heartily in support of this bill. I am trying to take care of these boys to help build up their morale. This is the least thing we could do to help these boys get recreational facilities in clubs which we as Members of Congress have refused to appropriate money with which they could buy them. I know something of a soldier's mental suffering. If we can alleviate his mental horrors by helping to equip his place of recreation, even if it does cost a few nickels, let us help him to the extent of a little innocent fun. Money is not all there is in this life, a fighting man's conscience must be considered. I agree with General Sherman's definition of war. I know that their mental suffering is almost unbearable. They have my utmost sympathy and I would be happy if I could bring them a few minutes of happiness at the close of their lonely days.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. BARING. By your amendment you are giving this privilege to the veterans. Does not the gentleman think this is the right of every American, that he should have the privilege, if he desires?

Mr. SUTTON. Under this bill they cannot use slot machines, but under this amendment the men in the armed services can use them. By this bill the members of the Armed Forces and the District of Columbia are the only people who are excluded from the use of slot machines.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

I think it would be very unwise to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. First of all, to make it permissible for ownership to be had in members of the Armed Forces according to the terms of the amendment or by an enlisted man's club would simply invite collusion between the owners of the machines who cannot otherwise use them and place them in the hands of the operators of the clubs, master sergeants, sergeants, corporals, or privates, with no intent and purpose of making a sale of these machines but at a stipulated sum for the use of them, resulting in collusion between the owners of the machines and the operators of the clubs.

It is a well-known fact that a new enlisted men's club has no funds other than those which are allocated to it by the Special Services Branch of the Armed Forces. Certainly to finance the enlisted men's organizations of our armed services through any lawful means, means that are unlawful, illegal, means that have been prohibited by the Congress through the use of an interstate commerce prohibition, is simply a confession that we do not provide enough recreational facilities and entertainment facilities at our military bases. I am sure that out of the military budget we have provided adequate provision can be made for the soldiers, sailors, and marines of our country without a specific act of Congress permitting them and placing the stamp of approval of Congress to use slot machines to pay for their recreational facilities.

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

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. In a case like that we ought to appropriate more money for them, for we have not provided recreational facilities for them for the past 10 years.

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

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. I wish to ask simply this one question: How can it be recreational to contribute involuntarily to the "kitty" of the clubs? It seems to me that the gentleman from Tennessee, brilliant as he is, contradicts himself; and his statement is repugnant in itself. As he said in his former statement, if our armed services cannot maintain their morale without slot machines, which he admits are nothing but stealing devices to rob the pockets of the enlisted men, I do not see how it can be classed as recreation.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman for his most appropriate observation.

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

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I might say to my good friend from Alabama that it is recreation to some people to see those balls roll in there.

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

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. How would it be possible for a new outfit to buy these machines except on time? Is it not quite true that these machines all over the country, unless you have the professional gang in supervising these machines, they just do not seem to operate right? You have to be in with the right crowd and have them servicing the machines, for if you try to own them yourself—and we had some at some of our Legion posts; they tried the experiment. They said they would own the machines themselves. But for some reason or other they just would not operate right, and they could not operate them right until they had them put under a rental arrangement with a local racketeer. If they were to transfer title so as to comply with this amendment you

would still find that the same crowd that is operating these machines outside would be working the machinery in the back of the machines handling the take at the Army base.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is eminently correct. My observation from my investigation of these machines is that it would take a Massachusetts Institute of Technology graduate to fix one of the infernal things once it broke down.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am going to be brief, Mr. Chairman. I think this is a very bad amendment to this legislation. The committee had full hearings. Not a single person or organization, not even from the Defense Department, came before our committee and made such a frivolous suggestion as this.

I want to say that our soldiers are honest and they want to be honest. If you put these things in for them to be dishonest, it is not a very good thing. We can raise money for the soldiers and the servicemen other than through these one-armed bandits. Let us do away with them. They are not good for the public then they are not good for the servicemen. Let us not tempt our servicemen and take their money for nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to have many more opportunities to talk with these many friends of mine who surround me; yet very seriously if there is anything that can afford any enjoyment or any comfort that these boys in Korea can find any fun in, whatever it may be, I am for it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say to the gentleman that I have some very grave aversions to the amendment proposed here for the simple reason that under the Selective Service Act we are calling boys from 19 to 25 into the service. For this Congress to take action, if it passes this legislation, exempting the Army camps, permitting these boys to walk right into the trap so far as slot machines are concerned, I think is wrong.

The Secretary of Defense has already removed them from the Athletic Club in the Pentagon building and Mr. O'Keefe of the Department of Justice told the committee it was the policy of the Gov-

ernment to prohibit the use of them in and on Government owned and controlled property.

If the Congress were to adopt this amendment, the reaction from the parents and mothers especially, of the boys being drafted throughout the country will be terrific.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, it seems strange to me, the reluctance with which we face an evil that has got a little money attached to it. You know, I very reluctantly oppose the amendment offered by my good friend and my next door neighbor. I have not made a friend or an acquaintance since I have come to Congress that I value more than the friendship of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON]. Still I must say that I am in absolute opposition to his amendment.

We would be in a very indefensible position here if we were to say it is wrong to have a slot machine in a restaurant, it is wrong to have a slot machine in a hotel, it is wrong to have a slot machine even in a beer joint, but it is perfectly all right to have one in the PX or in the officers' club or where our boys meet together evenings. It is all right for them, but it is wrong for everybody else. I could not face the mothers in my district if I supported such an amendment—absolutely I could not do it.

Mr. Chairman, this whole piece of legislation does not suit me. I am going to vote for it, but I do not like it and I will tell you why. It does not go far enough. It is like hunting a grizzly bear with a crossbow. I would like to see outlawed race horses, racing dogs, fighting cocks, dice boxes, and so forth. Outlaw gambling altogether. I do not believe in gambling. I do not believe in the temptation that it throws before our people, especially our young men.

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

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. I would like to say to my good friend that this bill does not prohibit the use of slot machines in beer joints or in any place else, but by my amendment it will keep those boys in the army camps from going into a beer joint and donating their money to them, and if you adopt this amendment they will donate to the army camps.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I wish I could agree with my friend from Tennessee, but it is impossible for me to do so. As I have said previously, this bill is weak but I hate slot machines so badly that I am going to vote for any legislation that seeks in any way to limit their use. They have been outlawed in my State, and I hope they will never again be legalized. Gambling, dope, and alcoholism—three fiends with which it is fruitless to seek to compromise. Some of my colleagues here today have offered as an argument against this legislation the statement that this legislation would not abolish gambling. The commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," and the laws of man upholding that commandment have not abolished murder, but no one considers repealing the law against it. We, as a Nation, have already compromised too much with evil. We spend

\$9,000,000,000 a year for alcoholic beverages and \$3,000,000,000 per year to educate our children who will be the men and women of tomorrow. This bill legalizes slot machines when used for charitable purposes and where they are operated by fraternal or charitable organizations. This bill reminds me of a story.

In a certain city the city council had made it a rule to take no action respecting the city regulation unless they could find authority for their action in the city ordinances. They had a great volume in which all the ordinances that the city council had ever passed had been assembled. One day a dog developed rabies and was found roaming the streets of the town and the citizens sought their homes, brought their children indoors, and notified the city council. Such a thing had never happened in the town before and the city council spent days studying their book of ordinances. At last a clause was found that seemed to bear on the situation. This passage read as follows: "In case a beast shall rage and rave so that he endanger the public safety, his tail shall forthwith be removed." Then the argument begun anew, as it sometimes seems to do in this House. One said a dog does not bite with his tail, another said a dog with no tail can bite as hard and be just as dangerous as a dog with a tail a yard long. Another councilor who believed the laws were all right advanced the theory that a dog with no tail would be easier controlled than one with a tail because in the case of the tailless dog there would be less dog to regulate.

While the argument proceeded the first dog bit other dogs and conditions in the town were becoming worse every hour. Finally a young man came before the assembly and asked to have the passage referred to read to him. When the young man heard it, he said, "The law is sufficient. It does not state in the law the point at which the dog's tail shall be removed. I move that we cut the dogs' tails off just 1 inch behind their ears." The motion carried unanimously and the application of that measure ended the mad-dog menace in the town once and for all. This bill just cuts the dogs' tails off but I am going to support it because it is one step in the right direction but still a very short step.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARING: Page 3, line 11, after the word "possession" strike out down to and including the word "section" on line 18, and insert: "Provided any State that has enacted a law legalizing or licensing the use of gambling devices shall be exempt from the provisions of this act. Any subdivision of any State that has enacted a law and has the approval and sanction of said State shall be exempt from the provisions of this act."

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment clarifies one of the doubts that I have on this bill where it vitally

affects Nevada. If this amendment is passed, Nevada will not have to have enabling legislation and a special session of the State legislature. We could continue on with our usual form of business in our State if this amendment were passed. This is one of the points, as I said, that vitally affects Nevada.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that we have provided in this bill that it does not affect the State of the gentleman from Nevada at all; in other words, all the machines he has in Nevada at the present time could be operated. And, I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that if the legislature of any State of this Union desires to come without the provisions of this bill, the only thing they have to do is to pass a law and out they come. Now, there is no other State affected like Nevada. Nevada is an open gambling State. You can use slot machines or any other machine, I understand, out there. Now, we are not affecting them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the distinguished gentleman mean to infer that there are no gambling machines in the State of Florida?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I never said a thing about the State of Florida; not a thing. There might be so far as I know, but if I could take one swoop of the pen and get them out, they would not be there, I will say that, or in Nevada either.

I think the amendment ought to be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARING) there were—ayes 23, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARING: Page 7, line 10, after the period insert: "Providing, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to the transportation involving the return to the original consignor of a gambling device by the original consignee who resides in a State or subdivision thereof where such devices are licensed."

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, this is the other amendment as proposed by my State, which will make it possible for the machines which are sold on consignment to be sent back to the manufacturer for repairs or exchange.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an inappropriate amendment. In addition, if these machines wear out, and they have parts in the State of Illinois where most of them are made, then let them ship those parts down to Nevada and give the people in Nevada the work to do instead of shipping the machines back up to Illinois. We are trying to take care of the gentleman from Nevada, if he will let

us, but he will not let us take care of him.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment does not pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARING) there were—ayes 23, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to criticize this legislation. I support it as far as it goes. But it seems to me the discussion is sort of a tempest in a teapot. Some of the discussion on this bill would make it appear that this legislation would outlaw most of the gambling in the United States. I wish that were true. What you propose to do is to prevent the transportation of certain gambling machines from one State to another. Some one said a few minutes ago that many of the gambling devices are made in the State of Illinois. Of course, under this measure that State will not be affected by this approval of this bill. Machines made within any State can be used within that State. The gentleman from Indiana, I think explained that situation a few minutes ago.

I would not have you think I am against this bill. I am in favor of it. I wish it could go further. I know it has the approval of many law enforcement officers throughout the country who are presently having difficulty in dealing with a bad situation that appears to be getting out of hand. I think we all agree that unless those administering the laws within the respective States, do their part, little can be done on a Nation-wide basis. You must have law enforcement within the States.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, who is very much interested in this problem. I know he is anxious to do everything possible to correct it.

Mr. HARRIS. I assume the gentleman has observed that the real purpose of this proposal, which is the proposal of the conference of attorneys general of the various States of the Union, is to get at the syndicated slot-machine racket. That was the problem which was posed to the Department of Justice by this conference. The conference brought it with the assistance of the Department of Justice to our committee. The committee, after recognizing that problem, which we were advised was a real problem to the country, reported this bill, at the same time recognizing the rights of the States and the responsibilities of the several States in connection with crime and law enforcement.

Mr. REES. I hope this syndicated crowd that the gentleman has talked about will be outlawed by this bill and put out of business. They have taken thousands of dollars from the young people of this country under the guise, in many instances, that the money going into the machines would be, after all, used for a worthy purpose. I hope the

objective described by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas may be realized. I know he is in earnest and wants to do the thing that is right. The thing you are going to need most is the cooperation of the officers in the various States.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I am sure the gentleman is going to support this legislation, as am I, but will not the gentleman agree with me that this law does not mean anything unless it is enforced?

Mr. REES. Oh, certainly. If it is not enforced, it is no good. That is true. I am going to support the legislation, but I say it does not go far enough. This bill says, in substance, these machines cannot be shipped outside the States where they are made.

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

Mr. REES. Yes, I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend, who is always courteous. On rare occasions we may not quite agree, but I have always found him to be eminently fair.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman. I have great respect for the gentleman's opinion, and certainly great respect for his earnestness, but does the gentleman think that he can legislate gambling out of existence?

Mr. REES. I doubt very much that gambling, as such, can be legislated out of existence. I think we should go further than to say that gambling devices cannot be used if they are made outside of the State where they are operated. I am referring especially to the big operators that have been referred to this afternoon. Federal officers are called upon, time after time, to deal with high-powered criminals who are connected, either directly or indirectly with the syndicates which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has so ably described. Again, I hope this legislation will do the things hoped for by the sponsors of the bill.

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

Mr. REES. I yield again to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. As far as the Congress is concerned, the authority is given to the appropriate agencies to see that they are put out of business.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman and able lawyer from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. You say the bill does not go far enough. I presume you mean that by just curbing interstate shipments of these gambling devices it does not go far enough, and that this Congress should actually prohibit gambling within any of the States. Is that correct?

Mr. REES. Well, I realize the problem with respect to interfering with State laws.

Mr. TACKETT. Then, how far does the gentleman think the bill ought to go?

Mr. REES. I can understand the gentleman's interest in protecting what is known as States' rights. We all under-

stand that unless we have the cooperation and the active assistance of State and local officials, it will be most difficult to enforce this measure if enacted into law.

We read through the newspapers almost every day of the crimes that are being committed and the racketeering going on on a national scale. We are told that a great deal of the racketeering is being done by what are known as big-time gamblers of the underworld who exact millions of dollars from innocent victims of this country. We are also told about the only way the Government can get at them is through income-tax evasion, if you can find it. Now, you say the only way you can approach this angle of the problem is to prevent the use of gambling machines made outside the State. Surely, since this crime problem, so dramatically described here this afternoon, has reached such terrific proportions and has become Nation-wide, there must be a way of outlawing the thing on a Nation-wide scale. I am talking particularly about what is described here as big-time gambling.

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

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The proposal to prohibit the shipment of slot machine gambling devices through interstate commerce into areas wherein slot machines have not been legalized amounts to no more or less than an unenforceable policy calling upon the members of this House to protest sin. Just like the majority of you, I, too, shall vote against sin, well knowing that this legislation will never amount to a hoot.

No law is any stronger than the will of the people within the involved localities. There are no one-arm bandit slot machines in the areas where the people do not want them. Regardless of prohibitive law, there will continue to be one-arm bandit slot machines within the areas where the people want them. I am thankful that the people still rule in this democracy.

I served as a prosecuting attorney of the Ninth Judicial Circuit of the State of Arkansas. I can prove by every official and citizen of that circuit that there was not one single, solitary slot machine within the circuit during my tenure in office. We had no slot machines because the people did not want them. The court officials and the local officers can control this type of crime if they want to and if the people demand it. As when I served as prosecuting attorney, there are now no slot machines in the Ninth Judicial Circuit of Arkansas. The prosecuting attorney of that circuit well knows that his constituents do not intend to tolerate such devices; and that should he allow this mode of crime, the people would be immediately looking for a more effective prosecuting attorney. There are other judicial circuits that will continue to have slot machines in compliance with the wishes of the people residing in that area, regardless of Federal statutory policy to the contrary.

Several Members of this House have argued that this bill does not go far

enough. I will admit that the proposal amounts to little, but it would certainly be impossible for us who believe in the rights of States to favor a stronger proposal. Actually, this bill goes too far because it allows the Federal Government to infringe upon the rights, duties, obligations, and responsibilities belonging to the States. Of course, we are voicing ourselves against sin; and, therefore, are willing to overlook fundamentals and perhaps set a precedent that will in the near future be difficult to reconcile. Should the bill go as far and be as effective as some Members would have you feel it should, I cannot understand how those of us who believe in the rights of the States, rather than Federal regimentation, could support the measure. Those advocates could have no other intention than to authorize the Federal Government to abolish State functions and obligations, which would eventually lead to the abolition of State lines and the federalization of our people. Those advocates would form a Federal Gestapo to supervise the people within our districts.

It is interesting to note that the leading proponents of this legislation are likewise the leading proponents for the retention of States' rights. This attitude is difficult to reconcile. In one breath certain of us argue that the States should control crime within the States, and in the next breath we are willing to allow the Federal Government—by such legislation as is now under consideration—to regulate State functions by the back-door method. You well know the tune that would be sung by those advocates of this legislation should it be for the purpose of allowing the Federal Government to set up a Fair Employment Practices Commission to govern our people, or to establish Federal antilynching jurisdiction, or any of the other so-called civil rights measures. Then, many of the advocates of this legislation would be hollering those were the functions for the local people and that the Federal Government should not infringe upon the responsibilities of the various States. Oh, yes, it will be argued with reference to the so-called civil rights legislation that the Federal Government has no jurisdiction and that any such proposed activities would be contrary to the Constitution. I am in accord with such argument, but the Federal Government has no more authority to regulate slot-machine activities than it has to regulate other State crimes. The proponents of this legislation contend that the Federal Government is only regulating interstate commerce. For instance, that is exactly the contention of those who advocate Federal civil rights jurisdiction. The fair employment practices proposal would regulate civil rights phases of labor engaged in interstate commerce and thereby, in effect, regulate civil rights phases of all labor legislation within the States.

I could discuss the Federal jurisdictional contention advanced by the advocates of all other civil rights proposals, but it all comes down to proposing that the Federal Government regulate the local people wherein the State has sole jurisdiction by allowing the Fed-

eral Government to regulate activities wherein it is contended that the Federal Government has authority. To prohibit the shipment of slot machines in interstate commerce to or from territories in which this mode of gambling has not been legalized has for its purpose the prohibition of this type of gambling within the States. None of you will argue that the Federal Government has any authority to control gambling within the State, but by this legislation—if it were effective—we would be authorizing the Federal Government to do just exactly that. As some of you contend, the proposal will be ineffective unless the Federal Government be authorized to outright control gambling within the States. I am also in accord with that argument, but I shall never support any legislation which has for its purpose the abolition of local functions and the federalization of our people.

I am reminded of the days spent by this House not long ago debating civil-rights legislation. What a different tune is today being sung by many who were then protesting Federal infringement upon State jurisdiction. The holler of the civil-rights opponents was certainly contrary to their contentions today.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. It is only 2 months until November. Perhaps that might make some difference.

Mr. TACKETT. No; that does not make any difference to those of us who do not believe in Federal infringement and nationalization. The people in my area do not believe in State lines being abolished by the Federal Government. We still contend that all rights were retained by the people and their States, with the exception of those which were specifically granted by our Constitution to the Federal Government. In that same area, we are opposed to slot-machine devices, and there is no one in this House who more dislikes this method of gambling than I. That is actually not the point involved. Murder and rape are even more heinous crimes than slot-machine gambling, but would any of you who believe in local government argue that the Federal Government has jurisdiction in these crimes. Even those who argue that the Federal Government should have jurisdiction in lynching cases are at a loss to favor Federal jurisdiction for murder, rape, and gambling.

Again, I wish to repeat that every statutory law is just as strong as the will of the people within the involved area.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. And if the local people want you to vote for it, you will vote for it?

Mr. TACKETT. I was not sent to Congress to represent the interests of BOYD TACKETT, but as their Representative to vote their wishes. The establishment of a law contrary to their wishes will amount to nothing, because the people rule.

None of us believe in lynching, but I contend that the Federal Government has no more right dabbling into local lynchings than it has to prosecute for

murder committed within the boundaries of a State. The Federal Government certainly has no more authority for controlling slot-machine activities than it has for controlling the more heinous crimes of murder and rape. I do not believe that slot-machine gambling can be justified; in fact, I consider it one of the most vicious types of gambling. Your people do not need tolerate one-arm bandits. They elect their local officials by the same method and at the same time they elect you.

This bill in its present form amounts to nothing, but I shall strongly protest any efforts to so modify its provisions as to establish a Federal Gestapo to take over the operations and functions of the States.

(By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.)

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JACKSON of Washington, 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. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 807, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in 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 gros.

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.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BARING. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualified. The Clerk will report the motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARING moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study and investigation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARING) there were—yeas 10, noes 116.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amend-

ment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 272. Concurrent resolution authorizing correction of chapter and section numbers in the enrollment of H. R. 7786.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] be excused as conferee on the bill H. R. 9176, entitled "An act to establish a system of priorities and allocations for materials and facilities, authorize the requisitioning thereof, provide financial assistance for expansion of productive capacity and supply, strengthen controls over credit, regulate speculation on commodity exchanges, and by these measures facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the national security, and for other purposes," and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] be appointed in his stead.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7786) entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 68, 72, 92, 175, 189, 192, 198, 200, 209, 215, 238, 284, 288, 289, 319, 337, 338, 345, 354, 361, 363, 373, 388, 399, 467, 471, 472, 473, 475, 476, and 477; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, with an amendment to the above-entitled bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Amendment No. 35: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment, insert the following: "\$832,000, and the affairs of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, provided for in Senate Resolution 298, Eighty-first Congress, shall be liquidated not later than August 31, 1950."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate to

the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 35.

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

There was no objection.

PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3546) to extend the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (b) of the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever in this act the word 'State' or 'States' is used, it shall be understood to include Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts from time to time as the Congress may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

"(b) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State which (1), except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, has an unemployment compensation law approved by the Secretary under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and is found to be in compliance with section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and (2) is found to be in compliance with the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its public employment offices."

SEC. 3. Sections 6 and 7 of the act are hereby repealed.

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.

LAKE ASHTABULA

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) to designate the reservoir above the Baldhill Dam in North Dakota as Lake Ashtabula.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the reservoir located above the Baldhill Dam in North Dakota shall hereafter be known as Lake Ashtabula, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of Lake Ashtabula.

The joint resolution 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.

BERNARD F. ELMERS

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNE of New York, DENTON, and KEATING.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, I was unavoidably absent. If present on roll call No. 255, I would have voted "nay." This is the roll call by which the bill H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, was passed.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPRESSION OF GENERAL MACARTHUR'S REPORT ON DEFENSE OF FORMOSA

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the action of President Truman directing General Douglas MacArthur to suppress his communication to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, constituting his appraisal of the necessity to defend Formosa, is an unfortunate act.

It is to be taken by the American people as another flagrant example of the incredible bungling by the administration over the past 5 years, bungling which delivered Manchuria and most of China to the Communists and which culminated in the Korean conflict. It is simply another chapter in a long series of blunders whereby sound military advice was suppressed and political decisions, in keeping with the policy of appeasing the Soviet Union, were superimposed for political reasons. It is simply another exhibit of a bankrupt leadership which suppressed the Wedemeyer report for 2 years because it urged aid for the enemies of communism in China.

General MacArthur is not only the supreme commander in Japan for the allied forces, but he is the Commander in the Field for the United Nations, and in the latter capacity has already submitted two reports to the United Nations Security Council, which is presided over by Jacob Malik, the Soviet Union's delegate. Certainly, if the Soviet Union is entitled to MacArthur's views, through Jacob Malik, then the American people likewise have a right to them.

Although the White House has authority to suppress the utterances of the military, we in America still are fortunate enough to have a free press. Therefore, I am able to hold in my hand a copy of the suppressed MacArthur communication to the Veterans of For-

eign Wars, which has been printed in the United States News and World Report in its issue which will appear on the newsstands tomorrow and which was already off the press and in the mails and could not be recalled. Thus, the White House scheme to withhold General MacArthur's views has been thwarted by one of the cornerstones of American liberty, a free press.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this document, I now ask unanimous consent to have General MacArthur's communication, as published in the United States News and World Report, appear in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks and the proceedings of the House.

I would call the attention of the House to one of the probable reasons for the suppression of this report. You will recall that last January 12 Secretary of State Acheson, in a speech to the National Press Club here in Washington, declared that our (and I quote) "defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus," (unquote) thus virtually inviting the Communists to go in and take Korea and Formosa, both of which were beyond Mr. Acheson's "perimeter."

General MacArthur, in his suppressed communication to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, lays down a much more realistic defense perimeter which embraces all free lands off-shore Asia in the Pacific—which, of course, includes Formosa. I would also like to call your attention to the General's words, in contrast to those of our political Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and I quote General MacArthur: "If we hold this line, we may have peace—lose it and war is inevitable."

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot conclude the rest of this statement, but I hold in my hand a copy of General MacArthur's statement which appears in the United States News and World Report of September 1, 1950, which undoubtedly will go to every part of the United States. If this publication is permitted to use it, certainly the rest of the people of the country should have it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in my remarks as part of my statement.

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

There was no objection.

(The statement is as follows:)

FORMOSA MUST BE DEFENDED—A DECLARATION BY GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, SUPREME COMMANDER IN JAPAN FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

To Clyde A. Lewis, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Chicago, Ill.:

Your inspiring message of the 17th has moved me deeply, and I trust that you will convey to all of my comrades in arms of the Veterans of Foreign Wars assembled on the occasion of our fifty-first annual national encampment my assurance that their confidence and support will give this command much added strength to meet the tests of battle which lie immediately ahead. Tell them that I am happy to report that their

successors in arms now engaging the enemy along our battle lines in South Korea are exemplifying that same high standard of devotion, fortitude, and valor which characterized their own march to victory when they themselves engaged in combat in the field. From senior commanders down through all ranks, their tactical skill, their invincible determination, and their fighting qualities against a fanatical foe, well trained, expertly directed, and heavily armed, have upheld our country's finest traditions. Toward victory, however, difficult the road, they are giving an account of themselves which should make every American heart beat with pride and infinite satisfaction.

In view of misconceptions currently being voiced concerning the relationship of Formosa to our strategic potential in the Pacific, I believe it in the public interest to avail myself of this opportunity to state my views thereon to you, all of whom having fought overseas understand broad strategic concepts.

To begin with, any appraisal of that strategic potential requires an appreciation of the changes wrought in the course of the past war. Prior thereto the western strategic frontier of the United States lay on the littoral line of the Americas with an exposed island salient extending out through Hawaii, Midway, and Guam to the Philippines. That salient was not an outpost of strength but an avenue of weakness along which the enemy could and did attack us. The Pacific was a potential area of advance for any predatory force intent upon striking at the bordering land areas.

All of this was changed by our Pacific victory. Our strategic frontier then shifted to embrace the entire Pacific Ocean, which has become a vast moat to protect us as long as we hold it. Indeed, it acts as a protective shield for all of the Americas and all free lands of the Pacific Ocean area. We control it to the shores of Asia by a chain of islands, extending in an arc from the Aleutians to the Marianas, held by us and our allies.

From this island chain we can dominate with airpower every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore and prevent any hostile movement into the Pacific. Any predatory attack from Asia must be an amphibious effort. No amphibious force can be successful without control of the sea lanes and the air over those lanes in its avenue of advance. With naval and air supremacy and modest ground elements to defend bases, any major attack from continental Asia toward us or our friends of the Pacific would be doomed to failure.

Under such conditions the Pacific no longer represents menacing avenues of approach for a prospective invader—it assumes instead the friendly aspect of a peaceful lake. Our line of defense is a natural one and can be maintained with a minimum of military effort and expense. It envisions no attack against anyone nor does it provide the bastions essential for offensive operations, but properly maintained would be an invincible defense against aggression. If we hold this line we may have peace—lose it and war is inevitable.

The geographic location of Formosa is such that in the hands of a power unfriendly to the United States, it constitutes an enemy salient in the very center of this defensive perimeter, 100 to 150 miles closer to the adjacent friendly segments—Okinawa and the Philippines—than any point in continental Asia.

At the present time there is on Formosa a concentration of operational air and naval bases which is potentially greater than any similar concentration on the Asiatic mainland between the Yellow Sea and the Strait

of Malacca. Additional bases can be developed in a relatively short time by an aggressive exploitation of all World War II Japanese facilities.

An enemy force utilizing those installations currently available could increase by 100 percent the air effort which could be directed against Okinawa as compared to operations based on the mainland and at the same time could direct damaging air attacks with fighter-type aircraft against friendly installations in the Philippines, which are currently beyond the range of fighters based on the mainland. Our air supremacy at once would become doubtful.

As a result of its geographic location and base potential, utilization of Formosa by a military power hostile to the United States may either counterbalance or overshadow the strategic importance of the central and southern flank of the United States front-line position. Formosa in the hands of such a hostile power could be compared to an unsinkable aircraft carrier and submarine tender ideally located to accomplish offensive strategy and at the same time checkmate defensive or counteroffensive operations by friendly forces based on Okinawa and the Philippines.

This unsinkable carrier-tender has the capacity to operate from 10 to 20 air groups of types ranging from jet fighters to B-29 type bombers as well as to provide forward operating facilities for short-range coastal submarines. In acquiring this forward submarine base, the efficacy of the short-range submarine would be so enormously increased by the additional radius of activity as to threaten completely sea traffic from the South and interdict all sea lanes in the Western Pacific. Submarine blockade by the enemy with all its destructive ramifications would thereby become a virtual certainty.

Should Formosa fall and bases thereafter come into the hands of a potential enemy of the United States, the latter will have acquired an additional fleet which will have been obtained and can be maintained at an incomparably lower cost than could its equivalent in aircraft carriers and submarine tenders. Current estimates of air and submarine resources in the Far East indicate the capability of such a potential enemy to extend his forces southward and still maintain an imposing degree of military strength for employment elsewhere in the Pacific area.

Historically, Formosa has been used as a springboard for just such military aggression directed against areas to the south. The most notable and recent example was the utilization of it by the Japanese in World War II. At the outbreak of the Pacific War in 1941, it played an important part as a staging area and supporting base for the various Japanese invasion convoys. The supporting air forces of Japan's Army and Navy were based on fields situated along southern Formosa.

From 1942 through 1944 Formosa was a vital link in the transportation and communications chain which stretched from Japan through Okinawa and the Philippines to southeast Asia. As the United States carrier forces advanced into the western Pacific, the bases on Formosa assumed an increasingly greater role in the Japanese defense scheme. Should Formosa fall into the hands of a hostile power, history would repeat itself. Its military potential would again be fully exploited as the means to breach and neutralize our western Pacific defense system and mount a war of conquest against the free nations of the Pacific basin.

Nothing could be more fallacious than the threadbare argument by those who advocate appeasement and defeatism in the Pacific that if we defend Formosa we alienate continental Asia. Those who speak thus do not understand the Orient. They do not grasp that it is in the pattern of oriental psychol-

ogy to respect and follow aggressive, resolute and dynamic leadership—to quickly turn from a leadership characterized by timidity or vacillation—and they underestimate the oriental mentality.

Nothing in the last 5 years has so inspired the Far East as the American determination to preserve the bulwarks of our Pacific Ocean strategic position from future encroachment, for few of its peoples fail accurately to appraise the safeguard such determination brings to their free institutions.

To pursue any other course would be to turn over the fruits of our Pacific victory to a potential enemy. It would shift any future battle area 5,000 miles eastward to the coasts of the American continents, our own home coasts; it would completely expose our friends in the Philippines, our friends in Australia and New Zealand, our friends in Indonesia, our friends in Japan, and other areas, to the lustful thrusts of those who stand for slavery as against liberty, for atheism as against God.

The decision of President Truman on June 27 lighted into flame a lamp of hope throughout Asia that was burning dimly towards extinction. It marked for the Far East the focal and turning point in this area's struggle for freedom. It swept aside in one great monumental stroke all of the hypocrisy and the sophistry which has confused and deluded so many people distant from the actual scene.

MACARTHUR.

LET US STAND ON PRINCIPLE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today we are reaping the harvest that comes to a Nation whose leaders have turned their backs on the principles of justice and righteousness.

Our whole sordid history of the recognition of the Communist government of Russia early in the Roosevelt administration and the sending to the Communists of billions of dollars of supplies and money to make the Communists strong has been the big mistake of our generation.

All through the past years, Communist Russia has been the same cruel, aggressive military power with the same ideas and the same notions as she has today. Our leaders in the administration of lend-lease, the conduct of the war, the distribution of billions of dollars' worth of postwar relief and in the conferences at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran have sought to appease Russia and have failed to stand for the principle of right.

The suggestion some months ago by former President Herbert Hoover calling for reorganization of the United Nations, leaving out Russia and her satellites, has had my careful consideration. And I have concluded this change should be made.

The United Nations ought to be an organization of the anti-Communist nations throughout the world. A program could then be developed in which these nations could work together for their common defense and for the peace of the world. The United Nations would then become a bulwark for human freedom everywhere. This, of course, would not preclude the exchange of notes and messages or conferences of United Nations leaders with Russia and other Communist countries in an effort to get the Communist world to cease their program of aggression.

We should not lose sight of the fact that Korea is one country. North Koreans and South Koreans speak a common language, have common customs, religion, and economy. The country's division results solely from a decision at the close of World War II by the Pentagon in Washington to allow the Russians to accept the surrender of Korea—then Japanese-controlled—north of an arbitrarily drawn line on the map, the thirty-eighth parallel, and the Americans accepted surrender south of that line. The Russians then moved in, stayed there, communized and militarized North Korea. Today North Korea is an aggressor.

We are told that the forces fighting with South Korea now are the United Nations' forces. Americans complain—and justifiably so—that they have had to bear the brunt of the fighting for the United Nations in Korea.

Suppose a world police force were established by the United Nations, made up of troops and officers of the member countries, such a world police force or world army would, under the present set-up, include Communists. This, then, would give them a golden opportunity to go into every trouble spot in the world and to keep their Communist troops there, just as they have done in North Korea. It would put Russia and other Communist countries in a position to destroy all the efforts of anti-Communist countries seeking to establish peace.

Today what would happen if Russia's Deputy Foreign Minister Jacob Malik, now president of the Security Council, were to announce he was going to visit the front in the Korean war? If Mr. Warren Austin, our chief United Nations delegate, were president, we would insist he had that right. Suppose Mr. Malik, as head of the Security Council, decided to change commanders or to appoint some staff officers for the United Nations in South Korea.

The present situation is like having Satan as a member of the church board.

Yet it is contended by some who are very well informed and well qualified that the Communists should continue to participate in United Nations affairs. But as a UN member the Communists can sabotage all our efforts.

If the United Nations becomes an organization of the anti-Communist countries of the world, deliberation can then be opened with a prayer for divine guidance. It can declare where it stands and be a beacon light to the entire world. It would be a final answer as to whether or not the Red Government of China should come into the United Nations. Red governments everywhere would be barred.

Freedom-loving people would be welcome. It would be the strongest possible inducement for wavering countries to oust their Communist control and to join those nations who want to preserve civilization and human freedom.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. McGUIRE), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. BURTON (at the request of Mr. FUGATE), for Monday, August 28, on account of illness.

To Mr. ANGELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6339. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and investigation to determine the feasibility and advisability of constructing a multi-purpose tunnel through the Laguna Mountains in San Diego County, Calif.; and

H. R. 9134. An act to amend section 4311 of the Revised Statutes (46 U. S. C. 251).

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2484. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide war-risk and certain marine and liability insurance;

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; and

S. 3724. An act for the relief of Maria Sulikowska Forbes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 29, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1653. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report by the Department of the Navy pertaining to transportation of personnel for the fiscal year 1950, pursuant to Public Law 560, Eightieth Congress, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands, H. R. 7332. A bill to authorize an appropriation for cooperation with joint district No. 5, towns of Almon, Barthelme, Morris, and Seneca, and the village of Bowler, Shawano County, Wis., for the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of public school buildings at Bowler, Wis., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; with amendment (Rept. No. 3009). Referred

to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 7941. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3010). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9564. A bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 9565. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 9566. A bill to extend medical benefits to dependents of Coast Guard personnel and to widows of deceased Coast Guard personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GULL:

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution requesting the President to answer questions relating to our foreign policy, and for the creation of a Select Joint Committee on Foreign Policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCGUIRE:

H. Con. Res. 273. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the disposition of certain Italian colonies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. Res. 829. Resolution to direct the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the arrest, detention, and deportation of Rafael Garcia Travesi-Carral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 9567. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Burr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9568. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoshiko Hata Shockey and her minor daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2350. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank Sneberger, clerk, Slovak Calvinistic Presbyterian Union, Jersey City, N. J., relative to "pressure being brought upon the Government of the United States of America to open the doors of this beloved country of ours to questionable characters;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2351. Also, petition of A. Fred Roberts, secretary, Citizens-Taxpayers Association of Westerly, R. I., relative to the adoption of an amendment to the social-security law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2352. Also, petition of Mrs. Nettie Kisor, secretary, Port Orange Townsend Club, No. 1, Port Orange, Fla., requesting that emergency legislative measures be taken in dealing with the vital social-security problem; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2353. Also, petition of Neva C. Lamphere and others, Winter Park, Fla., requesting

passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2354. Also, petition of Mabel Kelly and others, Port Orange, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 29, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

The day returns, O Lord, and brings us the round of concerns and duties. Help us to perform them with a sense of expediency, but let our hearts be filled with high intent and good will. Lead us to perceive what Thou dost require of us even to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with our God. Grant that in all things we may be masters of ourselves that in the best sense we may be truly the servants of others. Enable us to keep faith in our fellowmen and remain sound of heart in spite of ingratitude. Open wide our souls that we may breathe in the great and good things of life. In the name of our strong deliverer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 28, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

On August 28, 1950:

S. 819. An act for the relief of Herman L. Weiner;

S. 1506. An act for the relief of Andre Lan;

S. 2457. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of A. K. Chahroudi;

S. 2614. An act for the relief of O. O. Haugen;

S. 3129. An act to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Rosebud Indian Agency, S. Dak.;

S. 3238. An act for the relief of Dr. Frederick Daniel McDade; and

S. 3698. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work.

On August 29, 1950:

S. 2204. An act for the relief of Rudolph Farcher.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the