

## NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Paul L. Styles, of Alabama, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term expiring December 16, 1954.

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

Senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Daniel J. Daley

Surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Richard H. Linn      Wayland J. Hayes, Jr.  
David D. LeGrand      Clarke W. Mangun, Jr.

Senior dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Donald J. Galagan

Sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

O. John Schmidt      Joseph A. Boyer  
Kenneth C. Lauster      Ross W. Buck

Pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Joseph P. Crisalli

Senior nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

L. Dorothy Carroll

Senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Norma Russell

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

George W. Whitehurst, to be United States district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida.

Frank A. Hooper, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou God of all goodness, we are again uniting our souls in the fellowship of prayer, seeking together those needed blessings which none can ever find or enjoy alone.

We pray that daily our lives may be brought under the spell and sway of the Master's spirit in order that they may be transformed into His own glorious likeness.

Grant that in our problems and tasks we may have the interpreting and guiding light of His Spirit.

May it be the supreme desire of our hearts to do Thy will for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On February 14, 1950:

H. R. 587. An act for the relief of the estate of Dick Walock, Alfred L. Woods, and Edward Kimokteak.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the morning Post.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one an address delivered by Commander Henry Selvitella, of the Italian-American World War Veterans; in one, the legislative program of the same organization; and in one, an address he delivered before the Lithuanian Citizens Club of Lawrence, Mass.

Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the American Legion.

Mr. QUINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the Secretary of State regarding Robert A. Vogeler, Jr.

Mr. GORSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution and certain miscellaneous excerpts.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Republicans of Wright County, Iowa.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Hagerstown Herald.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Middletown Times-Herald, a daily newspaper in her district.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

## MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO EGYPT

Mr. VAN ZANDT. 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. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of history the Middle East has been the most strategic area in

the world. Within the Middle East lies the bridgehead to three continents. Today, the Middle East finds itself caught physically in the middle of the ideological war between the east and west and if a shooting war comes, the importance of the Middle East to the United States is immeasurably increased.

No military authority claims we could hold Europe against an onslaught of the Red army. Since Russia has the atomic bomb, it would be unsound indeed for us to count on bases in England.

Until our Air Force is developed with sufficient range to base in America, to win the battle of the air over Russia the United States will need overseas bases. The Middle East offers bases which could be held by our Ground and Naval Forces and from which we could win the initial round in the battle of the air against the Red air forces.

It is my view that Egypt is as far north and east as we could hold bases with reasonable assurance. Doubtless Russia realizes this fact and one of her initial moves in the event of war would be to occupy Egypt by an air-borne Red army. Realizing her plight, Egypt is desperate for defensive military equipment. It is vital to the United States in the event of war that the Red air-borne army not be permitted to deny us bases in Egypt. I am reliably advised that Great Britain, sensing the strategic value of Egypt, is willing to give Egypt considerable defensive military equipment which she obtained from us through lend-lease. By the terms of lend-lease, however, England must secure our permission before releasing this defensive military equipment. I am reliably advised further that a desperate attempt is being made by a pressure group in the United States to prevent this essential military equipment being given to Egypt. This pressure group has hired a former secretary to the President, Mr. Clark Clifford, to intervene with the President and his initial fee is reported to be \$30,000. Doubtless he will receive much more if he is successful in blocking the proposal.

I submit to my colleagues in Congress and to the American people that it is to the interest of the United States that we grant permission to Great Britain to extend this military assistance to Egypt. It would be to our interest also to see that Egypt is provided essential military equipment for a small defensive force, capable of meeting an air-borne invasion of the Red army. There is no evidence that Egypt would use this equipment offensively. She has accepted the verdict of the United Nations in the Middle East and is living up to the verdict in spirit and in fact.

If war comes it could be that the denial of Egyptian bases to the Red forces and the making of these bases available to us might be the difference between defeat and victory. We cannot afford to let Egypt go by default and I urge the President of the United States to authorize military assistance to this friendly, freedom-loving country—Egypt.

## SURPLUS POTATOES FOR FOOD

Mr. HESELTON. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that I was informed about a half hour ago that the Greenfield authorities have received authorization from the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare to order 5 tons of surplus potatoes from storage in the immediate vicinity of Greenfield; that the Salvation Army plans to pick up these potatoes on Thursday—tomorrow being a legal holiday in Massachusetts; and that they will then be available for distribution to the needy people of Greenfield for food.

I attempted to report yesterday in some detail as to the steps which were necessary to bring about this result. I promised to put this in concise form for the use of my colleagues in assisting their communities which may wish to receive some of these potatoes. I do that now.

You will find the full Greenfield experience in the RECORD for February 20, but I am confident that with their experience a great deal of red tape can be eliminated and a great deal of direct action is possible.

Any community must conduct a survey through responsible agencies. In Greenfield this was done by the entire clergy of the town with the council of social agencies. The report of the number of needy families should be submitted to the local board of public welfare, be approved by it, and forwarded to the responsible State official. I have obtained a list for the New England and North Atlantic Seaboard States. They are:

Connecticut: E. C. Geissler, supervisor of purchases, department of finance and control, purchasing department, State Capitol Building, room 408, Hartford, Conn.

Maine: John E. Collins, supervisor, surplus commodities and property, department of education, Statehouse, Augusta, Maine.

Massachusetts: John C. Stalker, director, food distribution division, department of public welfare, 600 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

New Hampshire: Harold Theney, purchasing agent for State of New Hampshire, Statehouse, Concord, N. H.

Rhode Island: George E. Helliwell, deputy commissioner, State of Rhode Island General Store, Howard, R. I.

Vermont: Burton N. Sisco, deputy commissioner, department of institutions and corrections, 51 Court Street, Montpelier, Vt.

Delaware—two agencies: A. Tarumianz, assistant business manager, Delaware State Hospital, Farnhurst, Del. Schools: George R. Miller, Jr., State superintendent, department of public instruction, box 191, Dover, Del.

Maryland—two agencies: J. M. Patterson, director, Maryland State Department of Public Welfare, 120 West Redwood Street, Baltimore, Md. Schools: T. G. Pullen, superintendent, Maryland State Board of Education, 1201 Mathison Building, Baltimore, Md.

New Jersey: James S. King, State supervisor, commodity distribution, department of economic development, division of commerce and municipal aid, 520 East State Street, Trenton, N. J.

New York: Distribution in New York is handled through each of the county departments of public welfare. Each county has its own set-up. State provides no distribution agency at a central point.

Pennsylvania: Paul Worcester, Pennsylvania State Department of Property and Supplies, bureau of purchases, room 178, Main Capitol Building, Harrisburg, Pa.

This official in each State has full authority to issue authorization for the withdrawal of the required number of potatoes, once the local board of public welfare has voted to accept the responsibility for the proper storage and proper distribution of these potatoes. I shall include at the end of my remarks the letter sent by the Greenfield board which resulted in immediate authorization. It is not necessary to execute the Form FP-53, the contents of which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday.

I trust this information will be useful to my colleagues. I shall be glad to furnish any further information requested.

I should repeat that I have raised the question of the adequacy of the minimum quantities provided in the Department's table which I inserted in the RECORD yesterday and I hope soon to have a realistic recognition of the amount any normal American family can properly use as food during a month. I can state that Mr. Stalker has met that situation temporarily by authorizing the immediate delivery of a 3 months' supply and I have requested him to provide the revised amount as soon as possible since I understand that the area office in New York, located at 139 Centre Street, eighth floor, New York 13, N. Y., Mr. John Dittrich has full authority to immediately approve a State-recommended revision.

May I again point out that this procedure will probably be useful only in those communities located within a reasonable distance of storage locations. This admittedly is inequitable so far as other communities are concerned. The only solution which occurs to me is a prompt hearing on the identical bills introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.], and myself. You will find the text of those identical bills at page 2000 in the RECORD of February 20. You will also find a letter which we sent to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture yesterday, asking for a prompt hearing. We shall appreciate your cooperation in urging that hearing.

The letter sent by the Greenfield board which resulted in immediate authorization read as follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1950.

MT. JOHN C. STALKER,  
Director of Commodity Distribution,  
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. STALKER: At a meeting of the welfare board of the town of Greenfield on the above date, it has been agreed that we will act as the storing and distributing

agency for surplus commodities (potatoes) in the town of Greenfield.

It is understood that there will be no expense connected with the procuring of these potatoes at the source, and it will not be necessary to sign any contract governing this distribution, and the source will be in the immediate vicinity of the town of Greenfield, such as Deerfield, Sunderland, or Whately. This is in accordance with my conversation over the phone with Representative JOHN HESELTON and his understanding with you. These potatoes will be distributed in accordance with the schedule established, limiting the quantity to a 3-month supply, based on this schedule.

Very truly yours,

BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE,  
WILLIAM B. HAYES, Secretary.

#### SURPLUS POTATOES

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. 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. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] on having obtained results so satisfactory for his district. I had the pleasure of joining in a letter from him, from the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], and from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture on February 20, in which we asked for action on the identical bills introduced by each of us and referred to his committee. The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1950.

Re H. R. 7135, H. R. 7136, H. R. 7137, H. R. 7138.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
House Office Building, Washington,  
D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: May we call your attention to these identical bills filed in the House February 2, 1950, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Because of the urgent nature of the problem presented in terms of the proposed destruction of edible surplus potatoes, some of this destruction we understand having been carried out, we request your full cooperation in setting these bills down for hearing at the earliest possible date. We believe the full facts should be developed as quickly as possible so that this destruction may be avoided and this particular commodity made available for food. We are confident that you and all members of the committee recognize the emergency nature of the problem, and we hope that you will believe that we have tried to make a constructive suggestion in the interest of the American taxpayer and in the interest of those millions of Americans who, unfortunately, are not able to purchase this fine food commodity in the open market.

We are informed that the latest figures show 2,715,751 persons receiving old-age pensions, 1,486,404 receiving dependents' and children's benefits, 92,000 blind people receiving help, and 543,000 on the State and local relief rolls. With this total minimum figure of 4,837,155 people who could make use of these potatoes if they could be given to them, there are many thousands more who clearly are not able to pay the current price of potatoes and therefore are not purchasing them.

According to the Commodity Credit Corporation, as of December 31, 1949, it held

approximately 277,480 tons of 10 surplus food commodities which can be eaten without further processing. The Corporation's official report shows that the total cost was approximately \$265,000,000. We hope we have made a suggestion which can be utilized to get this food to deserving people rather than to pay additional amounts for storage and ultimately hire more people and pay further amounts to destroy this food.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT J. CORBETT,  
Thirteenth District, Pennsylvania.  
KENNETH B. KEATING,  
Fortieth District, New York.  
JOHN W. HESELTON,  
First District, Massachusetts.  
HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.,  
Sixth District, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the committee will set an early date for hearing on these bills.

#### LENTEN SERVICES

Mr. HAGEN. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the problems of this hour illustrate very clearly the need of us all to deepen and strengthen the spiritual foundations of our national life.

As has been done in previous years, there will be a daily 20-minute Lenten service for the Capitol Hill community in the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, opposite the Folger Shakespeare Library. This is within quick walking distance of the House and Senate Office Buildings and the Capitol. This service is held each weekday from 12:10 to 12:30 except Saturdays. The service will be addressed by ministers of the various Protestant denominations of the Washington area. Everyone will be welcome.

I commend these services to my fellow Members of the Congress for their personal attendance. I make a suggestion, also, that we make it possible for our staff members to attend. The services start on Ash Wednesday, February 22, and continue through Lent.

Services also will be held every Wednesday evening at 8 o'clock.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure all of us are delighted that no conflict in viewpoint on pending legislation is being allowed to interfere with the reading tomorrow of that inspiring masterpiece, Washington's Farewell Address. I am certain also, that we on this side of the aisle are very anxious to get on with the business tomorrow and do everything possible to complete the consideration of the legislation to be submitted to us with reasonable dispatch.

I am hopeful that the same is true on the other side of the aisle. The reading of the Farewell Address, I am told, will

consume about an hour. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. HERLONG objected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. That is not a privileged motion.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### FEPC LEGISLATION

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Members on the floor of the House make reference to the great leaders of American history. I too have done so. Today I simply want to again remind the House that the founding fathers of this country, particularly Washington and Jefferson, believed passionately in the equality of all men under the law. That is exactly what those of us who favor the FEPC are asking for when the bill comes to a vote tomorrow. We want all men to have economic equality under the law as well as political equality. I hope that tomorrow the debate on this measure can be kept at that level and will not descend to recriminations and interpretations that have absolutely no foundation in fact. If we do that I think we can debate a great basic issue in a scholarly and dignified manner which will add to the prestige of the House. I hope such will be the case, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### VISITING MEMBERS OF JAPANESE DIET

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that there are a number of members of the Japanese Diet

in the gallery. A number of people who have been sent here at the suggestion of General MacArthur in order that they might see at first hand the operations of democracy. It was my privilege to be in Japan in November with a group from the Committee on Public Lands. We were entertained in the Japanese Diet. The Speaker or President of the Japanese Lower House met with our committee and expressed the thought of the Japanese people that amity would continue between our two countries.

The Japanese are a hard-working, industrious people. They have changed their way, their concept of government. They seek a true form of democracy for Japan. I am happy to call your attention to the fact that they are here and that the future of this country rests in the Pacific Basin. Just as what was once an enemy at the beginning of the century and became a staunch ally in World Wars I and II as the result of American tutelage, so the potentialities of the Japanese people under democracy to align themselves with this country against communism means the front line of our defense against that form of political enslavement is strengthened and extended.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I should like to commend the gentleman for his statement and to say that I subscribe entirely to the sentiments he has expressed. The difficulties in which his State found itself at the beginning of the war has probably been my particular gain. I come from Chicago, and we have one of the largest colonies of nisei anywhere in the country. They are upright, industrious, hard-working citizens and are doing much for the benefit of the city and for the community generally.

Mr. MILLER of California. The most decorated outfit in the American Army was the One Hundredth Battalion, of nisei, American citizens of Japanese origin.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. I, too, was a member of a different Congressional mission that was in Japan during September and October. I do not recall any place during our tour of the Orient where we received a more generous reception than was accorded to members of our group as we visited the Japanese Diet. I am sure that the American people are pleased to have this distinguished group of Japanese people in our country.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

In closing, I want to say that I know I speak your sentiments when we welcome to the House of Representatives the delegation of the Japanese Diet now in the gallery. [Applause.]

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Select Committee on Small Business may have until midnight tomorrow in which to file brief minority views to be appended to the report filed by the chairman of the committee today.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. SIKES) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a memorial.

#### ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE FOR TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced H. R. 7356, which would increase the Members' telephone and telegraph allowance from \$500 to \$1,000 per year.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the \$500 limitation holds whether you live 10 miles or 2,000 miles from the District of Columbia. Since telegraph and telephone bills are computed in large measure upon distance, those of us who do not live near the District of Columbia are penalized to begin with.

May I point out further, Mr. Speaker, that any amount of this money not required for a Member's service to his people automatically reverts to the Treasury, and none is lost to the Government by reason of nonuse. Many of us have used all or practically all of the money which is now available. We feel that more is necessary, if we are to give to our constituents the service we feel they are entitled to receive. I urge and I hope that all interested members will urge that the Committee on House Administration will speedily act upon this matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARDY. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of last week the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] made certain

remarks concerning the fact that he is no longer a member of my subcommittee, and in those remarks he indicated that he had heard a rumor to the effect that the Administrator, Mr. Wickard, was at least in part responsible for his not being on my subcommittee. Mr. Wickard wrote to me about this on February 14th. I believe that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will like to make some comment in connection with a quotation that I should like to read from Mr. Wickard's letter. Mr. Wickard said:

I want to unequivocally and categorically deny that I ever made any request at any time in connection with an effort to have Mr. HOFFMAN removed from the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would say in answer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] that the information did come to me from what I considered a reliable source, right out of the Department of Agriculture. I have a copy of the letter Mr. Wickard wrote to the gentleman. I have a copy of the letter I wrote in reply. It reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1950.

Mr. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,  
Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WICKARD: Yours of the 14th, which came by special messenger, together with the copy of your letter to PORTER HARDY, JR., at hand.

The last sentence reads as follows:

"I make this request not so much because I wish to be personally exonerated, but because of the insinuation that there is something so bad in my organization that this extraordinarily improper action is being taken to cover it up."

Am in accord with the statement that my arbitrary and unprecedented removal from a subcommittee was, to quote you, "extraordinarily improper action" and trust that the majority party will without delay take steps to correct that improper action.

Sincerely yours,

P. S.—Rereading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, am striking the next to the last paragraph in the first column on page 1813, daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as the substance appears on page 1776 of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(Copy to Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR.)

If the gentleman states that Mr. Wickard insists that he did not have anything to do with my unauthorized removal from the subcommittee, that is all right with me, I will be glad to accept his statement. Over the years I have heard of these rumors about what individuals in the Departments said and were doing. Sometimes they are good, accurate—in accord with the fact—sometimes they are not. Now, I remember the rumors about Hiss and some others in the executive departments. When we called attention to them sometimes we were told: "Oh, well, you are just listening to the wind." But if the court sustains the conviction in the Hiss case Hiss is going to wind up in jail and the so-called rumors we heard about Hiss resulted in his exposure.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I felt sure the gentleman would like to correct any unfair statement that he said he had received.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not accept the characterization of my statement as unfair but if the gentleman says he did not have anything to do with my removal from the Hardy subcommittee and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] says Mr. Wickard did not ask for my removal then I accept that as the fact. I would accept the word of the gentleman from Virginia for almost anything.

Mr. HARDY. I am grateful to the gentleman.

#### PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK

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, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if there has been any change in connection with the announced program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. After the termination of Calendar Wednesday—

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any idea when that will be?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will notice that I said "after the termination of business on Calendar Wednesday." If there is any time remaining for the rest of the week I intend to program the bill S. 2105, a bill relating to the mining industry. A rule making the bill in order has been reported out of the Committee on Rules and I understand that the committee in charge of the bill is going to propose a couple of amendments to the bill which will remove a substantial part of the opposition that existed to the bill as reported out of the committee originally.

That is the only change I know of at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will there be any further additions for the rest of this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Without binding myself I have no intention now, unless something pressing arises—and I have no knowledge of it—the strong probabilities are that there will not be anything further this week.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman give us any estimate as to how long we will be in session tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I could. The gentleman's estimate is just as good as and probably better than mine. Frankly, I am unable to state.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We will be in session until Washington's Farewell Address is read.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Mississippi is very optimistic. I hope that will not be so.

Mr. RANKIN. I was expressing the American wish, with which I am sure George Washington would agree, if he were here.

#### SURPLUS FOOD

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] in urging that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House promptly proceed with hearings on the bill, H. R. 7135. Throughout the length and breadth of this Nation we have tens of thousands of people on relief, we have millions of dollars worth of surplus commodities going to waste, and I believe that the situation is sufficiently serious that the merits of this bill for the relief of the people who have helped pay for these stored-up goods should be considered at once.

#### WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. RICH. 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. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much about the program for tomorrow—Washington's Birthday. Ever since I have been a Member of Congress Washington's Farewell Address has been read to the Members of the House on Washington's Birthday. May I say that the membership of the House could do no greater service to the country than listen attentively to what Washington said in his farewell address which he delivered to the Congress of the United States at that time. Then heed his advice. It gives us a lot of instructions as to what we should do and what is best for this country and, in my opinion, the suggestions made in his farewell address are as important today as they were when Washington delivered that memorable address.

If the membership of the House wants to do something good for their country they should listen attentively to the address and when the reading of it is concluded, the Members should go to their offices or homes and think carefully about what has been stated in Washington's address. Then heed it. If they do that, they will be doing the greatest good for this country that they could possibly do. Certainly they would keep us out of war and out of foreign entanglements. He was, in his wise counsel and advice, the Father of his Country. He

did not believe in perpetuity of office. He stood for America—for freedom. He worked for liberty, and he did not believe in socialism—the way we are traveling under this administration. Again I admonish you Members of Congress—heed Washington's advice.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem on water.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include newspaper and other material.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he previously made and to include excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### FILING OF MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the event minority views are filed to the report of the Committee on Small Business today, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to file additional views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

#### AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 476)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 21, 1950.

#### HEALTH INSURANCE

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, I call the attention of the House to petitions from members of the

American Legion Auxiliary, of Ashby and Westford, Mass., against any compulsory health insurance plan under national bureaucratic control reading as follows:

Whereas the American veteran in two world wars has defended the American free enterprise system, which has made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas having experienced the shortcomings of impersonal, assembly-line medical care inherent in the form of Government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose an unjust tax on the veteran's pay check for medical care to which he is now entitled free of charge as a reward for his service to his country; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would force a tax of 3 percent on the income of the employed veteran, rising to a tax of at least 6 percent within a few years, creating new financial burdens which increase the costs of necessities of life and lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion Auxiliary does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of Massachusetts, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

Signed by the president and the secretary.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

#### NICOLETTA AND GUILIA PONTRELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 677) for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any orders of deportation which may have been commenced in the cases of Nicoletta Pontrelli and Guilia Pontrelli.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 and section 18 of the Immigration Act of 1917, the aliens, Nicoletta Pontrelli and Guilia Pontrelli, upon payment by them of the required head taxes, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States at the port of New York as of the date of the enactment of this act, if they are not inadmissible on any grounds other than the fact that Nicoletta Pontrelli is feeble-minded and Guilia Pontrelli is an accompanying alien whose protection or guardianship is required by the feeble-minded alien."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## HONORIO CANCELLER EVANGELISTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1866) for the relief of Honorio Canciller Evangelista.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Honorio Canciller Evangelista, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at the port of San Francisco, Calif., on January 17, 1948. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Philippine quota of the first year that the same Philippine quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Honorio Canciller and Nancy Ting Evangelista, who were admitted to the United States as temporary visitors, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their entry into the United States at the port of San Francisco, Calif., on January 17, 1948, upon payment by them of the required head tax and visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the Philippine quota and one number from the nonpreference category of the quota for Chinese persons of the first year that such quota numbers are available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Honorio Canciller and Nancy Ting Evangelista."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MARTIN KENNETH IKEDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2705) for the relief of Martin Kenneth Ikeda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding persons of certain races from permanent admission to, and from naturalization as citizens of, the United States, Martin Kenneth Ikeda, minor son of Ichio Ikeda, a citizen of the United States, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed and without presenting an immigration visa or other travel documents, and may become naturalized as a citizen of the United States upon compliance with other requirements of the naturalization laws applicable in his case and consistent with this act. Upon the admission of the said Martin Kenneth Ikeda to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Japanese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 161-162; 50 Stat. 165; 46 Stat. 581; 8 U. S. C. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States for permanent residence persons who are ineligible to citizenship. Martin Kenneth

Ikeda, minor son of Ichio Ikeda, a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be admissible to the United States for permanent residence, provided he is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the first available quota for nationals of China."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CAMILLA FABRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3018) for the relief of Camilla Fabris.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

## KATE LAURSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4015) for the relief of Kate Laursen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Kate Laursen, the wife of a citizen of the United States, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the words "act of", strike the balance of the line down to and including the word "laws", on line 8, and insert "1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), insofar as concerns any act or acts of Kate Laursen of which the Department of Justice has notice at the time of enactment of this act, the said Kate Laursen may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is not found to be otherwise inadmissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DR. TA FU WU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4532) for the relief of Dr. Ta Fu Wu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States of Dr. Ta Fu Wu as of June 30, 1948, the date on which he lawfully entered the United States.

Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Chinese persons of the first year that such quota is hereafter available.

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.

## DR. AGOSTINO DeLISI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5566) for the relief of Dr. Agostino DeLisi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Agostino DeLisi who entered the United States on June 26, 1948, to continue his medical studies, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Italy for the first year such quota is available.

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.

## HAMAKO AMANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6271) for the relief of Hamako Amano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of law relating to racial ineligibility and the provisions of the law relating to prerequisites to the issuance of a visitor's visa, Hamako Amano, the fiancée of Harry Schneider, an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, shall, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, be deemed eligible for a visitor's visa for the purpose of contracting marriage with said Harry Schneider: *Provided*, That said marriage shall be contracted within a period of 90 days after the arrival of Hamako Amano in the United States: *Provided further*, That upon the contracting of the marriage aforesaid within the period of 90 days after the arrival of Hamako Amano in the United States, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to adjust the status of Hamako Amano to that of a permanent resident of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Harry Schneider (nee Hamako Amano), the wife of a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry Schneider."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MRS. WILLIAM Y. IMANAKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6344) for the relief of Mrs. William Y. Imanaka.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mrs. William Y. Imanaka, wife of Corp. William Y. Imanaka, a citizen of the United States who is serving in Japan with the armed forces of the United States, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon

application hereafter filed and without presenting an immigration visa or other travel documents, if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon the admission of the said Mrs. William Y. Imanaka to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the Japanese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. William Y. Imanaka, a native and citizen of Japan, of the Japanese race, the wife of Corp. William Y. Imanaka, a citizen of the United States who is serving in Japan with the armed forces of the United States, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHIKAKO MARY OHORI HORI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6414) for the relief of Mrs. Chikako Mary Ohori Hori.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from permanent admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mrs. Chikako Mary Ohori Hori, a natural-born citizen of the Dominion of Canada and the wife of Soichiro Hori, Pacoima, Calif., a citizen of the United States, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Chikako Mary Ohori Hori, a native and citizen of Canada of the Japanese race, the wife of a citizen of the United States, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MITSUE MIYAMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6589) for the relief of Mitsue Miyamoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion from the United States of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not here-

after apply to Mitsue Miyamoto, the Japanese fiancée of Cloice Howard Bryan, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II. The said Mitsue Miyamoto shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if the appropriate administrative authorities find that the said Mitsue Miyamoto is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Cloice Howard Bryan and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. If the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mitsue Miyamoto, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). If the above-named parties are married within 3 months after the entry of the said Mitsue Miyamoto, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Mitsue Miyamoto, as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

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.

MITSUKO UEMURA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6639) for the relief of Mitsuko Uemura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion from the United States of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Mitsuko Uemura, the Japanese fiancée of Clement Don Jones, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II. The said Mitsuko Uemura shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if the appropriate administrative authorities find that the said Mitsuko Uemura is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Clement Don Jones and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. If the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Mitsuko Uemura, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). If the above-named parties are married within 3 months after the entry of the said Mitsuko Uemura, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Mitsuko Uemura, as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

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.

ARTHUR CHEN SHU JEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6756) for the relief of Arthur Chen Shu Jee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause an immigration visa to be issued to Arthur Chen Shu Jee, born on August 2, 1946, at Soochow, China, the son of Dr. Kenneth Chen Huan Jee, who is a native-born United States

citizen, if he is found by the United States consul to whom application for visa is made, to be admissible under all the provisions of the immigration laws other than the annual-quota limitations.

Sec. 2. Upon the admission of Arthur Chen Shu Jee to the United States the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Chinese persons for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of existing immigration laws Arthur Chen Shu Jee, born on August 16, 1947, at Soochow, China, the son of Dr. Kenneth Chen Huan Jee, who is a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant if he is admissible for permanent residence under the provisions of the immigration laws other than the annual quota limitations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. KYOKO NAKAMURA KORNHAUSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6787) for the relief of Mrs. Kyoko Nakamura Kornhauser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Kyoko Nakamura Kornhauser, a native and citizen of Japan, of the Japanese race, the wife of David Henry Kornhauser, a United States citizen who is an honorably discharged veteran of the United States armed forces during World War II, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. NOBUKO ETO HEARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6894) for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Eto Heard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Nobuko Eto Heard, a native and citizen of Japan, of the Japanese race, the wife of Thomas James Heard, a United States citizen who is presently serving in the armed forces of the United States, and that if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws she shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

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.

HISAKO SAKATA IKEZAWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7035) for the relief of Hisako Sakata Ikezawa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Hisako Sakata Ikezawa, the Japanese spouse of Michael Akira Ikezawa, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence as a nonquota immigrant upon application hereafter filed, if she is otherwise admissible under immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

P. S. COOK CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 563) for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the P. S. Cook Co., of Lincoln, Nebr., the sum not exceeding \$2,545.76, which the Public Housing Commissioner certifies, after such audit as he deems advisable, to be the amount of losses sustained by such company in performing its cost-plus-fixed-fee subcontracts for plumbing and heating on Federal Public Housing Authority projects Neb.-V-25136 (Blair, Nebr.), Ia.-V-13148 (Red Oak, Iowa), and Ia.-V-13112 (Shenandoah, Iowa), which losses were caused by increased labor costs, no adjustment for which was allowed by the Public Housing Administration, and such payment shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such company against the United States for reimbursement for such losses: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

GLADYS INEZ GREENWOOD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 914) for the relief of Gladys Inez Greenwood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gladys Inez Greenwood, of New London, Conn. (widow of Col. Donald R. Greenwood, O-6290, United States Army, who died on July 7, 1946, at Hot Springs, Ark., while en route under Army order to La Jolla, Calif., his official residence of record), an amount equal to the travel allowance to which she would have been entitled had her husband not died at Hot Springs and had he completed his journey to La Jolla, Calif., his official residence of record: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed

guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

AERO-BOCKER KNITTING MILLS, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1047) for the relief of Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc., New York, N. Y., the sum of \$14,439.80. Such sum represents the amount such corporation paid, under protest, to the United States to cover the excess cost to the United States of purchasing 25,000 pounds of knitted worsted fabric elsewhere than from such corporation. The said Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc., was unable to carry out its contract to furnish such fabric to the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, United States Army, because of a typographical error in the bid submitted by such corporation. Such bid read "\$1.45" a pound as the price for which such corporation undertook to furnish such fabric instead of "\$2.45" a pound which was the price which such corporation intended to submit: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

CHARLES W. WULF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1290) for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ROBERT B. WORKMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1449) for the relief of Robert B. Workman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert B. Workman, of Lincoln, Maine, the sum of \$4,125, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for household and personal effects destroyed on December 17, 1938, when the station building in which he was residing with his family while serving as an employee of the Civil Aeronautics Authority at the United States Airways Communication Station, Knight Field, Evanston, Wyo., was destroyed by fire caused by a defective flue and chimney in the communication station: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this

act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

W. B. TERRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1464) for the relief of W. B. Terry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$446 to W. B. Terry, of Orange, Orange County, Tex., in full payment of all claims against the United States as refund for bond forfeited for Deason Childress, who has been apprehended and turned over to the Federal authorities: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM KRAUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1699) for the relief of the estate of William Kraus.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to the estate of William Kraus, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said William Kraus, who was killed as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Tenth Avenue and Twenty-ninth Street, New York City, on January 6, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,452.73."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. L. LEFFINGWELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1933) for the relief of C. L. Leffingwell and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a), notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to pay, out of the appropriation otherwise available for the reimbursement of expenses incurred in traveling and moving household effects by employees of the Railway Mail Service of the Post Office Department, to the persons named in subsection (b) hereof, such amounts for expenses as were incurred by them in connection with their transfer from one duty station to another on orders of officials of the Surface Postal Transport Division between the dates indicated following the names of each of such persons: *Provided*, That the amounts to be paid shall in each case be subject to administrative determination by the Post Office Department and audit by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That no part of the respective amounts authorized to be paid by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim of any person hereinafter named, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

(b) James H. Barrow, for expenses incurred between December 3, 1945, and July 23, 1947; Walter L. Robinson, Jr., for expenses incurred between April 20, 1947, and November 3, 1947; Allyn W. Reimund, for expenses incurred between July 24, 1947, and November 25, 1947; Walter E. Patterson, for expenses incurred between July 6, 1947, and November 9, 1947; Harold L. Marsh, for expenses incurred between February 3, 1947, and June 3, 1947; Malcolm R. Clark, for expenses incurred between August 14, 1947, and December 16, 1947; Marshall B. McRee, for expenses incurred between October 12, 1947, and February 13, 1948; Charles L. Leffingwell, for expenses incurred between July 28, 1947, and March 3, 1948; Eugene Attkisson, for expenses incurred between November 23, 1947, and October 1, 1948.

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.

I. D. COSSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2719) for the relief of I. D. Cosson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, whereas injuries, suffering, and hardship sustained when saturation bombs were dropped in the yard and near his home by a United States Army plane on August 11, 1944, resulted in I. D. Cosson's being permanently paralyzed from the waist down and in his right leg subsequently being amputated in the mid thigh, that in addition to sums heretofore authorized, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, of De Funiak Springs, Fla., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in

connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENO E. STITELY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2765) for the relief of Reno E. Stitely.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MRS. DOROTHY MANIOUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2929) for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Dorothy Manious, Nebraska City, Nebr., the sum of \$10,000 in full settlement of her claim against the United States arising out of the death of Alvin C. Manious, her husband; and the sum of \$2,500 in full settlement of her claim against the United States arising from injuries received while a passenger in an automobile which was struck by one being driven by Private Jeter Maxwell in Munich, Germany.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the sign "\$" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, medical expenses, and loss of earnings sustained by her as the result of an accident involving an Army truck, which occurred in Munich, Germany, on January 31, 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH GARDNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner, the Samuel and Nettie Bowne Hospital, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., the sum

of \$25,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation on account of personal injuries and medical and hospital and other expenses incurred by her as a result thereof, sustained by her when an automobile in which she was traveling collided with a United States Army truck driven by Pvt. George A. Green, while proceeding on Route No. 55, near the town of Poughquag, N. Y., on February 3, 1944: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to" insert "the estate of."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$25,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

Page 2, line 4, after the date "1944:", strike out "*Provided*", and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided*, That the acceptance by the said estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner of the amount appropriated by this act shall not be construed as affecting any claim or claims that she may desire to assert against any other person or persons on account of damages growing out of this same accident: *And provided further*."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Y. S. HU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4301) for the relief of Y. S. Hu.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

J. R. HOLDEN, R. C. BIGGADIKE, AND JOHN HOFFMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4342) for the relief of J. R. Holden, R. C. Biggadike, and John Hoffman.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two objections are required.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HARRY TANSEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5546) for the relief of Harry Tansey.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ALCIDÉ RAYMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6051) for the relief of Alcide Raymond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Army be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enter in the records of the Department of the Army the following: That Alcide Raymond, Army serial number R-203028, sergeant, Battery A, Thirteenth Coast Artillery, shall be held and considered to have been retired on November 14, 1936, after more than 30 years' service.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,965.67 to Maud E. Raymond, widow of Alcide Raymond, which amount represents full retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of active-duty pay of a sergeant from November 14, 1936, to and including January 31, 1948, the date of the death of Alcide Raymond: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

## PAUL D. BANNING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6691) for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$12,366.33, of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of \$406.89 shall be credited in the accounts of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of \$144.16 shall be credited in the accounts of E. J. Brennan, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of \$623.67 shall be credited in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, to the extent necessary to adjust overdrafts in their accounts as described in House Report No. 1609, Eighty-first Congress, second session; (b) not to exceed the sum of \$9 shall be used to reimburse B. H. Willis, cashier, office of the collector of internal revenue, Jacksonville, Fla., for the amount paid by him to the Federal Reserve bank in settlement of a discrepancy caused by a deposit of a \$1 note which had been raised to \$10; (c) not to exceed the sum of \$20 shall be used to reimburse Miss Vera Dixon, window teller, office of the collector of internal revenue, St. Louis, Mo., for the amount paid by her to the Federal Reserve bank to replace a counterfeit \$20 bill; (d) not to exceed the sum of \$20 shall be used to reimburse J. L. Schrum, cashier, office of the collector of internal revenue, Greensboro, N. C., for the amount paid by him to the Guilford (N. C.) National Bank to replace a counterfeit \$20 bill; (e) not to exceed the sum of \$10 shall be used to reimburse James Howley, teller, office of the collector of internal revenue, Chicago, Ill., for the amount paid by him to replace a counterfeit \$10 bill; and (f) not to exceed the sum of \$11,132.61 shall be credited to public-debt receipts to correct

discrepancies resulting from the failure of issuing agents to account for bond stock supplied to them.

Sec. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of the following certifying officers, former certifying officers, and a disbursing officer of the Treasury Department for amounts disallowed in their accounts as enumerated in House Report No. 1609, Eighty-first Congress, second session, in sums not to exceed those hereinafter stated: Charles S. Bell, \$7.50; Edwin H. Dressel, \$50; Harry C. Westover, \$1,151.68; Mrs. Pluma J. O'Farrell, \$28.86; E. F. Keim, \$25.20; Frank J. Kuhl, \$39.30; Earl G. Loser, \$6.24; J. C. Breaud, \$908.87; O. V. Powell, \$354.33; and Denis W. Delaney, \$9.99.

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.

## SGT. BLAINE W. HUGHES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6692) for the relief of Sgt. Blaine W. Hughes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Sgt. Blaine W. Hughes, AF 19036079, United States Air Force, be, and he is hereby, relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$203.28, representing the amount of pay received by him from the United States for work performed by him as a temporary civilian employee in the capacity of automotive mechanic, grade 12, between October 8, 1945, and November 11, 1945, both dates inclusive, at the Sierra Ordnance Depot, Herlong, Calif., while he was on furlough. In the settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for all payments made to the said Sgt. Blaine W. Hughes for the services so performed by him.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sgt. Blaine W. Hughes, United States Air Force, the sum of \$69.60 (\$82.40 less \$12.80, withholding tax), to be exempt from Federal income tax, which sum represents the net balance of the compensation due to the said Blaine W. Hughes for the services performed by him between October 8, 1945, and November 21, 1945, both dates inclusive, at the said Sierra Ordnance Depot, while he was on furlough: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

## ERVIN HAAS AND LENO VESCOVI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6694) for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the instructions of the Navy Department contained in Navy Civilian Personnel Instructions (NCPI 250, Rev. II), Ervin Haas, former fire chief, United States naval submarine base, New London, Conn., from January 26, 1942, to October 2, 1944, and Leno Vescovi, former fire chief, United States naval sub-

marine base, New London, Conn., from October 5, 1944, to May 5, 1948, shall be held and considered to have been entitled to occupancy of public quarters without charge while serving as fire chief at the afore-mentioned naval submarine base; and such persons shall not be subject to charge for the accumulated appraised value of the rental and utilities furnished for such periods in the amounts of \$645.65 and \$360.66, respectively: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

## EDGAR F. RUSSELL; LILLIAN V. RUSSELL, HIS WIFE; AND BESSIE R. WARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6695) for the relief of Edgar F. Russell; Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edgar F. Russell and Lillian V. Russell, his wife, the sum of \$903.25, and to Bessie R. Ward, the sum of \$135.75, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the value of personal property destroyed by fire on June 14, 1944, in a Government building at Hoonah, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

## LAWRENCE B. WILLIAMS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6696) for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams, the sum of \$1,437.08, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the value of personal property destroyed by fire on March 19, 1946, in a Government building at Savoonga, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

**EUGENIO MAISTERRENA BARRENECHE**

The Clerk called the bill (S. 204) for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of January 2, 1940, the date upon which he was temporarily admitted into the United States, upon the payment by him of the 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 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.

**PIETER CORNELIS TEN WOLDE AND FAMILY**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 714) for the relief of Pieter Cornelis ten Wolde and family.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws the aliens Pieter Cornelis ten Wolde, his wife, Mrs. Johanna Cristina ten Wolde, and their two minor children, Christol Henny ten Wolde and Loekie Helena ten Wolde, of New Orleans, La., who entered the United States at Miami, Fla., on September 2, 1947, for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at such place and on such date. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to make appropriate deduction of four numbers from the quota for the Netherlands.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MRS. JOHN KAUDY, FORMERLY STELLA CAPPLER**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1170) for the relief of Mrs. John Kaudy, formerly Stella Cappler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Mrs. John Kaudy (formerly Stella Cappler), the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the Act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, Seventy-ninth Congress), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "residence" strike out the balance of line 9 and line 10 down to and including the word "Congress").

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**GABE BUDWEE**

The Clerk called the bill (S. 309) for the relief of Gabe Budwee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Gabe Budwee, the husband of an American-born citizen of the United States, and the father of two minor citizens of the United States, who aided in the war effort by his employment as a civilian by the United States Army in Australia, during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the Immigration Act of 26, 1924, if he is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

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.

**MRS. SOLVEIG NORMANSON**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2232) for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

**THERESE HOHMAN**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3330) for the relief of Therese Hohman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Therese Hohman, residing in Bethlehem, Pa., who was admitted into the United States at the port of Boston on a temporary visa, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of December 17, 1948; the departure bond shall be canceled upon payment of visa fees and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category from the German quota for the first year said quota is available.

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.

**ALFRED ZORGIS ET AL.**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4604) to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills, namely Alfred Zorgis, Teodor Egle, Karlis Fogelis, Vasily Kils, and Aleksanders Zelmenis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of State and the Attorney General be, and are hereby, authorized and directly jointly to provide for the temporary admission of Alfred Zorgis, Teodor Egle, Karlis Fogelis, Vasily

Kils, and Aleksanders Zelmenis, who are foreign specialists possessing special and unique skills vitally needed for the operation of a textile mill by Robert Hirss, of Woonsocket, R. I.

If, at the expiration of 12 months immediately following the admission into the United States of these foreign specialists, the Attorney General shall, upon application filed with the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization by these named aliens, find that such persons have maintained employment with Robert Hirss, he is hereby authorized and directed to amend the record of such aliens' temporary admission to show admission for permanent residence as of the date of their respective actual entry into the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Alfred Zorgis." Page 1, strike out line 10 and lines 1 to 9 on page 2.

Page 2, line 10, insert the following: "Sec. 2. If the Attorney General finds that any of the above-named aliens has failed to maintain a satisfactory employment status at any time within the year after the date of his temporary admission, such alien shall be deemed to have remained in the United States for a longer time than permitted and shall be subject to deportation as provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills, namely, Teodor Egle, Karlis Fogelis, Vasily Kils, and Aleksanders Zelmenis."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**VERONICA JOLLY**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4781) for the relief of Veronica Jolly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Veronica Jolly, of Washington, D. C., shall be held and considered to be found lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her actual entry into the United States, upon payment by her of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to deduct one number from the quota for Australia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AMENDING PRIVATE LAW NO. 463, SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5541) to amend Private Law No. 463, Seventy-sixth Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Private Law 463, Seventy-sixth Congress, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That, for the purposes of section 5, of the act entitled 'An act in reference to the expatriation of citizens and their protection abroad,' approved March 2, 1907, as amended,

William Lawrence Tan, of Honolulu, Hawaii, the minor child of Wilma Alberta Geary, a citizen of the United States whose American citizenship was resumed on March 30, 1935, notwithstanding that he is inadmissible for entry into the United States for permanent residence he shall not be deported.

"Sec. 2. The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of William Lawrence Tan as of December 1, 1934, at the port of Honolulu, Hawaii."

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.

#### HARUKO TERAMOTO

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 6577) for the relief of Haruko Teramoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Haruko Teramoto, Hyogo-Ken, Japan, the Japanese fiancée of Dale O. Nichols, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Haruko Teramoto may be eligible for a visa as a non-immigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Haruko Teramoto is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Dale O. Nichols, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Haruko Teramoto, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after entry of said Haruko Teramoto, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Haruko Teramoto as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head taxes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### E. W. EATON COAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 229) for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,163.24, to E. W. Eaton Coal Co., of Belfast, Maine, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation cost in excess of normal rates of transportation prevailing prior to January 1, 1942, on coal received on and after April 1, 1944, to December 31, 1944, in and around New York Harbor area and in New England, on anthracite coal from district No. 3 in northern West Virginia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person

violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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.

#### LLOYD D. LYLES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 321) for the relief of Lloyd D. Lyles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lloyd D. Lyles, of Asheville, N. C., the sum of \$231.69 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the difference between the salary paid him under grade CAF-2 by the General Accounting Office for the period December 5, 1947, to January 24, 1948, and the salary of grade CAF-8, the duties of which he performed during such period after having been erroneously separated from the higher grade: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

#### CLARENCE HERBERT HARTMAN, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 481) for the relief of the legal guardian of Clarence Herbert Hartman, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to the legal guardian of Clarence Herbert Hartman, a minor, of Clearwater, Fla., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said minor on June 7, 1943, near Pinellas Army Air Field, St. Petersburg, Fla., when a rope suspended from an Army airplane struck him on the neck and threw him to the ground: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

#### EDNA A. BAUSER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1916) for the relief of Edna A. Bauser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not

otherwise appropriated, to Edna A. Bauser, postmaster at Bunker Hill, Ill., the sum of \$366.71, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement for the expenses incurred by her in providing temporary quarters for the post office following a tornado which destroyed the former quarters: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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

Abbott, Colin Cedric.  
Acosta, Catalina Avila De, or Katie Acosta or Louisa Avila.  
Akins, Mei Lin Liu, or Marion Liu Akins (nee Mei Lin Liu).  
Albert Joseph Armand.  
Alexandropoulos, Nicolaos.  
Amador, Casimiro Moreno.  
Amador, Flores De, or Maria Ignacia De Jesus.  
Andronis, Agnes, or Agni Androni (nee Vatzakis or Batzakis or Bodzarki).  
Armitage, Edith Elizabeth.  
Atilano, Encarnacion, or Encarnacion Atilano Navarro or Jose Encarnacion Atilano Navarro.  
Atilano, Rosa Cordero de, or Rosa Aldama Cordero.  
Ayyob, Rayyah Mitri, or Ayoob or Ayoub.  
Badillo-Molar, Gabriel.  
Baites, Leontina Elvira (nee Leontina Elvira Moga).  
Bergersen, Arne Johan.  
Bergersen, Astrid Hedvig (nee Christiansen).  
Best, Paul Wardlaw.  
Bik, Chan Pui, or Esther Chan or Mrs. So Bing Sun.  
Biondi, Angelina Vecchio.  
Bisconti, Giuseppe, or Joseph B. Bisconti.  
Booth, Alfred Smallwood.  
Bozzay, George.  
Bribescas, Ascencion.  
Bribescas, Petra Nieves (alias Petra N. Bribescas alias Petra Nieves).  
Bucewick, Albina Alzbeta, or Albina Alizabeth Bucevicus (nee Valentos).  
Burt, Arthur Frederick Jasper.  
Calogero, Glyceria (nee Dariva).  
Camano, Enrique.  
Chapman, Phyllis Eileen.  
Churchill, Diane Cecilia.  
Coffaro, Paolino (alias Paul Joseph Coffaro).  
Cooper, Herbert Roy.  
Coronado, Ramon Elizondo.  
Couris, Victoria Hantzaras.  
Cuevas, Armando Jose Lopez y.  
Cybulski, Mieczyslaw Frawzic, or Mieczyslaw Cybulski.

- [REDACTED] D'Andria, Pietro or Peter.  
 [REDACTED] Dean, Faith.  
 [REDACTED] De La O-Favilla, Jesus (alias  
 Pedro De La O or Pedro Regalado).  
 [REDACTED] Dvorak, Zdenek.  
 [REDACTED] Facca, Guerino (alias Jerry  
 Facca).  
 [REDACTED] Fierro, Gregorio, or Gregorio  
 Fierro-Parras.  
 [REDACTED] Fierro, Sanjuana Carillo de, or  
 Sanjuana Carillo.  
 [REDACTED] Finkelstein, Marie, or Maria  
 Popovici.  
 [REDACTED] Fong, Mon Lai.  
 [REDACTED] Sang, Chang Hung.  
 [REDACTED] Foros, Petros, or Pete Foros or  
 Peter Foros.  
 [REDACTED] Garcia, Maria Calderon de  
 (alias Maria Carrasco alias Maria Carrasco de  
 Garcia).  
 [REDACTED] Garcia, Petra.  
 [REDACTED] Garcia, Oscar Raimundo Y.  
 Chaple.  
 [REDACTED] Garcia, Carmen (nee Carmen  
 Estevez Betancourt).  
 [REDACTED] Garonzik, Ray, formerly Raella,  
 or Ray Gilman (nee Raella or Ray Ruckenstein).  
 [REDACTED] George, Lilly Belle.  
 [REDACTED] Gerchow, Maria Eugenia.  
 [REDACTED] Glikis, Panagiotis, or Panagiotis  
 Pantellis Glikis or Pangrotis or Pete  
 Glikis.  
 [REDACTED] Goldberg, Sarah (nee Hyman).  
 [REDACTED] Gomes, Luis Manuel.  
 [REDACTED] Gonzalez, Aurelio Vigao Y.  
 [REDACTED] Graham, John Francis.  
 [REDACTED] Graham, Marguerite Enid.  
 [REDACTED] Granado, Estefana Reza De  
 (alias Estefana Reza alias Estefana Rivera).  
 [REDACTED] Griott, Alice Agnes.  
 [REDACTED] Gross, Ludovic.  
 [REDACTED] Gruetzmann, Clara (nee Bass).  
 [REDACTED] Gutman, Rasela (nee Politzer).  
 [REDACTED] Hansen, Emanuel Edward, or  
 Emanuel Hansen.  
 [REDACTED] Hansen, Eigel Mogens (alias Egil  
 Mogens Hansen).  
 [REDACTED] Hansen, Hans.  
 [REDACTED] Hanson, Hans Richard.  
 [REDACTED] Held, Elsie Johanna (alias Elsie  
 Johanna Wilde).  
 [REDACTED] Hermo, Manuel Paz, or Manuel  
 Paz.  
 [REDACTED] Holzli, Paul.  
 [REDACTED] Humphreys, Rosemary Bernadette.  
 [REDACTED] Humphreys, Adrienne Marie-Louise.  
 [REDACTED] Hurtado, Felipe Dominguez.  
 [REDACTED] Inanovitz, Abraham Leib, or  
 Louis Norvin.  
 [REDACTED] Jackson, Marjorie Alice.  
 [REDACTED] Jackson, Michael Thomas.  
 [REDACTED] Jagedba, Augustine Kumakpibe  
 (alias Augustine Thompson).  
 [REDACTED] Javadi, Esfandiar, or Jimmie  
 Javadi.  
 [REDACTED] Jendrzewski, Kazimierza (nee  
 Kazimierza Janiszewski).  
 [REDACTED] Johnson, Richard Arlan, formerly  
 Richard Arlan Westby.  
 [REDACTED] Katsaros, Marika (nee Tzika).  
 [REDACTED] Kiang, Phoenix Shih Feng  
 (alias Phoenix Kiang).  
 [REDACTED] Killeen, Raymond Michael, or  
 Michael Raymond Killeen.  
 [REDACTED] Kim, Sae Sun, or Hak San Kim.  
 [REDACTED] Kligen, Jack.  
 [REDACTED] Kozich, Stella Jean.  
 [REDACTED] Kraus, Bohumil.  
 [REDACTED] Krausova, Matylda.  
 [REDACTED] Krausova, Marie.  
 [REDACTED] Krikorian, Alex, or Aghlag Krikorian.  
 [REDACTED] Kwart, Stephania Nowak (alias  
 Bromislawa Nowak alias Stephania Nowak  
 alias Katherine Nowak alias Stephania  
 Dzierba or Katherine Dzierba).  
 [REDACTED] Kwiatkowski, Marek Jerzy Drobner  
 (alias Mark Post).
- [REDACTED] Lambert, Judyann.  
 [REDACTED] Landeta, Emilia Martinez y  
 Aldanese De.  
 [REDACTED] Lech, John.  
 [REDACTED] Lee, Hannah Margaret.  
 [REDACTED] Leonardi Michele.  
 [REDACTED] Levy, Corin (nee Franco).  
 [REDACTED] Leyba, Altigracia Mercedes  
 Joaquina Perez, or Joaquina Perez-Leyba  
 (alias Joepulna Bido de Perez Leyba and  
 Altigracia Mercedes Joaquina Bido).  
 [REDACTED] Lopez, Jesus, or Jesus Lopez  
 Alvarado.  
 [REDACTED] Lopez, Teresita, or Teresita  
 Lopez Alvarado.  
 [REDACTED] Lopez, Salvador, or Salvador  
 Lopez Alvarado.  
 [REDACTED] Louis, Juliana.  
 [REDACTED] Madrid, Carmel Quiroz De.  
 [REDACTED] Maloney, Annie Jean (nee  
 Kearsey).  
 [REDACTED] Maloney, Sharon Anne.  
 [REDACTED] Mikela, Heidrum Kirkutis (alias  
 Heidrum Crow).  
 [REDACTED] Miller, Douglas George.  
 [REDACTED] Milstein, Aron.  
 [REDACTED] Mione, Stefano Francesco, or  
 Stefano Mione.  
 [REDACTED] Mitchell, Anna (nee Anna Ford).  
 [REDACTED] Montgelas, Carl Maximilian, or  
 Carl Maximilian Maria Adolph Joseph Montgelas.  
 [REDACTED] Mount, Milagros Josefina (nee  
 Llorente).  
 [REDACTED] Mullinas, Georgios, or George  
 Dennis Mullinas or George Mollis.  
 [REDACTED] McDonnell, Elizabeth Yvonne.  
 [REDACTED] McKirdy, Colin.  
 [REDACTED] Nagle, Florence Tyson (nee  
 Tyson).  
 [REDACTED] Needleman, Renee (nee Gross  
 alias Grutz y Vuchonicka alias Riveca Grutz  
 Y Zuchonicka).  
 [REDACTED] Nelle, Frederick James.  
 [REDACTED] Nelle, Elizabeth Louise.  
 [REDACTED] Nelle, Dorothy Bertha.  
 [REDACTED] Ness, Sigurd (alias Sigurd  
 Naess).  
 [REDACTED] Nibbs, Ernest Albert.  
 [REDACTED] Nibbs, Elenora.  
 [REDACTED] Nieto, Zacarias.  
 [REDACTED] Nunez, Roberto Rivas, or Robert  
 R. Nunez.  
 [REDACTED] Oddo, Mary (nee Maria Starchenko).  
 [REDACTED] Olsen, Ragnhild Konstanse  
 (alias Ragnhild Jerkill, nee Larsen).  
 [REDACTED] Osuna, Maria Concepcion Parra  
 de.  
 [REDACTED] Ottochian, Dionisio.  
 [REDACTED] Overton, Randolph Lee.  
 [REDACTED] Panton, Leslie Alexander.  
 [REDACTED] Papapostolou, Ailiki Constantino  
 (nee Kantsika).  
 [REDACTED] Perez, Benigno Boo.  
 [REDACTED] Perry, Margaret, formerly Sands  
 (nee McCartney).  
 [REDACTED] Pineda, Salvador, or Francisco  
 Pichardo or Salvador Pinedo De La Rosa.  
 [REDACTED] Pirrone, Antonino.  
 [REDACTED] Plessas, Dimitra Thomas.  
 [REDACTED] Prata, Adelalde Lopes.  
 [REDACTED] Ramirez, Fausto Arturo, or  
 Fausto Arturo Ramirez y Benet.  
 [REDACTED] Regues, Francisco, or Francisco  
 Regues y Torregrosa (alias Francisco Torregrosa  
 Regues).  
 [REDACTED] Reinert, Joseph, or Josef Reinert.  
 [REDACTED] Rene, Joseph Albert.  
 [REDACTED] Rerech, Guiseppe Gregorio  
 (alias Joseph Rerech).  
 [REDACTED] Ricci, Victor Alan.  
 [REDACTED] Rivera, Carlos, or Carlos Rivera  
 Aguilar or Carlos Aguilar.  
 [REDACTED] Rizzo, Josephine (nee Matte-  
 liano).  
 [REDACTED] Robbins, Christopher (alias  
 James Church).  
 [REDACTED] Robertson, Amy Theresa.  
 [REDACTED] Robledo, Gregorio, or Gregorio  
 Robledo Cianez.
- [REDACTED] Robledo, Socorro Martinez De  
 or Socorro Martinez.  
 [REDACTED] Rodrigues, Antonio.  
 [REDACTED] Sachsenhauser, Rudolph or Rudolf.  
 [REDACTED] Salazar, Gumesindo Beltran, or  
 Jose Beltran-Salazar.  
 [REDACTED] Saldana, Anita Marmolejo de.  
 [REDACTED] Sanchez, Francisco Magallon.  
 [REDACTED] Sawicki, Hilary Ferdinand.  
 [REDACTED] Scavo, Lucia Vitale.  
 [REDACTED] Schuldt, Charles Bruno Karl  
 Max, or Charles Bruno Schuldt.  
 [REDACTED] Schutz, Walter.  
 [REDACTED] Schutz, Marie.  
 [REDACTED] Selja, Johannes or John.  
 [REDACTED] Selja, Maret (nee Rald or Kristine  
 Juurmann).  
 [REDACTED] Shotkowski, Josephine Mary.  
 [REDACTED] Smale, William Ronald (alias  
 Donald William Grey).  
 [REDACTED] Smith, Cynthia Lauretta.  
 [REDACTED] Socha, Caroline (nee Gargu-  
 hnska).  
 [REDACTED] Somers, Amos Urias (alias Amos  
 Sommers or Somers).  
 [REDACTED] Sotto, Romula, Alferos.  
 [REDACTED] Spinola, Carlo, or Marquis Carlo  
 Spinola or Carlo Luigi Spinola.  
 [REDACTED] Spoor, Johanna Catharina (nee  
 Porton).  
 [REDACTED] Stanatiotis, Ioannis Dimitrios,  
 or Ioannis Stanos or John Dimitrios Stanos.  
 [REDACTED] Stensland, Carl Ola.  
 [REDACTED] Stensland, Inger.  
 [REDACTED] Stewart, Muriel Eulalie (nee  
 Foote).  
 [REDACTED] Stoll, Else, or Elizabeth Stoll.  
 [REDACTED] Saint Vincent, Howard Roy.  
 [REDACTED] Tammsaar, Johannes.  
 [REDACTED] Tapinis, Peter, or Panagiotis  
 Tapinis.  
 [REDACTED] Targal, Ali Kami.  
 [REDACTED] Thefterios, Eleftherios G.  
 [REDACTED] Thame, Victor Ralph.  
 [REDACTED] Theilemann, Elsa Frieda.  
 [REDACTED] Thibodeau, Kathleen Georgia.  
 [REDACTED] Thomas, William Barry Gar-  
 land.  
 [REDACTED] Thompson, Pearl Estella, formerly  
 Pearl Estella Wright.  
 [REDACTED] Tiranno, Cologero, or Charles  
 Tiranno.  
 [REDACTED] Torres, Altigracia, or Canceleda  
 Recio.  
 [REDACTED] Traag, Socorro.  
 [REDACTED] Trovato, Teresa (nee Fedra).  
 [REDACTED] Trujillo, Bernardo.  
 [REDACTED] Tsao, Han Sun.  
 [REDACTED] Tschauder, Wolfgang Dietrich.  
 [REDACTED] Tsohos, Michael Antoniou Kou-  
 louris, or Michael Antoniou Tsohos.  
 [REDACTED] Tzlotis, Argyrios.  
 [REDACTED] Urruchua, Juan.  
 [REDACTED] Urrutia, Acracia (nee Herrero-  
 Garcia).  
 [REDACTED] Valenzuela, Manuel.  
 [REDACTED] Vian Anastasia, formerly Anas-  
 tasia Xenias (nee Sotiriadis).  
 [REDACTED] Violagis, Eftyhia Constatin  
 (alias Eftyhia Violacis or Violantzis nee Cos-  
 mides).  
 [REDACTED] Wallestad, Arild Martin.  
 [REDACTED] Witriol, Meyer.  
 [REDACTED] Yaker, Mordco, or Marco Yaker.  
 [REDACTED] Yancsics, Klara, or Klara  
 Schmidt.  
 [REDACTED] You, Lee Kee.

With the following committee amend-  
ments:

On page 5, line 20, strike out the registra-  
tion number and the name, "[REDACTED]  
Hurtado, Felipe Dominguez."

On page 8, line 23, strike out the registra-  
tion number and the name, "[REDACTED]  
Panton, Leslie Alexander."

On page 9, line 6, strike out the registra-  
tion number and the name, "[REDACTED]  
Pirrone, Antonino."

On page 10, line 11, strike out the registration number and the name, "██████████ Sawicki, Hilary Ferdinand."

The concurrent 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.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

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

██████████ Ackermann, Rose (nee Leider).  
 ██████████ Bell, Trevor Reginald.  
 ██████████ Bennardo, Pasquale.  
 ██████████ Blin, Maurice Edme Lucien Roger.

██████████ Brehme, Julius Frederick Franz.  
 ██████████ Cruz, Ismael or Isabel.  
 ██████████ Dahlseide, Sharon Beverly.  
 ██████████ Dahmen, Fernando.  
 ██████████ David, Tuma, or Tuma Nasser David or Tom David.

██████████ Davidson, Judith Barbara.  
 ██████████ Delgado, Martin Lopez, or Martin D. Lopez.

██████████ Di Pino, Salvatore.  
 ██████████ Emmanuel, Alexander Anastasios.

██████████ Emmanuel, Panorea Psaloudi or Panorca (Noira) Emmanuel (nee Panorea Syntell).

██████████ Falco, Maria Anna Elisabeth (nee Stumm).

██████████ Fidler, Archibald Raymond.  
 ██████████ Fleischer, Joseph.  
 ██████████ Ford, Elaine Lucy.  
 ██████████ Gardis, Argyro (formerly Argyro Velendza nee Karra).

██████████ Goldman, Sylvia Cherill, or Cherill Sylvia Pastman or Sylvia Pastman or Sylvia Mazelow.

██████████ Gomez, Ernesto Gonzalez (alias Ernest Gomez Gonzalez).

██████████ Greaux, Paul Marceau.  
 ██████████ Guement, Joelle Beatrix Therese Marthe.

██████████ Gutierrez, Jacinta (nee Luna).  
 ██████████ Hopkins, Muriel Blanche (nee Mac Leod).

██████████ James, Josephine Constance, or Josephine James also Josephine Constance Matthews.

██████████ Kessenides, Agapi, or Agapi Efsathrou Tsavdaridis or Agapi Kessinidi.

██████████ Kochan, Anne Betty (nee Blirovcak).

██████████ Lenklewicz, Antonina (nee Tracz).

██████████ Lerma, Aurora Saez.  
 ██████████ Lopez, Herminia Aldaco de.  
 ██████████ Mascolo, Vittoria Lo, or Vittoria Perrino (maiden name) Vittoria Perrino Lo Mascolo.

██████████ Metz, Conrad.  
 ██████████ Michos, Nicolieris Anastase.  
 ██████████ Mikulsky, Edith Mary Mott (alias McClusky nee Mott).

██████████ Miniconi, Francois.  
 ██████████ Murillo, Inez Murillo de.  
 ██████████ McDonald, Barry Francis.

██████████ Papadellis, Emmanuel John.  
 ██████████ Parra, Armando, or Armando Parra-Hernandez.

██████████ Parsons, Albert Earnest, or Bert Clark.

██████████ Perego, Viovanni Luigi.  
 ██████████ Power, Melvin John.

██████████ Providence, Maude (nee Braithwaite).

██████████ Rasmussen, Aage.  
 ██████████ Rebane, Paul, or Paul Fuks.

██████████ Robichaud, Helen Edna, or Helen Edna O'Brien.

██████████ Robinson, Alice Anna Antonia (nee Casagrande).

██████████ Robinson, Maruls Arthur.  
 ██████████ Robinson, Harald Denis.

██████████ Roy, Marie Blanche Yvonne (alias Marie Blanche Yvonne LaPierre).

██████████ Schoenherr, Mary Elizabeth.  
 ██████████ Scopinich, Anna Maria, or Anna Maria Tuna.

██████████ Simone, Celestina F. De. (nee Francescutti).

██████████ Stevens, Herta Maria Juliana (nee Zarnikow).

██████████ Veldhuis, Cornelia Antonia.  
 ██████████ Villasenor, Emilia (nee Emilia Pargulan Castro).

██████████ Wainunsky, Berco Gelwan.  
 ██████████ Williams, Doris Ismayr.

██████████ Wright, George Frederic (alias George Frederico Wright).

██████████ Yu, Teh Fu.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out the registration number and the name, "██████████ David, Tuma, or Tuma Nasser David or Tom David."

On page 3, after line 2, insert the following two registration numbers and names:

██████████ Karpman, Itzhak Jakob."  
 ██████████ Karpman, Estera nee Goldfinger."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The 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.

#### MRS. VICTOR V. GREG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 633) for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000, to Mrs. Victor V. Greg, of 3155 Annopolis Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck, near Joliet, Ill., on December 22, 1935: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. MERLE LEATHERBURY PYLE AND PATRICIA M. PYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1133) for the relief of Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, Lawrence A. Pyle, late employee of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who died on August 8, 1947, shall be held and considered to have died subsequent to February 28, 1948, and Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle, widow and minor child, respectively, of the said Lawrence A. Pyle shall be entitled to the benefits of such section 12 (c), beginning the first day of the second month following the month in which this act is enacted, if all amounts paid out of the civil-service retirement and disability fund on account of the death of the said Lawrence A. Pyle are redeposited in such fund not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1606) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That jurisdiction be, and the same hereby is, conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and through it the claims of its subcontractors, against the United States arising out of the performance of a contract with the Veterans' Administration for the construction of a hospital building at Fort Howard, Md.: *Provided,* That if the said court shall find that the United States through any of its departments or agencies delayed the issuance of priorities which resulted in subjecting the said contractor and its subcontractors to additional costs, including overhead expense, or if the said court shall find the United States, through any such department or agency, including Defense Plant Corporation, sponsored any work program in the general area of the contractor's work which rendered it impossible for the contractor and its subcontractors to achieve that degree of labor performance which they would have achieved had any such work program not existed, or made it necessary for them to pay higher wages for such labor as was available than they would otherwise have had to pay, and that these conditions subjected the contractor and its subcontractors to additional cost and overhead expense, then the said court shall in either event enter judgment for the contractor and its subcontractors in the amount of such additional costs, including a reasonable allowance for profit based upon such excess of cost and overhead expense.

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.

## MILDRED SMITH BUTLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1697) for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000, to Mildred Smith Butler, sister by legal adoption and beneficiary of the national service life insurance issued to John Cronin, deceased.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert: "That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay to Mildred Smith Butler, of Jasper, N. Y., the proceeds of National Service Insurance Policy No. N13047458 issued to John Cronin, late sergeant, Third Student Training Regiment, Fort Benning, Ga., whose death occurred in line of duty on March 16, 1944. Although Fred Butler was designated by the insured as beneficiary of such policy, his claim for payment thereunder was disallowed by Veterans' Administration on the ground that he did not stand in loco parentis to the insured within the meaning of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. Mildred Smith Butler, legally adopted sister of John Cronin, and wife of Fred Butler, beneficiary of said policy, is next in line to receive insurance."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EARL L. DOSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3080) for the relief of Earl L. Doss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Earl L. Doss, postal money order clerk in the United States Post Office at Savannah, Ga., the sum of \$145.56. The payment of such sum shall be in reimbursement for the payment of an equal amount by the said Earl L. Doss to the Post Office Department on account of the payment without fault on his part, of two forged post-office money orders Nos. 194242 and 194243, issued at Estill, South Carolina, August 30, 1947, in the total amount of \$145.56.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The 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.

## LOUIS P. MURPHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3506) for the relief of Louis P. Murphy, United States immigrant inspector, El Paso, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$725.50, to reimburse United States Immigrant Inspector Louis P. Murphy, of El Paso, Tex., for the value of personal property lost in a fire which destroyed a United States Government truck in which Inspector Murphy was being conveyed on official Government business while en route from El Paso, Tex., to Guaymas, Sonora, Mexico, on October 3, 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MRS. AGNES EMMA HAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4380) for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay, Coalinga, Calif., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay against the United States on account of the loss of her husband, Charles William Hay, who died on September 19, 1944, as the result of personal injuries sustained when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle on September 16, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## WILLIAM J. DRINKWINE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4608) for the relief of William J. Drinkwine.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,325 to William J. Drinkwine, of 5029 Seventh Avenue, Kenosha, Wis., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of wages and expenses resulting from being unjustly suspended from the Kenosha, Wis., post office for violation of the Hatch Act in June 1939 and restored to duty July 1940: *Provided*, That no part

of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$2,325" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,100."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## STELLA AVNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4720) for the relief of Stella Avner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Stella Avner, Washington, D. C., the sum of \$5,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Stella Avner against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her (while an employee of the Personnel and Administration Division, Office of Military Government for Bavaria) when she was shot by a sentry of the Army of the United States on the A6 South Autobahn, near Neuburg, Germany, on October 16, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FRANCIS A. GUNN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5274) for the relief of Francis A. Gunn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Francis A. Gunn, of South Weymouth, Mass., the sum of \$6,984.82. Such sum represents reimbursement for actual additional costs incurred by the said Francis A. Gunn in constructing a building to be used as quarters by the South Weymouth branch of the Boston post office, such additional costs being caused by delay in the granting of the Civilian Production Administration authorization necessary for such construction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of

10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after "building", strike out "a" and insert "to."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FRED I. MASSENGILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5523) for the relief of Fred I. Massengill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred I. Massengill, postmaster at Terrell, Tex., the sum of \$1,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Fred I. Massengill against the United States by reason of his being required to pay such sum to the United States for postage stamps lost, without fault on his part, from the post office at Terrell, Tex., during December 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

#### JEAN CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of Jean Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jean Clark, of Huntington Station, N. Y., the sum of \$10,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving an Army vehicle, occurring on January 28, 1944, at South Huntington, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,232."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WINNEBAGO RESERVATION, NEBR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2520) to authorize the sale of certain allotted devised land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell the trust allotment No. 110 of George Tebo, Jr., deceased Winnebago allottee, described as the east half of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 26 north, range 8 east, sixth principal meridian, Thurston County, Nebr., containing 80 acres, conveyance to be made by deed or the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds of such sale to Walter Tebo for his benefit.

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.

#### PINE RIDGE INDIAN RESERVATION, S. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6521) to authorize the sale of certain land on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak., allotted to Lucy Arapahoe Iron Bear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell at a price not less than \$2,500 the trust allotment numbered 5145 of Lucy Arapahoe Iron Bear, described as the southwest quarter of section 2, township 37 north, range 38 west, of the sixth principal meridian, South Dakota, conveyance to be made by deed or the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser and to disburse the proceeds of such sale to Lucy Arapahoe Iron Bear for her benefit: *Provided*, That the proceeds shall be regarded as trust funds and shall not be subject to liens or attachments of any character whatsoever except obligations due the United States.

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.

#### Y. S. HU

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 600, the bill (H. R. 4301) for the relief of Y. S. Hu, and I withdraw my previous objection to its consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Y. S. Hu, Honolulu, T. H., the sum of \$446.66. Such sum represents full payment for 51 days' annual accumulated leave earned by the said Y. S. Hu, as an employee of the Bureau of Customs of the Department of the Treasury, during the period beginning January 1, 1933, and ending May 16, 1940. The said Y. S. Hu did not take all of his leave in

the years 1933 and 1934 because of lack of help in the Bureau of Customs and was denied the accumulated leave upon his resignation, May 16, 1940: *Provided*, That part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The 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.

#### PEAT RESEARCH

Mr. MARSHALL. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1950, it was my privilege to introduce H. R. 7330, urging upon the country research and development affecting one of its greatest untapped resources—peat.

Never before in the history of our country has there been a greater need for such full and complete development of its native materials as now. It is needed for our economic health, industrial strength, and national security.

Development of our national resources is a responsibility of the Federal Government and the necessity of the present times requires that we undertake action quite promptly. Successful research has long been conducted with wood, lignite, bituminous, and anthracite coals. Research in peat, geologically between wood and lignite, has been neglected. Yet such research holds promise of unlocking new and valuable treasures.

The State of Minnesota has the largest deposits of peat, about 7,000,000,000 tons, which corresponds to about 2,500,000,000 tons of bituminous coal. It exists in great volume in many other States.

Total lack of nearby supplies of fuel constitutes an element of both economic and strategic danger, due to the cold war and the danger of other emergencies. The cost and vulnerability of long overland and overwater transportation of fuel must be seriously considered in the present economic picture.

It should be mentioned here that the necessity for processing taconite as a substitute for our large iron-ore supplies makes it imperative that an economical short-haul fuel be available. This is a situation which will soon prevail in Minnesota.

Proper utilization of peat will result in generating power at a low cost—gasification, use of gas turbines, low-temperature distillation. The preliminary studies already indicate that high pressure electric generating stations can be built. Such plants are self-liquidating and the cost of electric power can be considerably reduced. This will encourage small business and industry to take advantage of low-cost power. It should be empha-

sized that the largest and most valuable uranium and radium deposits were found where identical peat conditions exist.

The most significant byproducts of the utilization of peat, to mention only a few, are production of char from low-temperature distillation, high value fertilizer—which will help the development of industry and agriculture—ammonium sulphate, paraffin, acid and acetates, paper-making processes, certain forms of wallboard and insulation material, certain so-called exploded materials similar to exploded wood fiber, artificial wood and other building materials, plastics, packing materials, improvement of timber grades, reforestation, other basic chemicals, and soil reclamation.

Only scientific research can tell more and more economical applications.

Peat is very widely used in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Ireland, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Hungary. And according to recent reliable reports, the new central heating system of Moscow is entirely based on the use and utilization of peat. Furthermore the Soviet Union uses it rather successfully for agricultural and industrial purposes.

Summarizing, the utilization of peat is in the interests of national defense and security; commercial, industrial, and agricultural expansion needs; broadening of the mineral fuel supply; less expensive electric power generating, enabling the dispersal of industry, avoiding the density of industrial targets; lessening the overburdened transportation facilities in peace or war, making areas of the country more self sufficient, if and when those become isolated by the attacks of war or by natural catastrophes.

I urge every Member of the Congress to give this plan serious study.

#### REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 480 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. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. 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 Public Lands, 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. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of Senate bill 2734. A similar bill was passed before, but it was vetoed by the Presi-

dent. Since that time the committee has eliminated all of the objectionable features in the original bill and has agreed unanimously on the Senate bill. I do not think there can be any opposition or objection to it; consequently I am not going to take up any time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. 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. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

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. 2734, with Mr. BATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, at the last session the bill S. 1407 was passed by the Senate and House of Representatives. As I recall, this body passed it unanimously and I believe the other body also passed it unanimously.

The bill, however, was vetoed by the President. In his veto message among other things the President said:

I have withheld my approval with reluctance and only after the most careful consideration of all of the provisions of S. 1407. The bill contains many meritorious features. In fact, its only objectionable provisions are those of section 9, which, with some qualifications, extend State civil and criminal laws and court jurisdiction to the Navajo-Hopi Reservations which are now under Federal and tribal laws and courts. Section 9 is heavily weighted with possibilities of grave injury to the very people who are intended to be the beneficiaries of the bill. Its many and serious defects outweigh, in my judgment, the merits of the rest of the bill.

That was the observation of the President of the United States in his veto message on S. 1407. The bill we have for consideration today is exactly S. 1407 with the objectionable feature eliminated. Since the objectionable feature has been eliminated, and since the bill passed both houses last session, overwhelmingly, and since there is no opposition or at least no serious opposition that I know of anywhere, I feel I should take but little time on this occasion to address the committee.

We have so many important matters to consider that I feel we should never waste time. I believe it was Shakespeare who said, "I wasted time; now time wastes me." So I certainly do not want to waste your valuable time in just talking.

I might say this one thing in conclusion. This bill contemplates spending, over a period of 10 years, \$88,570,000 for the purpose of promoting the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations.

If we are to keep faith with these people, according to the treaty that we made with them in 1868; if we are to do justice to this great group of people whom we subjugated by force of arms; if we are to help relieve these people from misery and want; if we are to help alleviate suffering among them; if we are to help raise their standard of living to even a bare minimum of what it should be; if we are to give them the educational opportunities which we promised them, by treaty, or anything close to such opportunities; if we are going to help reduce the infant mortality which is, as I recall, something like four times as great as the average over our great land; and if we are going to reduce mortality from tuberculosis and other malignant diseases that bear so heavily upon these people—in other words, if we are going to do just simple and substantial justice to the people that we have subjugated, and who are not at fault themselves, yes, if we are going to live up to our treaty obligations and our obligations from a humanitarian standpoint, I think we ought to pass this bill and pass it expeditiously, without further ado.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I would like to compliment the gentleman for his interest in this great problem. I join with many Members from the West in congratulating him on the fine effort he has made to bring some justice to these unfortunate people. As the gentleman has said, there is much to be done. This is a step in the right direction, and I am glad to support the gentleman's views.

Mr. MORRIS. That compliment from the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is greatly appreciated, because I know how sincere the gentleman is. I am sure I do not deserve the compliment that he has given me, but I do know that it is sincere, and coming from the source from which it does come I sincerely appreciate it.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to second the remarks made by my colleague from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], and emphasize them if I were able to express my thoughts adequately as to the splendid work of the gentleman from Oklahoma, Chairman MORRIS. The gentleman from Oklahoma has done well to generations yet unborn among our Indian citizens. I want to thank him from the bottom of my heart for the careful, painstaking way in which he has handled this legislation, and to express my appreciation of his work, in the strongest possible terms, on behalf of these Indian people.

Mr. MORRIS. I appreciate those remarks from the gentleman from Arizona. I will say that no man has been more diligent in furthering this legislation than has he. His heart, his industry, his time, and his mind have all been employed in an effort to bring this proposed legislation to a successful conclusion.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the distinguished former chairman of this subcommittee of which I now have the honor to be chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. I heartily agree with the others as to the good job which the present chairman of the committee has done with this legislation. He has struggled with it, even in face of a veto. He has done a splendid job.

There is one question I would like to ask the gentleman. The first year the Appropriations Committee appropriated approximately \$10,000,000 for the furtherance of the program that is contained in this bill. This year the Bureau of the budget recommended \$10,000,000 more, or thereabouts, which will doubtless be appropriated. Is that included in the \$85,000,000 in this bill, or is that in addition to the \$85,000,000 that is in the bill?

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry, I am not able to answer that question. I have been wondering about it myself. I have not had an opportunity to examine all the facts and find out whether or not it is. No one can be hurt in the matter, however, for the reason that if it is, it is already done and when this authorization bill is passed and becomes law, the Appropriation Committee will of course take all matters pertaining to this whole situation into consideration, I am sure.

May I also say that if this bill does become law, and I believe it certainly will, a great deal of the credit must go to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], who, with his subcommittee, when he was chairman of the full committee, visited the Navajo and Hopi Reservations and gleaned first-hand information in regard to the situation existing there. He has been diligent ever since in his efforts to further the interests of this legislation, and I appreciate all that he has done.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such further time to the gentleman from Oklahoma as he may need; I know the gentleman from New York wishes to interrogate him.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Section 9 of the bill, as I interpret the section deals with the Social Security Act.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Has section 9 been taken up with the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. MORRIS. I may say that our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], took the matter up informally, I believe, with some members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PETERSON. I may say with reference to section 9 that we went into it and considered it germane. As far as the whole rehabilitation program was concerned we called it to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means. They did not object, nor did they agree to it; but we did want them to be advised on it so they would have a right to object if they wanted to.

This provision is the result of a study which was made and a serious effort on the part of the administration to deal with this problem. The section does not actually levy a social-security tax, but is, rather, a method of distribution of a sum equal to that under the Social Security Act.

Mr. TABER. As I interpret that section it provides that the States shall receive 80 percent of the total amounts expended by the State under State plans approved under the Social Security Act for old-age assistance and all that sort of thing. Would not that mean that they would be given not only the regular contribution of the Federal Government, \$15 out of the first \$20, but in addition 80 percent of what they had paid? That is the way I interpret the language as it now stands. For instance, if they had paid out \$20 and received in return \$15 they would get another \$16; so, instead of being out \$5 they would be \$11 to the good. I may be wrong in my interpretation, but that is the way it looks to me, although I have just started to study it.

Mr. MORRIS. The way the matter actually works, I may say to the gentleman from New York as I understand it, and I may say I have studied this matter pretty thoroughly, is that it will be somewhere between 80 percent and 90 percent. The expense of the administration of the act as I understand it is going to fall on these States. If we are to be just and fair with these States we must take this into consideration.

I may say to the distinguished gentleman from New York in the first place that these States are very sparsely settled compared with most of the other States of the Union.

In addition to that they have a much heavier impact of Indian population upon them than the others do. In fact, the Navajo Tribe now comprises about 65,000 members. Those people in the States effected cannot possibly carry on with the same kind of social-security program as to Indians that the rest of us carry on with in the usual circumstances. Then may I call this to the gentleman's attention: In Arizona out of 72,691,200 acres of land the Government owns 50,471,920 acres or 69.43 percent. The State, of course, receives no tax revenue whatsoever from that land owned by the Federal Government. It is all tax free. In New Mexico out of 77,764,040 acres the Government owns 35,479,713 acres or 45.62 percent. In Utah the Government owns 71.33 percent.

Getting back to the gentleman's specific question, this particular lan-

guage has been worked out very carefully by the gentlemen in the other body, particularly by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and with the Interior Department and others. As it actually results, as it appears to me the State will pay about 20 percent of the program.

Mr. TABER. Not the way I read it.

Mr. MORRIS. I think it does the way it reads. May I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] who comes from that State and who may be able to throw further light on the matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the spirit and intent of this measure is that the Federal Government shall bear about 90 percent of the total burden as it applies to Indians, the State bearing the other 10 percent; but not in the way the gentleman from New York indicated a while ago.

Mr. TABER. That is the way it reads. If you are not going to take language the way it reads and construe it just as it reads, you are going to be in trouble. You are going to find that, instead of being 80 percent, in a good many cases it is 140 or 150 percent. That is something that would be going a little stronger than it seems the most ardent Arizonian would want to go.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is exactly right; there is no such intention on the part of anyone that I know of from Arizona to provide for that, but I am sure the language of the bill does not so provide.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid it does. That is what it says.

Mr. MORRIS. Getting back to the exact language, may I say to the gentleman from New York, with all of the astuteness and the ability which the gentleman has, together with the clarity of thought which he usually shows, he is in error, because the bill says that the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay what? Pay "an amount, in addition to the amounts prescribed to be paid to such State under such sections, equal to 80 percent of the total amounts expended during the preceding quarter by the State."

In other words, we take the ordinary set-up of what the Federal Government would contribute anyway to any State. The Federal Government makes a contribution which is usually something more than 50 percent in the ordinary instance. As proposed in this bill the Federal Government will make that same contribution, then it will also reimburse the State 80 percent of what the State has paid of the State's funds. That is very plain to me. I think the language is apt, I think it is clear.

Mr. TABER. The trouble with the gentleman's reasoning is this says 80 percent of what the State shall pay. The State makes the whole payment of whatever is paid; then it is reimbursed under the Social Security Act for three-quarters of what is paid up to \$20 and for half afterward. But this would give them, in addition to the other thing, 80 percent besides, and they would not have contributed anywhere near that amount toward it. Now that is the way the thing would work.

Mr. MORRIS. No; I am sure it would not work that way, from the conferences I have had with those responsible for the language. They feel that the State will be reimbursed 80 percent of the money of the State, that the State has paid. I am sure that is the intent of it.

Mr. TABER. That may be the intent, but that is not the way it reads.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, I disagree with the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this proposed legislation. I have visited this reservation on different occasions, the last time last fall, when I spent a whole day with the agent on the reservation going over the problems that faced him following the appropriation of the \$10,000,000 a year ago for rehabilitation of these Indians.

I think there is a more serious situation on this Navajo Reservation than on any other spot in the United States. These Indians are exceedingly poor. Their income is very, very low. Their soil and their resources are limited. Erosion has taken place to a serious extent. Many of their resources, such as they have, have not been developed. There is an excess of population. Even after we appropriate the \$85,000,000 and expend it over the 10 years proposed in this bill, according to the best surveys we have up until now, the reservation will not support over half of the people that we find on it. The population is increasing at the rate of around 1,200 people a year; in other words, we have a very serious sore spot in our economy and in our social life on this particular reservation.

This bill is an attempt to deal with some of those problems and alleviate them as we can. It proposes to provide education in a spot where 80 percent of the children now do not have education. It proposes to improve the roads. It proposes to make minerals and other resources available. It proposes to develop some 78 irrigation projects and enlarge and extend them, and other efforts will be made under this bill to help these people that so seriously need our help.

The bill is not all that I would like to see it; in fact, I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time that I think will improve the bill dealing with civil law on the reservation. It does not settle anywhere near all of the problems that we find on this reservation. There is difficulty between the Navajo and the Hopi as to the boundary between the two tribes. That is quite a problem, and one that needs to be solved, and one that the Department of the Interior has not really tried to solve over the years. We discussed it in committee and proposed to bring in an amendment in regard to that particular problem, but we decided it was one that we could not handle in this bill.

There is the problem of excess population. A year or two ago we developed a plan whereby we could help these Indians to get jobs off the reservation. We are providing funds in this bill for

that purpose. Last year we had more jobs for these Indians on the Navajo Reservation than there were Indians to fill those jobs. They are good workers. The railroads like to have them in their employ. The mining companies come back year after year to get them. They help in the beet fields and in the harvest of the vegetables in that area. We are providing under this bill for guidance in getting off-reservation employment. When they leave these reservations, there are certain social problems that develop. We do not solve those problems in this bill; in fact, we do not solve very many of their social problems at all.

There is the question of the ownership of tracts of land after they are developed. Ownership is not in the individual Indians themselves, it is left in tribal ownership. I believe that is a mistake. I think legislation should be brought out so that they can have pride in ownership, individual ownership, as the white man has in other places.

Inheritance is not decided under this bill, another problem that certainly needs legislation. If we are going to encourage an Indian to develop his tract of land or develop what resources he has, he must have an incentive. One of those incentives is to pass property he has developed down to his children. That is not in this bill.

In fact, there are a number of problems that I would like to see handled but they are not in this legislation. I am going to offer an amendment that will provide for the application of certain State laws on the reservation, that I think are necessary. The President in vetoing the bill objected to that section in the original bill, and I think perhaps with some justification. I took that section to the drafting service that helps us, and they have written this section that I think meets the objections of the President and that I will offer at the proper time. It will provide for civil law in certain cases on the reservation. That, I think, will help the objective we have in this bill, which is to bring these people to a higher standard of living and a better economy, so that they can better fit into our civilization.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to thank the gentleman from Montana, as I did my colleague from Oklahoma, for the interest he has all along taken in this matter, and particularly for the initiatory work done in the preceding Congress. These Indians in the far Southwest in the present generation and in generations yet to come will have you two men in charge of the legislation to thank far more than they know.

Mr. D'EWART. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. My interest has been largely stirred up by his anxiety over the welfare of these Indians. I take pride in working with him and with the chairman of the committee in helping to rehabilitate these Indians, who so much need our help at this time.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I should not take all of my time because I want others to speak on this bill, but I want to point out that we have been struggling most energetically with this problem now for the last four or more years. That is why I wanted to say a good word for the work done not only in this Congress but in the Eightieth Congress by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], who was on the subcommittee at that time. I have publicly spoken before on the floor of the House on the work done at that time by the full committee under the chairmanship of the late Richard Welch. However, it takes a great deal of effort to get attention directed to a great problem like this when we have such a multiplicity of other problems pressing us, as we do these strenuous days.

The church people all over America have been writing us, as well as other right-thinking citizens who feel that we have been neglecting our American citizens of Indian blood. We have neglected them. Indeed we have neglected them through many, many years.

May I say to my friends from Montana that it was the coming of a small subcommittee headed by him to Window Rock, Ariz., in the autumn of 1947, I believe it was, that was the starter of this long overdue legislation.

While we had our attention called to it by the press, and the pulpit for that matter, it was the trip out there that counted and we have given our attention to it. Now, we have done as we did in preceding Congresses that which was necessary for temporary and direct relief but this is the all-important thing—the bill before us—which is a matter of long-range rehabilitation. It is going to take several generations to lift these people to the full stature of American citizens. That takes education and many other social benefits which we must provide them and which we are duty bound to provide them.

Perhaps there are Indians living who recall when Kit Carson led the United States Army into that country and drove the Navajos into their deep canyons and destroyed their peach orchards and made a treaty with them. In that treaty we promised to give them a school-teacher for every 30 pupils. But that promise has been sadly neglected. Ninety percent of these Indians are now illiterate. They did make a great contribution to the Second World War, but they would have made a greater contribution if so many of them had not been rejected because of illiteracy as well as because of physical defects as a result of under-nourishment, and that sort of thing.

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

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I have in my district the Santee Sioux, the Ponca, the Winnebagoes and the Omaha Indians on the four reservations. I am honored to be a member of all four tribes.

I want to ask the gentleman this question: In alleviating the sufferings of the Hopis and other Indians, are we discriminating against the other tribes who

in some manner are up against the same problems that the Hopis and others are?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I would say we are not discriminating. We are merely attacking the worse phase of the whole Indian problem here and now to deal with others later.

Mr. STEFAN. Will we, in the deficiency bill for relief, be able to send some relief to the Winnebagoes and the Omahas who today are suffering from malnutrition and, in many cases, hunger?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; we must do that. We have a general appropriation which applies to all Indians aside from this rehabilitation bill. I simply say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the Navajos, consisting of 65,000 Indians living on a high plateau, need this help.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand that perfectly because I happen to be a member of the committee which made appropriations one time for their relief and to help them. But while we were doing that there were other members of other Indian tribes who were equally suffering and who got no attention whatsoever. Today, on the reservations of the Omahas, the Santee Sioux, Poncas, and the Winnebagoes, there is a great amount of unemployment because the young Indians who were in the war have come home and have lost their jobs and are still on the reservations. The educational problem is serious. The police problem is serious. Some help must come to these other Indians.

While we are talking about giving help to the Navajos and Hopis, I hope the committee which had the bill for Indian services in charge will do something with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to alleviate suffering in other places as well as amongst the Hopis and Navajos.

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly agree with the gentleman, and I pledge my support for assistance to all Indians both for immediate relief and long-range betterment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the statement made by our distinguished colleague with reference to the problems of the Indians in his district is one which likewise is giving me serious concern. The Navajos and Hopis seem to be the No. 1 problem in the Nation. But there are other problems which have been called to our attention and we have instructed our staff to make an intensive study.

Mr. Peden, a former Member of the House, is now getting data with reference to the problems of these other tribes. We hope to work out legislation and we will keep in touch with the distinguished gentleman because he has been diligent and has on other occasions called the problem to our attention. His knowledge of the problem and his intense interest is well-known to our committee. We will cooperate with the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the particular bill under consideration, I will make my statement brief because what we actually have to-

day is a bill which has already passed the House after full debate, including the amendments which the House itself placed in the bill at the time. But we have eliminated section 9, which was the controversial section at that time. I am impressed with this fact: The chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council in appearing before the committee asked to have a chance to help themselves. Briefly, he said this:

There are about 65,000 of us, and there are more than 24,000 school-age children among us. We want as many schools built on our reservation as there is water available for. We want new schools, we want some of the old ones made larger, we want repairs made to those that are nearly falling down with age, and we want our day schools converted to boarding schools. We want a school system on our reservation big enough to take care of all our children. Give us the schools and we will make education compulsory. We will see to it that our children attend. Our people are poor and sick, it is true. But we are not asking for more than the chance to help ourselves. If you will give us a start, we will carry on from there, and we will become good citizens of this country. Our needs are really urgent.

There is a sincere appeal of one elected by their members to present to the Congress their problems. In testifying about the lack of roads in the area, there were certain sections which they could not get into during certain seasons of the year. They are taking care of 65,000 people on an area that can normally support only one-tenth of this number.

The tuberculosis rate is about five times that of the normal tuberculosis rate of the white citizens of the area.

I hope this bill may be passed.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. PETERSON. I have no further requests, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in order to further the purposes of existing treaties with the Navajo Indians, to provide facilities, employment, and services essential in combating hunger, disease, poverty, and demoralization among the members of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes, to make available the resources of their reservations for use in promoting a self-supporting economy and self-reliant communities, and to lay a stable foundation on which these Indians can engage in diversified economic activities and ultimately attain standards of living comparable with those enjoyed by other citizens, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to undertake, within the limits of the funds from time to time appropriated pursuant to this act, a program of basic improvements for the conservation and development of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, the more productive employment of their manpower, and the supplying of means to be used in their rehabilitation, whether on or off the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations. Such program shall include the following projects for which capital expenditures in the amount shown after each project listed in the following subsections and totaling \$88,570,000 are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) Soil and water conservation and range improvement work, \$10,000,000.

(2) Completion and extension of existing irrigation projects, and completion of the investigation to determine the feasibility of

the proposed San Juan-Shiprock irrigation project, \$9,000,000.

(3) Surveys and studies of timber, coal, mineral, and other physical and human resources, \$500,000.

(4) Development of industrial and business enterprises, \$1,000,000.

(5) Development of opportunities for off-reservation employment and resettlement and assistance in adjustments related thereto, \$3,500,000.

(6) Relocation and resettlement of Navajo and Hopi Indians (Colorado River Indian Reservation), \$5,750,000.

(7) Roads and trails, \$20,000,000.

(8) Telephone and radio communication systems, \$250,000.

(9) Agency, institutional, and domestic water supply, \$2,500,000.

(10) Establishment of a revolving loan fund, \$5,000,000.

(11) Hospital buildings and equipment, and other health conservation measures, \$4,750,000.

(12) School buildings and equipment, and other educational measures, \$25,000,000.

(13) Housing and necessary facilities and equipment, \$820,000.

(14) Common service facilities, \$500,000.

Funds so appropriated shall be available for administration, investigations, plans, construction, and all other objects necessary for or appropriate to the carrying out of the provisions of this act. Such further sums as may be necessary for or appropriate to the annual operation and maintenance of the projects herein enumerated are hereby also authorized to be appropriated. Funds appropriated under these authorizations shall be in addition to funds made available for use on the Navajo and Hopi Reservations, or with respect to Indians of the Navajo Tribes, out of appropriations heretofore or hereafter granted for the benefit, care, or assistance of Indians in general, or made pursuant to other authorizations now in effect.

Sec. 2. The foregoing program shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this act and existing laws relating to Indian affairs, shall include such facilities and services as are requisite for or incidental to the effectuation of the projects herein enumerated, shall apply sustained-yield principles to the administration of all renewable resources, and shall be prosecuted in a manner which will provide for completion of the program, so far as practicable, within 10 years from the date of the enactment of this act. An account of the progress being had in the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and of the use made of the funds appropriated to that end under this act, shall be included in each annual report of the work of the Department of the Interior submitted to the Congress during the period covered by the foregoing program.

Sec. 3. Navajo and Hopi Indians shall be given, whenever practicable, preference in employment on all projects undertaken pursuant to this act, and, in furtherance of this policy, may be given employment on such projects without regard to the provisions of the civil-service and classification laws. To the fullest extent possible Indian workers on such projects shall receive on-the-job training in order to enable them to become qualified for more skilled employment.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to make loans from the loan fund authorized by section 1 hereof to the Navajo Tribe, or any member or association of members thereof, or to the Hopi Tribe, or any member or association of members thereof, for such productive purposes as, in his judgment, will tend to promote the better utilization of the manpower and resources of the Navajo or Hopi Indians. Sums collected in repayment of such loans and sums collected

as interest or other charges thereon shall be credited to the loan fund and shall be available for the purpose for which the fund was established.

Sec. 5. Any restricted Indian lands owned by the Navajo Tribe, members thereof, or associations of such members, or by the Hopi Tribe, members thereof, or associations of such members, may be leased by the Indian owners, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for public, religious, educational, recreational, or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases. All leases so granted shall be for a term of not to exceed 25 years, but may include provisions authorizing their renewal for an additional term of not to exceed 25 years, and shall be made under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Restricted allotments of deceased Indians may be leased under this section, for the benefit of their heirs or devisees, in the circumstances and by the persons prescribed in the act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 745; 25 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 880). Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to repeal or affect any authority to lease restricted Indian lands conferred by or pursuant to any other provision of law.

Sec. 6. In order to facilitate the fullest possible participation by the Navajo Tribe in the program authorized by this act, the members of the tribe shall have the right to adopt a tribal constitution in the manner herein prescribed. Such constitution may provide for the exercise by the Navajo Tribe of any powers vested in the tribe or any organ thereof by existing law, together with such additional powers as the members of the tribe may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, deem proper to include therein. Such constitution shall be formulated by the Navajo Tribal Council at any regular meeting, distributed in printed form to the Navajo people for consideration, and adopted by secret ballot of the adult members of the Navajo Tribe in an election held under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at which a majority of the qualified votes cast favor such adoption. The constitution shall authorize the fullest possible participation of the Navajos in the administration of their affairs as approved by the Secretary of the Interior and shall become effective when approved by the Secretary. The constitution may be amended from time to time in the same manner as herein provided for its adoption, and the Secretary of the Interior shall approve any amendment which in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior advances the development of the Navajo people toward the fullest realization and exercise of the rights, privileges, duties, and responsibilities of American citizenship.

Sec. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the tribal funds now on deposit or hereafter placed to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians in the United States Treasury shall be available for such purposes as may be designated by the Navajo Tribal Council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 8. The Tribal Councils of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes and the Indian communities affected shall be kept informed and afforded opportunity to consider from their inception plans pertaining to the program authorized by this act. In the administration of the program, the Secretary of the Interior shall consider the recommendations of the tribal councils and shall follow such recommendations whenever he deems them feasible and consistent with the objectives of this act.

Sec. 9. Beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1950, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay quarterly to each State (from sums made available for making payments to the States under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a) of the Social Security Act) an amount, in addition to the amounts prescribed to be paid to such State under such sections, equal to 80 percent of (1) the total amounts expended during the preceding quarter by the State, under the State plans approved under the Social Security Act for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the needy blind, to Navajo and Hopi Indians residing within the boundaries of the State on reservations or on allotted or trust lands, with respect to whom payments are made to the State by the United States under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a), respectively, of the Social Security Act, not counting so much of such expenditure to any individual for any month as exceeds the limitations prescribed in such sections, reduced by (2) the total amounts paid to such State by the United States for such quarter under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a) of the Social Security Act with respect to such Indians.

Sec. 10. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), to be composed of three members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate to be appointed by the chairman thereof, not more than two of whom shall be from the same political party, and three members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the chairman thereof, not more than two of whom shall be from the same political party. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

(b) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs for the administration and rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and to review the progress achieved in the execution of such programs. Upon request, the committee shall aid the several standing committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over any part of such programs, and shall make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, from time to time, concerning the results of its studies, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs at the request of the committee, shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to his activities under this act.

(c) The committee, or any duly-authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

(d) The committee is authorized to appoint and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman.

Mr. PETERSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, and that it be printed in the Record at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: On page 11, following line 2, add a new section numbered 11 to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. From and after the effective date of this act all Indians within the tribal or allotted lands of the Navajo and Hopi Reservations shall be subject to the laws of the States wherein such lands are located, with respect to (1) school attendance, (2) malfeasance or misfeasance in public or tribal office, (3) embezzlement or misappropriation of funds, (4) regulation of automotive traffic, (5) marriage and divorce, (6) elections, and shall have access to the courts of such States for the enforcement of these rights and the redress of these wrongs to the same extent and in the same manner as any citizen thereof."

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, when the President vetoed the original bill he vetoed it because of section 9 that had provisions in it with regard to civil law. He vetoed it on two grounds. I will quote very briefly from his remarks:

In the first place, the meaning of section 9 is obscure.

"In the first place, the meaning of section 9 is obscure." We have taken great pains in the drafting of this proposed amendment, consulting our legal staff and the drafting section so that I think there is no question about the meaning of this amendment. In other words, we have overcome the first objection of the President to the provision.

The second major objection, and I quote again from the President's veto of section 9:

A second major objection to section 9 is that its avowed purpose of accomplishing a broad-scale extension of State laws to the Navajo and Hopi Reservations is in conflict with one of the fundamental principles of Indian law accepted by our Nation, namely, the principle of respect for tribal self-determination in matters of local government.

Broad scale extension we have eliminated by definitely limiting this proposed amendment to certain provisions and no others; thereby, we hope, taking care of that objection of the President.

We have the right to legislate in regard to law on the Indian reservation. I will quote very briefly on that point from

the Handbook of Federal Law, chapter 6, page 117, section 14. I will include the whole quotation. This statement is:

It is enough for the present to note that the domain of power of the Federal Government over Indian affairs marked out by the Federal decisions is so complete that, as a practical matter, the Federal courts and Federal administrative officials now generally proceed from the assumption that Indian affairs are matters of Federal, rather than State, concern, unless the contrary is shown by act of Congress or special circumstance. Thus, without questioning the constitutional doctrine that States possess original and complete sovereignty over their own territories save insofar as such sovereignty is limited by the Federal Constitution, a sense of realism must compel the conclusion that control of Indian affairs has been delegated, under the Constitution, to the Federal Government and that State jurisdiction in any matters affecting the Indians can be upheld only if one of two conditions is met; either that Congress has expressly delegated back to the State, or recognized in the State, some power of government respecting Indians; or that a question involving Indians involves non-Indians to a degree which calls into play the jurisdiction of a State government. Of these two situations, the former is undoubtedly more definite and therefore simpler to analyze. Such an analysis requires a listing of the acts of Congress which confer upon the States, or recognize in the States, specific powers of government with respect to Indians. (Handbook of Federal Indian Law, ch. 6, p. 117, sec. 1.)

That is what I propose to do in that amendment. There is a gap in the law on Indian reservations. The Federal law as it applies to the Navajo and Hopi Reservations applies only to 10 major crimes. They are found in United States Code, title 18, page 544, section 548:

United States Code, title 18, page 544, section 548: Indians committing certain crime; acts on reservations; rape of Indian.

All Indians committing against the person or property of another Indian or other person any of the following crimes, namely, murder, manslaughter, rape, incest, assault with intent to kill, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson, burglary, robbery, and larceny on and within any Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the United States Government, including rights-of-way running through the reservation, shall be subject to the same laws, tried in the same courts, and in the same manner, and be subject to the same penalties as are all other persons committing any of the above crimes within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided*, That any Indian who commits the crime of rape upon any female Indian within the limits of any Indian reservation shall be imprisoned at the discretion of the court: *Provided further*, That as herein used the offense rape shall be defined in accordance with the laws of the State in which the offense was committed.

The foregoing shall extend to prosecutions of Indians in South Dakota under section 549 of this title.

In addition to that we recognize to a certain extent tribal custom and usage, but between tribal usage and custom there is a whole lot of civil law that is necessary if we are to have the orderly development of these Indians. In my amendment I mention those specific ones; for instance, there is no law whatsoever governing school attendance. If a child does not want to go to school,

there is no way of insisting that he go. Even here in the District of Columbia we can compel attendance of a child of school age at school, but there is no way to compel attendance at school on the Navajo or Hopi Reservations. I therefore include school attendance in my amendment.

Malfesance or misfeasance in public or tribal office: There is nothing in tribal law that governs those matters. Certainly tribal custom does not concern itself with malfesance or misfeasance in public office and we are proposing to give these tribes some responsibility under this law. We propose to delegate certain powers to the council, but if they do not carry them out as they should be carried out, there is no course of action under State or Federal law. I therefore propose that we apply State law in regard to those things.

Embezzlement or misappropriation: We are turning over in one provision of this act the tribal funds to the tribal council or business council. We are not providing against the possibilities of embezzlement or misappropriation. If those funds are embezzled or misappropriated, and that has happened on other reservations, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has protested to me because he had no way to handle this kind of situation—I say we are going to turn over a large sum of money to this tribal council and there is no law, State or Federal, if those funds are dissipated or stolen, or mismanaged, to punish the guilty.

Highways and automotive traffic: We are going to be spending very large sums on road construction in these reservations. There is going to be heavy truck traffic within the reservation and heavy tourist traffic on the roads, but there are no traffic laws on either the Hopi or Navajo Reservations. Certainly there should be regulation of traffic on the reservations. If you should have an accident inside the Navajo Reservation, there would be no law governing that accident.

Marriage and divorce on those reservations: There are plural marriages. We find Indian fathers leaving their families. One of the difficulties in the management of this reservation is to determine definitely and surely whose children are whose and as we apply the social-security laws that will be more difficult. Certainly, if we are going to go ahead with the rehabilitation of this tribe, if we are going to fit them into our civilization, we should have some kind of laws governing marriage and divorce.

In 1948 the election laws applied on this reservation.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Would the gentleman's amendment require that when Indians are married under the tribal laws they have to have a divorce under a State law?

Mr. D'EWART. I gather that would be a question of whether you have common-law marriage in your State.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. We have no common-law marriage in our State.

Mr. D'EWART. If you have common-law marriage and the Indian man and woman lived together, your State would doubtlessly recognize that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. We have no common-law marriage in New Mexico. That is not recognized. Our supreme court has passed on that point. I was wondering whether the gentleman's amendment would require all Indians who are living together now to go and get married under State laws.

Mr. D'EWART. If there is no common law and they wanted their marriage to be recognized, it would have to take place under the laws of the State, if my amendment is adopted.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If they do not get married under the State law and are married under tribal law, they do not have to have a divorce if they separate, even with the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Did I understand the gentleman to say there will be no recovery in the event of an automobile accident on a reservation?

Mr. D'EWART. Yes. I have a citation in regard to that. This does not apply to the particular reservation, but the situations are similar:

Recently, as a result of the economy drive, the position of special officer was abolished and we are now back where we were before; petty offenses are committed on the reservation and nothing much is being done about it. Recently police officers of the local community attempted to arrest several Indians who were driving a car while intoxicated; the Indians got over the reservation line; one of them got out of the car and shot at the local officers; it was just fate the officer was not killed. Indians get drunk and beat their women and get into fights. Recently a white man was severely beaten by drunken Indians. Theoretically, these petty offenses are within the jurisdiction of so-called Indian courts, but there is no provision made for their punishment even if such Indians are tried by said local Indian courts. It is a deplorable situation. Something should be done to rectify this unbelievable situation.

That letter was signed by George L. Grobe, United States attorney.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask the gentleman whether he has talked this over with anyone to see whether we might not be heading into another veto? True, his amendment is somewhat restricted as compared with the cause of that veto last session. I am for it in spirit and in principle, but I would hate to see this measure run into another veto.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to have the gentleman question the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], in regard to that, who, I understand, took it up with the executive office. I did not personally. I submitted this amendment

to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], chairman of the committee, and it is my understanding he went further with it.

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

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the chairman's understanding, if any, in regard to this proposal? Is it not the same thing that led to the veto before, or is this a minor extension of State law which does not go as far as the earlier extension went causing the veto?

Mr. PETERSON. It is an extension that does not go as far as that which caused the veto, but I have not been able to get any assurances it would be approved. The situation is such we have been trying to get action. They only heard from the Department of the Interior this morning. But they are not in position to assure us it would be approved. There are some objections still pending.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to say that we did submit this on February 3d, so it is not our fault that we have not had a complete answer. I would like to say further that I have tried, and the attorneys who helped me in the drafting of this, to obviate the two conditions the President expressed that I read earlier in my remarks concerning his veto.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct. Just about a month ago he submitted it and we had been hoping to hear from him. He did submit it, and there is considerable merit in it, but we did not want to run into a veto again. Then I started calling, and this morning they said they had received a report from the Department of the Interior. While they did not go as far as the other, they felt they would have to still object to this amendment.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Certainly, the principle is the same, unless the President has had a change of heart. I do not see how he could not veto it if this amendment goes in, because the very reason he vetoed it was that the Indians were not sufficiently advanced to be placed under State law, and this amendment certainly does place them under State law to a very large extent, including marriages, which is one of the things that was bothering the President, I am sure.

Mr. D'EWART. To quote the President's exact words:

The ultimate acceptance of State jurisdiction is a logical consequence of our policy

of assisting the Indians to develop their natural talents and physical resources in ways that will enable them to participate fully in our free and vigorously competitive society.

Those were the exact words of the President. I think, since I am offering this limited amendment, and since his two objections were, first, that the meaning of the amendment was obscure and, second, that it was a broad scale extension, we have obviated those two objections, and I believe that we have met his objections.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. What would be the objection to passing or accepting the gentleman's amendment and having this bill go to conference?

Mr. D'EWART. I can see none whatsoever, and then we would have time to find out what the President's position was.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the gentleman's amendment restricted to the Navajo and the Hopi Indians, or does it include all Indians?

Mr. D'EWART. No; this is Navajo and Hopi, and no others. I agree with the gentleman that it should apply to other reservations. We have the same situations in other reservations, and I could tell you circumstances that would surprise you showing the need of this kind of an amendment, but this only applies to these two reservations.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Could the gentleman state whether legislation of this kind is to be considered by his committee, namely, to include these other matters?

Mr. PETERSON. The D'Ewart amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. PETERSON. If the D'Ewart amendment came to the committee as a separate bill, I would ask the committee immediately to consider it. There is lots of merit in the D'Ewart amendment, and, frankly, I favor a portion of it, but I do not want to run head-on into another veto or a long deadlock in conference while the Navajos are suffering. But there is a lot of merit in the amendment, there is no question about that, and if it were a separate bill I would try to get it out and get action by the House. I am not saying that to stall off his amendment, because there is merit in it, but I am sure it would run into a veto.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Would the gentleman please again state to the House in as few words as he sees fit just what his amendment will do?

Mr. D'EWART. This amendment extends State laws with respect to school attendance, malfeasance or misfeasance in public or tribal office, embezzlement or misappropriation of funds, regulation of automotive traffic, marriage and divorce, and elections, and nothing more.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, being a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House which deals with Indian problems, this very thing has come to the attention of that committee on a number of occasions and the need for such a provision in our laws.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana will be adopted because of the great merit it has. If we adopt that amendment, the conferees can work this matter out to the satisfaction of the Interior Department and the Indian Service. Surely every member of the committee dealing with these Indian problems recognizes the merit in this amendment. There could be nothing wrong in adopting it and then calling on the Interior Department to cooperate in working out language which would be beneficial to the Indians and the other people this amendment affects.

Mr. D'EWART. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

There is one more provision I have not discussed, which refers to elections. In 1948 these Indians voted for the first time. There are no election laws that govern on this reservation. They will vote for Senators, they will vote for Congressmen, they will vote for President, and they will vote for the governors of their States, but there are no election laws to govern their voting. That is certainly a strange situation. This amendment proposes that the State election laws be applicable on these reservations. It seems to me it is almost mandatory that be the case.

I earnestly appeal for the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, fundamentally, I agree with this amendment. I agreed with the original provisions of section 9, which were broader than the proposed amendment. However, the very practical situation is this: If we insist on putting this amendment in the bill, which it is not necessary to do because we can put it in general legislation if it is of great importance, or in subsequent special legislation, then we will jeopardize this bill. We had the experience last session of the bill being passed with this subject matter in it, and the President vetoed it. I am afraid that if this provision is in the bill we will meet with another veto. If we do, I think we are doing a great injury to these Indians by following such a procedure.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman not admit there is great need for and merit in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. MORRIS. I think there is merit in it, yes; and I think there is need for it.

Mr. JENSEN. Will not the gentleman also admit that a law passed and signed by the President without a part, at least, of the provisions of this amendment would be a law which would not be worthy of the name of a United States law?

Mr. MORRIS. No; I cannot agree to that at all, because these people are not without law. Do not think they are a lawless people, or that they are a society without law. They have two sets of laws now, their tribal law and the Federal law. They are not without law. They are getting along reasonably well in this regard, I would say. So I cannot agree with that at all.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly would be the last person in the world to accuse the Indians of being lawbreakers to any greater degree than the rest of the American people.

Mr. MORRIS. I am sure the gentleman would not so accuse them and I do not make any such inference. The gentleman knows the high respect I have for him.

Mr. JENSEN. And the gentleman knows the high respect I have for him also—if we must pass a few compliments. The fact is our Indians themselves are very much in favor, generally speaking, of the very provisions of the D'Ewart amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. The fact is that the Indian Tribal Council voted down the amendment last time which pertained to this very subject matter. The President in his veto message gave that as one of the salient reasons why he vetoed it—because the Indians did not want it. We have no assurance at all that the Indians will want even this limited provision in the bill. I think we would be very unwise to put it in because we can put it in later, may I say to the gentleman, if after mature reflection and consideration we feel that such a provision should be in the law. We can then put it in without much trouble, I believe.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a matter of fact, as I view the situation this amendment leaves out that portion of section 9 that the Indians wanted; that is that portion of the amendment which would give them the opportunity to go to the State courts for the settlement of their own problems among themselves. The amendment includes the things that the Indians do not want, and that is the laws with respect to marriage, divorce, and criminal laws.

They do not want that. But they are willing to take that if they were given the other parts, such as having some law among themselves, and the opportunity of going to the courts in settlement of their own problems among themselves. That is being left out. So this amendment, or the part that the Indians want is left out, and what the Indians do not want is put on. I agree that something is going to have to be done about these laws. I think we should have a general

bill applying to all reservations. I think it is needed in all reservations.

Mr. MORRIS. May I point out to the membership, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, who has addressed us, of course, knows more about these matters than we can possibly know who do not live there. He has expressed an important fact. I think we are treading on dangerous ground when we are seeking to put something in the bill which the Indians themselves do not want, and which the President may feel is so important that he may veto it again. Let us move on with this legislation. Let us not take a chance of doing injury to these Indians just because we want this, that, or the other thing in. We should not do that unless it is imperative and it is not imperative because it can be taken care of in subsequent legislation.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree thoroughly with the last statement that the gentleman made, and I am afraid that this will lead to a veto of this necessary legislation, and that the legislation will be handicapped or stymied. We do, however, need an extension of State law over Indian reservations. I would like to see general legislation to that effect.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] received this letter from Charles S. Murphy, administrative assistant to the President—

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

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, the letter is as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1950.

DEAR JOHN: This is in response to your request that we ascertain whether the present version of the Navajo-Hopi bill (S. 2734, 81st Cong.) meets the objections raised in the President's veto of a predecessor bill (S. 1407).

We have made a check of this matter and find that S. 2734 does meet the objections raised by the President in his veto of the previous bill, and that the bill in its present form is approved by the administration.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLIE

(Charles S. Murphy),

Administrative Assistant to the President.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we know that the provisions of the present bill was passed by both Houses before and will meet with the approval of the President. If, as the saying goes, we should start monkeying around with it and change it here and there in important features, we may endanger the entire bill for this session. Let us not do that. These people need this legislation. Let us not delay it longer.

I would like to make this further suggestion in regard to this important matter: When the time comes I will join with the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] or any other Member in efforts along this line. I hope we may work out the problem where our Indian friends will eventually be completely assimilated into our society. But, after all, we must consider them as we go along. We must do that in fairness and in justice. In this particular bill they voted against this subject matter. Let us observe and respect their wishes in this particular bill. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] I dislike to oppose any amendment that he might offer because I recognize the sincerity of his position always. He is not only a distinguished Member of this Congress but, as former chairman of this subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman now, he has always been deeply interested in justice and fair play for the Indians, and I respect him. However, I cannot agree with him on this occasion.

I wish also to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Lands (Mr. Peterson). In all my experience I have never worked with a man who, to my knowledge, had a higher and nobler purpose in mind, who was more industrious and worked harder to bring about good generally for society. He has been responsible for much good legislation. I have never seen a man in all my life who was quite such a human dynamo and steam engine in really getting legislative things done in a fine and expeditious way. He is a Rock of Gibraltar when it comes to a matter like this. I realize the burden that falls upon me, a comparatively new Member of the House as chairman of this subcommittee. I have been here 3 years, and that is not a very long time as a legislator. I feel his great strength of character, ability and experience and I want to publicly express my appreciation of it on this occasion.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank my distinguished friend. It is a fine committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, and it has been an inspiration to make possible the work that I have done.

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

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Would you feel that it was wise, as long as you are subjecting the Indians in these two particular States to the civil laws of those States, that in return they ought to be respected by those laws in their right to buy a drink?

Mr. MORRIS. I believe that issue has been presented once to the House, and it may be presented again, but I do not think it should come into the discussion of this bill at this time. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman directly, because I do not think we ought to get off onto a lot of ancillary matters in connection with this important measure.

Mr. WIER. You are off on a lot of them now.

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry, I cannot yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it necessary for me to speak at length, but I do want briefly to make my position clear on this matter.

I absolutely agree with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART]. He has worked hard and sincerely to figure out what can be done concerning this conflicting jurisdiction with respect to Indians. I am in agreement with him that this sort of legislation is necessary. I have worked with him and he has worked with me in putting in the amendment the last time, which was vetoed. That amendment was approved by the Indian council, because the Indian council and the Indians themselves—as a matter of fact, the Indians more than the Indian council—have been demanding the right to go to the State courts in conflicts between themselves and between individual Indians and the tribe or tribal council. That is what they wanted. So, because they wanted that they were willing to take this other also. They also want that part of the previous amendment which required that the State curriculum be applied to the Indian schools. That is left out of this amendment; in fact, this amendment leaves out the very things that the Indians wanted and puts in the things that we wanted but that they did not and do not want. Under these circumstances, I am very fearful that the President will veto it. I know positively that Collier will again set his people in motion to put the pressure on the President to veto it, because he does not believe in Indians coming under State law with respect to marriages. Former Secretary Ickes agrees with Collier, and, as you will recall, the press reported shortly after this bill was vetoed that there was a conference between former Secretary Ickes and the President in which, the press reported, this very point was stressed. Referring to this conference, the Washington Post on November 9, 1949, said in Drew Pearson's column:

One of the things Ickes talked to Truman about was the plight of the Navajos and the veto of a bill just passed by Congress, putting the Navajo under State laws of Arizona and New Mexico.

The Catholic Church has been worried over the divorce and remarriage systems of the Navajos by which they merely appear before their own tribal authorities if they wish to divorce.

However, both Ickes and Truman felt that the Indians were entitled to their ancient tribal customs.

Clearly, this amendment does violence to what it is reported the President believes in, and it certainly flies in the face of the well-known views of former Commissioner Collier and former Secretary Ickes with respect to Indian marriages and divorces. These men and their influence over Nation-wide organizations of Indian friends would put the pressure again on the President to veto this bill,

XCVI—132

and I fear that if the amendment is adopted it may bring about another veto.

I repeat that if we adopt this amendment we are putting in that which the Indians do not want and taking out that which the Indians do want.

I think this matter ought to be brought up in a general bill before the committee and that we should have additional hearings on it, particularly if it is to be a general bill applying to all the reservations. For example, up in Taos right now a suit has just been tried in the Federal court in which the tribe ejected the husband of an Indian from her property because he came from another Indian reservation. This pair had lived together in the Taos pueblo for years, they have three children, but now the tribe has decided that they do not like this Indian who married the girl in Taos and have ordered them to move out. The Federal court has held that the tribal council is supreme and that the Federal Government cannot interfere. Under State law the rights of this couple and their three children could be protected.

There are so many fundamental problems involved that the changes should be considered in a general bill during which all these various angles can be considered, what the Indians want, what the State wants in order to protect its society as well as the Indians, and what the Indian Office wants to assist them in the ultimate objective of integrating the Indian into the citizenship of the State. I sincerely hope that the Members of the House, although some of us fought hard for this amendment before, will not vote for it now. The adoption of a similar provision before gives notice of the policy the Congress desires to have pursued. With the veto of the President the question has received national attention, and both Indians and non-Indians are and should be studying the problem. Since the chairman has stated that a separate bill will be considered, it would be wiser not to endanger this important bill by another attempt here to solve this problem of law and order, and of the Indians' civil rights as citizens of the State to have access to its courts for the enforcement of rights and the redress of wrongs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. D'EWART) there were—ayes 27, noes 23.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. D'EWART and Mr. PETERSON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 35, noes 28.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 8, line 12, after the word "amounts", strike out "expended" and insert "of contributions by the State toward expenditures."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this amendment will not be as controversial as the one the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] just offered.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON. As I understand it, that is the wording the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], discussed a few minutes ago?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is.

Mr. PETERSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has put into form an amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. We have no objection to it and will consent to the amendment on this side.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments to offer and I ask unanimous consent that they be read and considered together.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. PETERSON: On page 9, line 6, strike out "chairman thereof" and insert "President of the Senate" and page 9, lines 9 and 10, strike out "chairman thereof" and insert "Speaker of the House of Representatives."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, 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. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 480, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the D'EWART amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the other amendments en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: On page 11, following line 2, add a new section numbered 11, to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. From and after the effective date of this act all Indians within the tribal or allotted lands of the Navajo and Hopi Reservations shall be subject to the laws of the States wherein such lands are located, with respect to (1) school attendance, (2) malfeasance or misfeasance in public or tribal office, (3) embezzlement or misappropriation of funds, (4) regulation of automotive traffic, (5) marriage and divorce, (6) elections, and shall have access to the courts of such States for the enforcement of these rights and the redress of these wrongs to the same extent and in the same manner as any citizen thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment on which a separate vote was demanded.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. D'EWART) there were—ayes 37, noes 31.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 143, nays 196, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—143

Allen, Calif.	Gwinn	Murray, Wis.
Andersen,	Hagen	Nelson
H. Carl	Hale	Nixon
Anderson, Calif.	Hall	Norblad
Andresen,	Leonard W.	O'Hara, Minn.
August H.	Halleck	O'Konski
Angel	Hand	Pfeiffer,
Auchincloss	Harvey	William L.
Barrett, Wyo.	Heseton	Phillips, Calif.
Beall	Hill	Phillips, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Hinshaw	Plumley
Bishop	Hoeven	Potter
Blackney	Hoffman, Ill.	Poulson
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, Ill.
Bolton, Ohio	Holmes	Reed, N. Y.
Bramblett	Hope	Rees
Brehm	Horan	Rich
Brown, Ohio	Hull	Rogers, Mass.
Burdick	Jackson, Calif.	St. George
Byrnes, Wis.	James	Sanborn
Canfield	Jenison	Saylor
Case, N. J.	Jenkins	Scott, Hardie
Church	Jennings	Scott,
Clevenger	Jensen	Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, Kans.	Johnson	Scudder
Cole, N. Y.	Jonas	Shafer
Corbett	Judd	Short
Cotton	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Crawford	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Kearns	Smith, Kans.
Curtis	Keating	Smith, Wis.
Dague	Keefe	Stefan
Davis, Wis.	Kilburn	Stockman
D'Ewart	Latham	Taber
Dolliver	LeCompte	Talle
Dondero	LeFevre	Tollefson
Ellsworth	Lemke	Towe
Elston	Lovre	Van Zandt
Engel, Mich.	McConnell	Vorys
Fellows	McCulloch	Vursell
Fenton	McDonough	Welchel
Ford	Mack, Wash.	Werdel
Fulton	Macy	Widnall
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Gavin	Mason	Williams
Gillette	Merrow	Wilson, Ind.
Golden	Meyer	Withrow
Goodwin	Michener	Wolcott
Graham	Miller, Md.	
Gross	Morton	

NAYS—196

Abbitt	Andrews	Bates
Abernethy	Aspinall	Battle
Addonizio	Barden	Beckworth
Albion	Barrett, Pa.	Bennett, Fla.

Bentsen	Hardy	O'Sullivan
Biemiller	Hare	Pace
Blatnik	Harrison	Passman
Boggs, La.	Hart	Patman
Bolling	Havenner	Patten
Bolton, Md.	Hays, Ark.	Perkins
Bonner	Heller	Peterson
Bosone	Herlong	Philbin
Boykin	Hobbs	Pickett
Breen	Hollfield	Poage
Brooks	Huber	Polk
Bryson	Jackson, Wash.	Preston
Buchanan	Javits	Price
Buckley, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Burke	Jones, N. C.	Quinn
Burleson	Karst	Rains
Burnside	Karsten	Rankin
Burton	Kee	Redden
Byrne, N. Y.	Kelly, N. Y.	Regan
Camp	Kennedy	Rhodes
Cannon	Kerr	Ribicoff
Carlyle	King	Richards
Carnahan	Kirwan	Rivers
Carroll	Klein	Rodino
Cavalcante	Kruse	Rooney
Celler	Lane	Roosevelt
Chesney	Lanham	Sabath
Christopher	Larcade	Sasser
Chudoff	Lesinski	Secrest
Clemente	Lind	Shelley
Combs	Linehan	Sheppard
Cooley	Lyle	Sikes
Cooper	Lynch	Sims
Crook	McCarthy	Smith, Va.
Crosser	McCormack	Spence
Davis, Ga.	McGuire	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	McKinnon	Sullivan
Deane	McMillan, S. C.	Sutton
DeGraffenried	McSweeney	Tackett
Delaney	Mack, Ill.	Tauriello
Denton	Madden	Thompson
Dollinger	Magee	Trimble
Doughton	Mahon	Underwood
Doyle	Mansfield	Wagner
Durham	Marcantonio	Walsh
Eaton	Marsalis	Welch
Elliott	Marshall	Wheeler
Engle, Calif.	Miles	White, Calif.
Evins	Miller, Calif.	White, Idaho
Feighan	Mills	Whitten
Fernandez	Mitchell	Whittington
Fisher	Morgan	Wier
Flood	Morris	Wilson, Okla.
Fogarty	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Forand	Moulder	Winstead
Frazier	Multer	Wood
Fugate	Murdock	Woodhouse
Furcolo	Noland	Worley
Gordon	Norrell	Yates
Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.	Young
Granger	O'Hara, Ill.	
Grant	O'Neill	

NOT VOTING—92

Allen, Ill.	Hall	Patterson
Allen, La.	Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer,
Arends	Harden	Joseph L.
Bailey	Harris	Powell
Baring	Hays, Ohio	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Ramsay
Buckley, N. Y.	Hedrick	Riehman
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Rogers, Fla.
Case, S. Dak.	Herter	Sadlak
Chatham	Howell	Sadowski
Cheif	Irving	Scrivner
Chipperfield	Jacobs	Smathers
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Kelley, Pa.	Staggers
Cox	Keogh	Stanley
Davenport	Kilday	Stigler
Davies, N. Y.	Kunkel	Taylor
Dawson	Lichtenwalter	Teague
Dingell	Lodge	Thomas
Donohue	Lucas	Thornberry
Douglas	McGrath	Velde
Eberharter	McGregor	Vinson
Fallon	McMillen, Ill.	Wadsworth
Garmatz	Martin, Iowa	Walter
Gary	Miller, Nebr.	Whitaker
Gathings	Monroney	Wickersham
Gilmer	Murphy	Willis
Gore	Murray, Tenn.	Wolverton
Gossett	Nicholson	Woodruff
Granahan	Norton	Zablocki
Green	O'Brien, Mich.	
Gregory	O'Toole	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Mr. Wolverton for, with Mr. Gary against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Green against.

Mr. Case of South Dakota for, with Mr. Jones of Missouri against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Stanley against.

Mr. Nicholson for, with Mr. Brown of Georgia against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Donohue against.

Mr. McMillen of Illinois for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Miller of Nebraska for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mrs. Harden for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Irving against.

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

Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Smathers against.

Mr. Patterson for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Chipperfield.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Scrivner.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the yeas and nays votes be included as part of today's Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the request that the yeas and nays votes just recorded be made a part of today's Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that it always is made a part of the Journal.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Herald.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. TACKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include certain editorials.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement released by him today.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include questions and answers by Paul O. Peters.

#### FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. SHAFER. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, February 15, in an extension of remarks, I included a newspaper statement pointing out the great dangers inherent in the packing of the Federal Reserve Board with pliant men who may fail to carry out the intent of the law which created that Board. Today I have a few remarks of my own to make which, I believe, will show how a board such as this can be packed. I draw my material from the Board's own records.

The spirit of the Banking Act of 1935 was clearly violated in the past by the appointments of Rudolph M. Evans; the late Lawrence Clayton; M. S. Szymczak, and to a certain extent, Marriner S. Eccles. I shall take these cases on in their order.

First of all, let me point out that the law provides that no more than one Governor shall be appointed from the same Federal reserve district at the same time, and it also provides that no member of the Board who has served a consecutive 14-year term shall be eligible for reappointment.

In the case of Governor Evans, he was appointed from Virginia presumably a resident of that State, whereas as a matter of fact he was a permanent resident of the State of Iowa until the time he was appointed to the Corn-Hog Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Department of Agriculture, in 1933 by Henry A. Wallace, a long-time personal friend. In fact, he is regarded as a protégé of Mr. Wallace. While serving in the Agriculture Department he was a landowner in the State of Iowa and maintained continuously large holdings and business interests and every year made several extended visits to his residence for the purpose of looking after his interests. He had a Washington address, of course, in Alexandria, like thousands of other Federal workers,

but I am certain that he, like thousands of others, regarded it as a temporary address until the question of his legal residence came up in March of 1942 when he was being considered for appointment as a member of the Federal Reserve Board. President Roosevelt was apparently advised that he was a bona fide resident of Virginia and apparently the Senate was likewise advised because the appointment was confirmed as a bona fide resident of Virginia. Since his appointment I understand that he has maintained his activities in Iowa, has absolutely no interest, commercial, political, or otherwise, in Virginia, except that of his living quarters. I am sure he still regards himself as an Iowan and spends much time each year in Iowa. The only reason for the deliberate evasion of the spirit of the law in connection with this lush appointment, 14 years at \$15,000 a year, was that Evans was a very close friend of Henry Wallace, and was a close friend of Marriner Eccles, who wanted him on the Board of the Federal Reserve System and found that it was impossible to have him appointed from Iowa because that State is located in the Seventh Federal Reserve District, Chicago, and the district already had a member on the board, Mr. M. S. Szymczak.

Another obvious violation of the spirit of the Federal Reserve Act, if not the letter, is apparent in the reappointment of M. S. Szymczak. The Federal Reserve Act provides that no member of the Board of Governors, having served a consecutive 14-year term, shall be eligible for reappointment as a member of the Board.

M. S. Szymczak, of Chicago, was first appointed to the Federal Reserve Board in June 1933 and served continuously until February 1, 1936, when the technical status of the whole Board was changed to that of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Without a break in service he was designated by the President to continue on with the changed organization and received a 12-year appointment dated February 1, 1936, and expiring February 1, 1948. It will be noted that at the expiration of the term in February 1948, he had served approximately 15 years as a member of the Federal Reserve Board.

In the face of this continuous service in excess of 14 years, Szymczak's appointment was urged by Chairman Eccles and was finally agreed to by the President and he was reappointed in February 1948 for a full term of 14 years. At the conclusion of this present term in 1962, he will have served continuously as a member of the Federal Reserve Board for approximately 29 years and will have reached the age of 68 before his term expires.

It is admitted that the Congress never intended that one man should serve so long on the Federal Reserve Board, or else the Congress would not have placed in the law the positive prohibition against the reappointment of any man who had served a 14-year term. The trick here was the placing in the act by the man

who wrote the bill of the word "continuous."

Lawrence Clayton, recently deceased, was appointed as a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on February 14, 1947, to fill a vacancy which had been left unfilled 8 or 10 years previously. In this appointment the spirit of the law was violated in the same manner as it was in the appointment of Evans, because although Clayton was appointed as a resident of Boston, he had been, in fact, a resident of the State of Utah since childhood.

Clayton was born in Salt Lake City in 1891. In 1924 he became associated with Marriner S. Eccles in the First National Bank of Ogden and continued in that capacity as one of Eccles' right-hand men until 1934, when Eccles brought him to Washington as Special Assistant to the Chairman—Eccles—in December 1934.

In January 1945, Eccles had Clayton moved to Boston, Mass., where he assumed the nominal position as president of Clayton Securities Corp., of Boston, a company owned and operated by Clayton's brother. It was said at the time that the purpose of this move was to make Clayton eligible, either for a position as president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, or for appointment to the Federal Reserve Board from the Boston District to succeed John K. McKee, whose term was to expire in February 1946. It is understood that President Roosevelt had agreed to this appointment. Unfortunately for Clayton, Roosevelt died, Truman became President, and Governor Vardaman was designated for the appointment to succeed McKee.

The Board of Directors of the Boston Federal Reserve Bank did not look with favor upon making Clayton president of that institution, and instead of him, they selected Laurence Whitemore.

Eccles then went to President Truman and demanded that Clayton be appointed to fill the long standing vacancy on the board and Clayton was, therefore, appointed, presumably, as a resident of Boston, Mass., in the First Federal Reserve District. In fairness to President Truman, it should be said that he was told that Clayton was a bona fide resident of Boston and had been there for many years; and this same misinformation was passed on to the United States Senate, and Clayton's appointment was confirmed in February 1947.

The necessity for evading the law in this case is obvious. Clayton was and had been widely known as Eccles' "Man Friday" for more than 20 years, and was known to do Eccles' bidding without question in all matters official and most matters personal. Since Eccles himself was appointed from the Twelfth Federal Reserve District, San Francisco, in which Utah—Clayton's real home—was located, it was necessary to move Clayton to a district from which no Governor was then serving, and because of the location of Clayton's brother in Boston, that locale naturally suggested itself. The Boston district embraces the States of

Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, and yet in all of that area—one of the most important and intelligent and wealthiest districts in all America—not one bona fide resident was offered the appointment, but this temporary resident, hand-picked and moved into the district for the purpose, was selected to represent the great area embracing the New England States, on the Federal Reserve Board, when he had been a temporary resident of that area less than 2 years.

Clayton died in December 1949.

I made a study of these interesting developments in the Federal Reserve Board after I read a statement which I inserted in the RECORD last Wednesday, and I want to assure the public that packing the Federal Reserve Board is entirely possible, as the record reveals.

Of course, we are unable to deduce that there was not a very good reason for this packing, and many of us feel that we know what the reason is. There is one thing that will lead us away from democracy toward fascism more quickly than anything else and that is the attempt to seize power in this country through the banks. If the banks can control it by one man or a little clique, industry will be the next to fall in line.

We have a lot of worries in this country, many of them from abroad, but I think it is time for us to do some worrying here at home. I am interested, for the sake of the future of our Republic, to determine what effect this deliberate packing of the Federal Reserve Board has had upon the actions of the Board in the past few years.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### COMMUNISTS IN PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last night I was over in the other body until 11:30. Part of what took place, I suppose all of it, is in the RECORD. I think it would be most interesting and certainly disturbing if every Member of the House would know what happened over there.

I do not know whether or not it is within the rules of the House to refer to what was said, so I will say only this, that a Member of the other body from documents before him which he said came from the investigators of the State Department or the FBI, cited case after case where statements of fact concluded with the statement that the individual to whom reference was made was a Communist or associated with Communists. The individuals to whom reference was made, except three or four, are in the State Department.

Then, as appears in the morning papers, when the Member of the other body was asked to put the names on record, he declined to do so. There was much criticism because he would not name the individuals. There would have been more had he done so.

My thought is this: If the public wants to know the names of the indi-

viduals to whom the gentleman is referring, if the public wants the record, the facts, all of the facts, as disclosed by the files, all that needs to be done is for the President of the United States to issue an order releasing those files to the public. Overlong the Congress has been denied information to enable it to legislate wisely and well. The very first words of the Constitution are these, "All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." The Supreme Court has held time and again, notably in McGrain against Daugherty, that the House and the other body have the right to information which is in the files of the executive department in order to enable them to carry out their legislative duties.

Most assuredly when it is charged as it has been charged that there are Communists not only in the State Department, but in other departments of the Government, the executive branch of the Government, it would seem, before the Congress appropriates money to enable those departments to carry on their functions, with those individuals as employees, that we should be entitled to have the record, force the President to make public the record, of any communistic activities, especially when that record is compiled by the department's own agents. Certainly this is true when the record discloses, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning shows, and as the newspapers indicate that a number of those employees—more than 50 of them—are Communists or associated with Communists and follow Communist practice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

#### FEPc LEGISLATION

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. For too long the average person has been complacent and undisturbed while the Communists, Socialists, and radicals have been working to remake our free Government into one patterned after European dictatorships.

Too many have said, "It can't happen here," while actually it was happening here day by day.

Too many have refused to believe we face any real danger of losing freedom, while actually it was being nibbled away bit by bit.

Now we have come to the point where those who, in the past, laughed at warnings of Communist activities, realize that Russia and the Communists have for years stolen from us secrets of the most vital nature, and used for the purpose not only their own foreign agents but native-born Americans serving as public officials and Government employees, who betrayed the country as foully and shamelessly as ever Benedict Arnold did.

We have seen Russian communism take over governments and countries one by one, until now 14 countries are in the cruel grip of communism; and commu-

nism is still going full speed on its conquering march.

We see our national debt, already two hundred fifty-six and two-thirds billion dollars, increasing day by day for long periods of time at the rate of approximately a million dollars an hour.

We see the Nation's coal pile dwindle to a week's supply in the dead of winter, bringing suffering to those without fuel, and unemployment to tens of thousands engaged in railroading and other industries dependent upon coal to operate.

While these things exist and grow worse day by day, we see the administration and the Congress, who ought to be concerning themselves with the important task of correcting these conditions, ignore them.

Instead we see the administration, heedless of the people's needs, heedless of the country's welfare, itself bidding for the support of politically active minority groups, demand of a subservient Congress that it enact into law one of the most vicious and bureaucratic measures which ever became a part of the Communist Party line—namely, the so-called and misnamed Fair Employment Practices Commission Act, usually referred to by the initials FEPC.

So, on the two hundred and eighteenth anniversary of the Father of our Country, we have the sorry spectacle of those who are willing to cater to minority groups combining their forces to bring out this vicious, bureaucratic, communistic, un-American bill on the day which heretofore has been set aside exclusively to respect and revere the memory of that great man who led the patriots of this country into the formation of our free Government in 1776.

For a time it seemed that the advocates of this vicious measure intended to ignore Washington's Birthday, even to the extent of breaking the long-established custom, followed for many years, of reading Washington's Farewell Address on his birthday anniversary. Seeing that a storm of indignation and resentment was about to descend upon their heads, the FEPC group now plans to share Washington's Birthday with Washington. They plan to proceed to press for the FEPC bill after the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

What is the FEPC bill, and who are those who are loudest in their insistence upon its enactment?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman assure the majority leader that if unanimous consent were asked that Calendar Wednesday be put over until the next day, Thursday, and that day would be used as Calendar Wednesday, that the consent would be granted?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Certainly the gentleman knows I could not assure him that, before he asked the question.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that a survey has been made and the gentleman has received information that if such request were made there would be objection, but not from those in favor of the FEPC. I simply say that

so that the RECORD may be clear, but not in any way to inject myself into my friend's speech. Just so that the RECORD may be clear. As far as I am concerned, I would be glad to have the next day utilized the same as Calendar Wednesday, but it can only be done by unanimous consent; and as far as I am concerned, I have made a survey and I have reached the conclusion that it cannot be done.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, I have yielded to the gentleman for the purpose of making a statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You might in turn ask the distinguished majority leader if it would be agreeable to him to ask that we dispense with Calendar Wednesday on tomorrow by unanimous consent, in order that this bill may go over and come up a week later, out of deference to George Washington.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, I would say that it is a matter of a great deal of surprise to me that after these months and years of dispensing with Calendar Wednesday, whatever may have been the reason for it, that on this particular day which has always been set aside to honor the memory of George Washington by reading his Farewell Address and then adjourning, it suddenly becomes imperative to call up this iniquitous FEPC bill.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. If time is so pressing that we have to bring up the FEPC tomorrow, perhaps it would be in order that we should object every Thursday to adjourning over until Monday.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It is a peculiar thing that at this particular time it became necessary to call up the FEPC bill on this anniversary of Washington's Birthday. While the subject is up, I would like to offer this remark also, that while the various advocates of the FEPC bill apparently are vying with each other to claim credit for its introduction and to claim credit for the machinery for getting it up, some of these days the people of the United States are going to wake up to the fact of what is being perpetrated upon them if this iniquitous bill is passed, and some of those who are so anxious to be known as its authors and fathers and sponsors are going to want to be on the other side of the fence when an outraged people finally find out what has been going on here and what it means to the country.

On last Wednesday, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] pointed out on this floor that it was the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] who in 1942 introduced the first FEPC bill in this Congress.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], as everyone knows, has probably been more active than any Member of this House in opposing the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and in seeking to destroy it. The House Committee on Un-American

Activities is the group which, next to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has done more than any other group or body to expose Communist activities in this country, and to bring to justice those traitors who have betrayed America to the Communists.

It is a peculiar thing that, throughout the years, those who have been most vocal and most active in fighting the Committee on Un-American Activities have likewise been the most vocal and most active in pressing for the enactment of this Communist-supported FEPC legislation. As is the case with so many Communist-supported policies, this iniquitous act is dressed up with a liberal and appealing label. It bears the title, "Federal Fair Employment Practice Act." If the bill adhered to the purpose set forth in its title, it would be supported by many who now oppose it. It is not a Fair Employment Practice Act. On the contrary, it is unfair. It is dictatorial. It is destructive of freedom. It is coercive in its provisions.

We had a so-called Fair Employment Practice Bureau set up during the war by Executive order. The people of America have not forgotten by any means the coercion, the unfairness, and the dictatorial practices indulged in by those who operated the wartime FEPC.

When the wartime FEPC was in operation we had a good example of what may be expected if another FEPC is created.

To begin with, the majority of the wartime FEPC staff were Negroes. There were a few renegade whites who were willing to become a part of such an organization, and they were given positions in some of the offices.

The personnel of the regional FEPC office in Atlanta consisted of one Negro man, one Negro woman, two white men, and one white woman. This personnel, with their positions and salaries, consisted of the following:

*Regional office, Atlanta*

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon	Regional director	White	\$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D.	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

From the best information I have been able to get, in January 1946 this motley bureau employed a total of 114 persons in its 14 regional offices and 7 administrative offices. Of the 114 persons, 61 were Negroes. This was more than half the total number, while the Negro population in the United States, roughly, is only 10 percent of the total.

Thus the example set by the Commission itself was one of rank discrimination. This indicates that ending discrimination is the last thing in the minds of those who sponsor this FEPC Commission.

Do you remember some of the dictatorial, asinine, silly activities of this black and tan group while it was having a field day during the war years?

It was brought to my attention at the time that one of its black and tan would-be Mussolinis issued an order in the State of Texas that a person who wanted to hire a colored employee in Texas could not insert an ad in the want ad section of the newspaper, which read: "Wanted, colored porter."

The prospective employer was ordered to insert his ad in this fashion: "Wanted, porter."

Of course, an order of that kind would not be obeyed in the State of Texas. It was not obeyed, and while it is very likely that if this legislation ever is enacted, similar orders will be issued, I believe it is a safe prediction that they would not be obeyed now.

There is no limit to the unreasonable, foolish, impossible requirements of the impractical, short-sighted advocates of this communistic theory. For instance, here are some of the regulations and rulings issued by the FEPC Commission in New York State, as outlined in a speech by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] on the floor of the House February 13, 1947.

**Unlawful practices:**

Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise.

Inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relatives.

Unlawful to require that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate.

Unlawful to inquire into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Unlawful to inquire whether an applicant for employment is an atheist.

An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization.

Unlawful to inquire into the complexion of an applicant for employment.

Unlawful to inquire whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship.

Unlawful to require that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers.

Unlawful to inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin.

Unlawful to inquire into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment.

Unlawful to inquire into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment.

Unlawful to inquire into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquire into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment.

Unlawful to inquire into the general military experience of an applicant for employment.

Unlawful to inquire into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War, i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919.

Thus under these New York FEPC rulings and regulations it would be unlawful

to find out whether an applicant for employment is a Baptist, Methodist, Catholic, or other denomination.

It would be unlawful to find out whether the applicant is a veteran of World War I or not.

It would be unlawful to inquire whether the applicant is an atheist or not.

You could not find out whether an applicant for employment is a Communist or not.

You could not inquire whether the applicant is white or colored.

You could not find out anything about the applicant's parents, wife, husband, or other close relatives.

You could not find out where a person was born.

You could not even find out whether he was a native of the United States or of a foreign country, and if you accidentally found out he was a native of a foreign country, you could not find out whether he had become a naturalized citizen of the United States or not.

The whole thing is so silly and simple, it condemns itself.

The real purpose of this legislation is not to end discrimination in employment, or give equality of opportunity in employment.

It is one phase of the efforts of misguided persons with warped and twisted minds who seek to tear down all barriers between the races, and force social intermingling, and intermarriage between whites and blacks.

This is something which cannot be forced upon the people in my section. I give you fair warning that such efforts cannot be successful. They will only bring bloodshed, and will bring about more antagonism and friction between the races than has existed at any time since reconstruction days when the last attempt to accomplish this purpose miserably and utterly failed.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday, February 27, for 1 hour following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### FLOODS IN THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, every newspaper and report reaching me from Louisiana is filled with stories of swollen rivers and flooded lands. We are in the midst of a period of floods on the lower Mississippi and huge amounts of water have been moving down the streams from the upper reaches of the Mississippi Valley and into the lower Mississippi Basin. It is predicted that the lower Mississippi and tributaries will reach a still higher level than it has reached at the present time and thus the flood stage in the next few weeks will approach a crisis. Thus far the work of the Army engineers has stood up well against the pressure of

water moving toward the Gulf of Mexico. No levee has broken and no crevasse has thus far occurred but as weeks go by the levees will become waterlogged and they then will meet their severest test. The improved channel permits an orderly movement of water down stream and the use of reservoirs which have been completed holds up thousands of acres of water to be released when it can be safely channeled down stream to the Gulf of Mexico. Thus we have a more orderly handling of the floodwaters that come from the 32 States of the Union constituting the land between the eastern divide in the Allegheny mountains and the western divide in the Rocky mountains.

Mr. Speaker, the water that is presently being channeled through Louisiana is not Louisiana water. It comes from many States, north, east, and west of the State of Louisiana. It is the floodwaters coming from areas along such streams as the Ohio, Cumberland, Tenn., upper Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas, White, and upper Red Rivers into Louisiana on its way to the Gulf.

Thus our problem in the lower part of the Mississippi Basin is not a Louisiana problem but a national problem made thus by the laws of nature improved by the methods of men to drain the greatest valley in the world of excess water.

While these floodwaters pouring down on us today come from other States and other sections of the country, they are nonetheless most destructive and dangerous. A year or two ago we had a crevasse at Baton Rouge, La., which was due to the sloughing off of the levee on the west bank of the Mississippi above Baton Rouge.

The destructiveness of this crevasse was reduced by the brilliant work of the Army engineers in immediately curbing and preventing the break-through of the levees at this point from spreading. As I said before, thus far no such levee break has occurred but in certain areas in Louisiana the backwater has filtered in, covering many thousands of acres of fertile land in our State. That water is water which because of the height of the main channel backs up into the tributaries and finds its way out of the stream channels at points not fully protected. In this way much damage is done.

Reports reaching me indicate in Louisiana at the present time that over 2,000,000 acres are now under water. I am informed over 9,000 people have been removed to higher ground where they will be safe until the floodwater recedes. This backwater area should be the subject of attention by Congress and an appropriation of funds by us at an early date. This situation is progressively getting worse.

Mr. Speaker, at many points along Red River, we find flooded areas at the present time. Red River is a stream which rises in far west Texas, flows some 1,300 miles east and southeast until it empties into the Atchafalaya near its confluence with the Mississippi River. At points around Cypress, for instance, the Red River backwater areas have become dis-

troublingly acute and this floodwater is causing a great deal of destruction and damage to property.

I have in my hands photographs taken in the last few days and flown here to Washington showing the extent to which this floodwater is covering the land along the Red River, especially on the west bank of the river in the vicinity of Cypress and Zimmerman, La. Some of these pictures are especially interesting as they show the efforts of cattle to protect themselves from drowning by seeking higher ground.

I mention these pictures especially because there is presently before the Appropriations Committee a proposal for a cloture and floodgate at Colfax, La., on the right descending bank together with a diversion channel. It is extremely important that this diversion channel be built. This project would provide for locks and for an "unleveed" canal permitting drainage of backwaters down Cane River.

As these papers indicate, at the present time seventy to eighty thousand acres of very fertile land in the Red River Basin are under water near Colfax because of the need of this flood control diversion channel. If the locks and the channel are built separately, it will cost \$1,350,000. If these are both built at the same time they will ultimately become a part of the Overton Red River Lateral Canal which has been authorized by this Congress. Thus these two items may be built jointly at the present time at a saving of from \$600,000 less than the \$1,350,000 which this project might otherwise cost. In other words, by combining the projects a saving of \$350,000 might be effected. In addition to this, the State of Louisiana has agreed to contribute \$250,000 as an incentive toward getting this project started. Thus by starting the project at the present time the United States Government will save \$600,000 in the overall picture of the development of this area.

Nor is this all. Up and down the Red River at many points backwater has inundated fertile land, rendering it impossible for cultivation, killing livestock and poultry and causing great damage to property in the areas covered. The Mississippi has fanned out over many parts of the district represented by my colleague, the honorable OTTO PASSMAN, threatening whole towns and cities and causing millions of dollars of damage.

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

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

Mr. JENSEN. I have just looked at the pictures which the gentleman has passed around here, and certainly I can understand why the gentleman is so greatly concerned about this matter. There is some relief in sight, at least to a degree, and it is coming pretty fast, because we in the Missouri Valley, which covers one-sixth of the United States, and which waters ordinarily drain right down through the gentleman's district and his State, are beginning, at least,

to build enough dams up there to hold a lot of that water in that great area on the tributaries and the main streams, and that is going to give you folks some relief.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to thank the gentleman for that contribution. We are deeply interested in the reservoir problem in the United States which will hold the floodwaters up in your section long enough for the other floodwaters to go through the lower Mississippi and permit them to pass safely through the State of Louisiana.

Mr. JENSEN. My district is bordered by the Missouri River for some 120 miles, from the State line of Missouri up to within about 20 miles of Sioux City. Of course, my problem is flood also. We have floods no end, but we are gradually whipping them. The farmers of the upper reaches of the Mississippi and the Missouri and the Ohio are doing the best job in holding this rain water where it falls by contouring and terracing the land, holding the water where it falls, and keeping the silt out of the streams, and by that soil-conservation program and the program we now have of building these dams on the upper reaches it will be, in a few years, a great help to you folks down there.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very kindly. I know that the farmers are always doing a good job in their terracing, and that will help us a great deal.

The story of the flood of 1950 is now being written, but many weeks will pass before we can finally tabulate the tremendous losses resulting from the mad-storm waters of the central United States as they rushed toward the sea.

So high has the Mississippi River become that the Bonnet Carre spillway, above New Orleans, has been opened, and I am informed that 250,000 per second cubic feet of water is being channeled through the floodway from the Mississippi to Lake Pontchartrain at the present time. This has taken the pressure off the New Orleans levees to some extent, but the situation on the Atchafalaya River is still in great difficulty. My able colleague from this part of Louisiana, Henry Larcade, who lives in the Atchafalaya Basin, yesterday gave the Senate Committee on Appropriations figures showing the volume of water which the Atchafalaya River is compelled to handle at this time, and he stressed the fact that tremendous pressure was being placed upon Atchafalaya levees. There is presently the threat of opening up the Atchafalaya floodway; and if this is done, tens of thousands of acres of fertile land within the Atchafalaya Basin will be flooded. Although the Atchafalaya floodway was authorized by law many years ago, the levees in this area have not been completed because of lack of money, and the use of this floodway in its present uncompleted condition will cause tremendous flood damage to south Louisiana. This session of Congress should certainly give this project enough money to completely build the Atchafalaya floodway.

I have in my hands newspapers and newspaper clippings giving the flood news in Louisiana. One Associated Press dispatch before me gives the flood gage reading at the present time and the predicted river crest on the Mississippi, Red, Atchafalaya, and other tributaries of the Mississippi. All of these figures indicate that a further rise and consequential flood damage is to be expected. The National Guard has been called out in certain areas, and tented cities have been laid out to take care of flood refugees.

Last year I read of the criticisms of some, who referred to flood control and navigation projects as "pork-barrel" legislation. I have no patience for these criticisms. Those who would level such criticisms should now take time out to go down to the great State of Louisiana and try to traverse the major highways there which are under water; look out over the land, covered with the swollen, muddy, ugly waters; visit the tented cities of flood refugees; and note the frantic efforts of cattle as they look for high ground to save their lives. These people, who have in the past been critical, should visit this area and note the distress and the hardship and the privation visited upon these people in my State, who have been thus penalized through no fault of their own, but merely because through our rivers we are seeking to drain the floodwaters of 32 States of the United States. They will go away as strong advocates of the Federal Government meeting this situation by full appropriations in the working out of the major flood-control and navigation plans, which will make our rivers servants of mankind rather than the destroyers of our people and our property. They will help us with the great problems of the lower Mississippi Basin, and especially of Louisiana, by providing us with the money which we need to build these critically needed flood-control projects. Surely this Congress can do no less.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### THE FEPC ISSUES

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked for 1 hour's time to discuss certain aspects of the so-called civil-rights program because it seemed to me with the very limited time that would be allowed under the rules of the House in the event that the FEPC bill is called up for consideration tomorrow with only 2 hours provided for debate, there would not be an opportunity for many Members of the House to discuss some of the fundamental issues involved in so substantial a change in our national policy. Therefore, today I expect to yield freely of my time as soon as I have completed a preliminary statement regarding this issue.

I think perhaps that some of the Members who have been interested in my point of view since a year ago when I described what has sometimes been called the Arkansas plan will want to share the time with me.

There never has been a time in recent years when the need for national unity was so great. While I differ profoundly with my friends, who have urged this legislation upon the House, I recognize that there are some conditions throughout the country which explain the ferment of opinion which has brought this issue before us.

It behooves us all to think in terms of the national community. I have been on the west coast in recent months. I have seen many members of the Negro race who were formerly residents of our region finding better opportunities on the west coast. It is in the interest of Arkansas and all the States which have built their economy on an agricultural foundation to have a thriving industrial life in other parts of the country for the good of our people who are squeezed out of agriculture and who are seeking to improve their economic situation.

I know, too, that we of the South who complain that this legislation is opposed to our region have indicated our interest in the problems of other regions, sometimes in a way that might have offended residents of those communities. I refer, for example, to the labor bills which have been before the House. I know when most of us from rural districts supported the Taft-Hartley measure some of our friends representing the labor point of view from industrial centers which conflicted with ours said, "Why should you take it upon yourselves to make this grave decision which affects our communities so vitally?" Our answer is again that ours is a national community and it is very much in our interest to avoid industrial conflict and thus to provide that the automobiles which roll off the assembly lines in Detroit shall come in full volume so that the farmers of our section shall have automobiles and tractors and the other products of our American industry.

So I think any recriminations along that line should be avoided and we should undertake to think in terms of our common interests and the relationship of industry and agriculture.

It is very difficult too, sometimes, to understand why some residents of other parts of the country would be so concerned about court procedures in the South. Yet I want to be consistent. Just as I have insisted that we in rural areas must be concerned about industrial production, so I freely grant that the holder of negotiable paper for the purchase of an automobile by a southern resident is and must be just as much concerned about the enforcement of his rights in our courts as we are in his industry and that he has a right to examine the judicial system if a breakdown is threatened at any point. So, with personal rights, the character of our courts is a defense against injustice that belongs to everyone, regardless of residence.

Mr. Speaker, I have said these things in order to speak with a background of agreement on that point—that our interests are so interlocked that residents of other sections have every right to

inquire about the progress being made in the South in providing for opportunities for the minority group—and I refer, of course, to our most important racial minority, the Negro race. It is a delicate issue, and I think it is always difficult for a member of the majority group, a white man, to speak with complete understanding of the point of view of the minority. I have done the best I could to put myself in the position of a member of the minority group. All of my adult life I have been interested in the problems and the welfare of the Negro people of my State. I am sure no one challenges that. It is not necessary to say it, but I crave your indulgence as I say it, because I would like to fortify it. I have done everything I could, as one citizen, for the improvement of the conditions of our minority people.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman uses the word "minority." Can the gentleman tell us in how many counties in the South the Negro people stand in the majority?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The Negro people in the South stand in the majority in a number of counties. I do not have the exact number. They are nationally a minority group. They are regionally a minority group. I see no point in arguing whether or not they are in certain localities a majority group, because, of course, the policies we discuss here are related to the Nation and not to the locality.

I am not sure that I understand the implications of the gentleman's question. If he intends only to point out that they are in the majority in certain communities, of course, that is true. But since they are not, in any State, the majority group, what I have said about the group as a minority will stand.

Booker T. Washington, a revered Negro leader, as early as 1884, in a meeting of the National Education Association, raised the question of the civil-rights bills—interesting enough, it was the same language in 1884 that we use today, for there were bills pending that were referred to as civil-rights bills—Booker T. Washington answered the question himself. He said:

The best thing to do is to leave it alone and it will solve itself.

If Booker T. Washington were alive I believe he would stand by his statement, looking at the present situation and considering the great progress that the Negro race has made in cooperation with the white people where they live—in other words, the progress that has been made by both groups working together. He would probably say, as a philosopher and teacher—and he was a great teacher—that human problems are never finally solved. Even if my friends who so vigorously urge the FEPC bill have their way, and if the President should accept their recommendations as to the personnel of the FEPC, a year from now, no matter how vigorously enforced, they would not be satisfied with the results.

The problem would still exist. Problems of this kind are never finally solved. That may be a fine commentary on human nature. It may be something that the Creator planted within us, a restlessness that drives us forward. The fact that some insist that the problems are not solved does not mean that Booker T. Washington was wrong in what he said about the civil rights bills in 1884, "Leave them alone." Booker T. Washington was right in placing reliance upon a common attack upon poverty, poor health, and limited educational opportunities rather than force legislation in Washington.

I shall not burden the House with a recital of the great progress that has been made in the States within the last 12 months in equalizing educational and other opportunities. There are those who offer the FEPC as a solution of one problem, who would agree that underlying that is a graver problem, a more fundamental problem, which is the education of our people. That does not have racial implications, except that of course for a long time, following their emergence from slavery, opportunities for the race were not abundant. Neither was the Negro always prepared to take advantage of such limited opportunities as were offered. It is no evidence at all of a lack of benevolence or humanitarian interest in the Negro on the part of the white majority that those opportunities were somewhat limited. I think it is a wholesome thing that the Negro has been insisting that opportunities be made more equal. Many measures for equalization awaited merely the insistence that they be granted. The interesting thing is that as the Negro asks for better opportunities in every field of endeavor he receives them. My city, the city of Little Rock, has just voted to put itself in debt to the extent of \$359,000 to equalize the recreational activities for white and colored. That is related to this problem because you see there is resistance in the South to the extreme kind of legislation that FEPC supporters offer. The resistance to it is explained partly by reason of certain social relationships; and on that point, in all frankness, there will be no change. I would like to say that without offense. I am dealing with what I think is a reality. Our people believe that there should be no social intermingling, and I am not talking now in terms of social equality; it is not a question of one race being superior and another race inferior. A lot of talk on that line is wholly irrelevant. What I am saying is that the South has decided that under present conditions, some decisions and some activities based upon them must be governed by each group living its separate life in separate communities.

Now, I am anxious not to misrepresent our Negro leaders; I am sure that the Negro leadership of the South theoretically stands opposed unanimously to compulsory segregation; they have said so. No one in the South on the majority side questions their right to say so. We recognize the implications of it, but the best proof in the world of their sound thinking is in the statement that a group

of Negro leaders made in 1942, in the famous Durham Conference that they recognized that the real progress to be made for their people must be within the framework of our own democracy in the Southern States; and I should add that no one should ask them to desist in their efforts to secure changes. But when it comes to a question of Federal policy, surely, as practical men, we should recognize that the decisions must be left to the States and to the localities.

When I discussed the President's message a year ago, 1 year after he had offered his civil-rights proposals, I pointed out that not a single one of his recommendations had met with congressional approval. I point out now that another year has gone by that this is still true and I do it primarily for the purpose of suggesting that if the program cannot receive congressional approval after this lapse of time surely there must be some valid objections to it. On the other hand, since agitation for it continues we who have objected to it must agree that since the agitation for it persists there must be some merit in it. That is the reason I have gone to the very bottom of it, into every phase of the program with such facilities as I have at my disposal to find the good that is in it. Having found some good in it, for the life of me, I do not understand why the administration turns down every effort to find the answer as reasonable men to a difficult question, a question that has divided our country, divided us in an hour when we ought to be united.

I do not know whether it is true or not, as many say, that this is a crucial hour in the life of humanity; I do not know whether it is true that decisions must shortly be made by millions of the world's people as to which road they will travel, our free way, or the totalitarian way. I do not know whether the men who speak in such grave terms as to eminent crises are right or not; if they are, we must have greater unity, and in any event, I am convinced that as far as our domestic happiness and peace is concerned, there is every reason for us as legislators to be calm, and to be fair, and to be reasonable as we approach this potentially explosive issue.

I have said that I could see in the FEPC issue only an indirect phase of the segregation problem. I suggested that I could understand the objections that are made by some to present practices, that there are indeed some harsh and even cruel aspects of segregation. What I have insisted upon as governmental policy is that those grievances must be addressed not to the National Congress, but to the municipalities and to the State legislatures. It is not our task. If we undertake to legislate in that field we will bungle the situation. We will find new divisions to plague us, and new and more severe problems will arise.

What does that have to do with FEPC? Oh, they say, it is an economic question, it has nothing to do with social relations, it has nothing to do with race relations. Well, now, the wartime FEPC was given power of a very limited character to deal

with these delicate human situations armed by an Executive order to do just one thing and that was to see that fair employment policies were adopted in war plants and in Federal agencies. Mind you, the wartime FEPC had nothing like the sweeping powers that Mr. POWELL's bill proposes to give, nothing like them. It was empowered only to deal with wartime activities and with Federal employment, that is all, and had authority only to prescribe fair employment practices. But if a war agency equipped by Executive order to deal with problems in a limited area should so disregard its authority as to issue orders breaking down patterns of life in the city of Baltimore and dealing with delicate social questions which have no relation to employment, if a wartime agency of that kind could assert such extensive powers, what would happen if we should adopt the committee FEPC bill and give an agency authority over practically every industry in this country? The Baltimore incident created tensions and accounts for some of the fears regarding sweeping legislation of this type. It obscured some worthwhile things the agency accomplished in situations like the Sun Oil Co. plant in Houston and justifies some of the fears now expressed.

Mr. Speaker, we are therefore dealing with a very fundamental problem—a problem that touches dangerous situations. It deals too with one of the foundation principles of our society, which is that of a free industry. Whenever any law undertakes to say that an employer shall hire applicant A instead of applicant B and shall be fined or imprisoned for not following a Federal agency's decision as to which employees may be discharged, surely there are alerted dangers for us to consider. As reasonable men, as legislators with responsibilities to maintain a nonviolent community and a just order wherever Federal authority is projected, we are challenged to exhibit the finest intelligence and ingenuity that this House can summon.

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

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I want to compliment the gentleman on the splendid statement he is making and on the effort I know he has made in trying to solve a difficult problem. I just suspect that if more of us were in the same frame of mind as the gentleman addressing the House at this time there would not be any difficulty in getting our views together on this problem that is facing the Congress. I do want to say to the gentleman that he has done an exceptionally fine job of research in trying to find the answer to a difficult question, and if it were myself sitting down with him I think we could satisfy ourselves on this question that is dividing the Congress, dividing the Democratic Party and dividing the people of our country.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to my friend from Utah. I resolved at the outset since it is an issue

that touches the deep emotions of life I would undertake to avoid it in this case. I am not sure it is possible. I grew up among Negro people. I have respect and affection for my Negro constituents. I would regard myself as unfit to sit in this House if I were indifferent to the point of view of the 50,000 Negroes who live in my district. I am sorry, in this instance, that the Negro community is divided; that some have said I am doing the right thing for them, and others that I am not. Dr. J. M. Robinson, of Little Rock, a prominent Negro leader, writes me emphatically that I am right and that the Negroes of the South should endorse my position. On the other hand, others have said something else about it. What I have tried to do is to say with candor the things I do believe, though it conflicts with the point of view of many official Negro spokesmen. I have tried to say it with kindness, and yet with vigor, because this is no time for evasion, no matter how much regard we have for the sentiments of those with whom we differ.

I have taken heart, though, when I get messages such as this one. Here is a letter from Hon. Arthur W. Mitchell. Many of you served in the Congress with him. I have not gotten down to the substitute that I hope to offer for the Labor Committee bill, but Arthur W. Mitchell, one of the most distinguished Negroes in America writes me: "I have given your bill all of the time and study I could spare, and I am of the opinion that it is a workable bill and one that will help remedy the discriminatory practice in the labor field as it applies to minority groups." Then he says he would be glad to appear in support of it if a hearing is ever given. That is the word of a trusted Negro leader, a former Member of this House.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am aware of the sincere work that our colleague from Arkansas has given this subject for perhaps 25 or 30 years, practically all of his adult life, as he has said, and I want to compliment the gentleman. Certainly, if there were ever a time when we need more light on this subject that is before us, it is today and tomorrow. I humbly suggest that if we are to make constructive headway with this problem that will stand the test and remain with us, it will be somewhere in the field that our colleague from Arkansas now indicates.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful for that statement.

You see, there are three divisions of us. We fall into three groups. There are those that are so earnest about this thing that they want to do everything overnight, and they want to do it by Federal law, and they are unyielding. Now, there is another group that, in spite of their humanitarian impulses and their attitude of kindness toward the minority groups, do not want to do anything; they say there is nothing to do. Then right in the middle of these groups there is that third group, and I hope that is where

my friend from Washington will find himself. There is that third group that holds that discrimination is an evil, it is a national problem; that the ideal of equal pay for equal performance should be pursued; that we should seek to grant to every man, whatever his race or religion an opportunity to earn a livelihood and to be paid in accordance with his contribution to society, that these are rights to be cherished. Since it is not always easy to maintain universally for reasons that sometimes bewilder us, it creates a problem that ought to have the notice of the Congress. I think then that we will find some common agreement in this middle area of a Federal declaration that the denial of equal opportunities or refusal to pay men in accordance with their productiveness should engage the thoughtful attention of the Government but not to clothe an agency with power to choose between applicants or employees or place fines or penalties upon any employer who does not follow their solution or recommendations. But, if we simply, as a matter of law, declare that the policy of the Federal Government is to seek equality and to give to some agency a mandate to enlarge upon opportunities for all people, and use conciliation to end discrimination, then I think we will be making headway; we will be taking forward steps. That is as far as I am willing to go.

I want to get down before I close to the real issue in this case, because I have not yet stated it. The question is, Shall we have a bill that contains on the part of a Federal agency the power to fine an employer or to imprison him for not following their orders? Is that what the Congress proposes to do? The committee bill gives such power. That is the issue, because the committee bill does have such enforcement powers. That is the reason I am raising my voice today against such an extreme measure.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman admits there is a problem with which Congress must deal. The gentleman, of course, is now recommending what is commonly known as a process of gradualism with respect to this problem.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I hope the gentleman will not attribute that to me. The word "gradualism" has been tossed around so much that I would prefer that the gentleman use another word, if he does not mind.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In my opinion, that is the only way I can adequately describe the gentleman's position. Of course, I may be in error. What I should like to point out to the gentleman is that there has been no civil-rights legislation since 1875.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. And have we not done pretty well?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; we have not.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Does not the gentleman think that the American

Negro is the best-off minority in all the world, the best paid, and the freest?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will answer the gentleman. The gentleman has now just given us a marvelous picture of Jim Crow and segregation. I think the best answer to that question is the answer the Negro himself gives you. He refuses to live any longer under Jim Crow and segregation. He resents being treated as different from anybody else. So the gentleman may travel all over the world and try to make comparisons, and one may disagree as to comparisons, but that is not the point at all. The point is that we here in America have to face this problem. We have refused to face it since 1875.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Not in my country have we refused to face it. We have worked pretty hard at it down in Arkansas. If I know the South, we have been working hard at it, and that is where 70 percent of the American Negroes live. I agree, of course, that we should have as our standard—not the other countries' but the American ideal—an ideal still to be pursued for both races.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If you have worked so hard at it, you have certainly cemented more than ever before your system of segregation and Jim Crow.

That you cannot challenge. You know it is true. As a matter of fact the gentleman's whole speech is based upon the perpetuation of that system.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I disagree with my friend from New York. I think the gentleman will look in vain for words of mine to sustain that statement.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I think the gentleman is eminently fair. I think he is doing a scholarly job here this afternoon and I, for one, appreciate the spirit in which he is conducting this discussion, although I disagree with him. The gentleman's position is, and I think if the gentleman reads back through his speech he will find it so, he has stated here that the system of segregation is one that exists, has existed, and must stand, and that we cannot change it. That is the gentleman's fundamental basis, is that not true?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I have said that changes to be made anywhere that there are harsh and cruel aspects of it must be made by the municipality or by the legislature and not by the Congress, and if you have in mind the abolishment of Jim Crow, frankly tell us so. I do not think you have said that yet.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I definitely have. Oh, yes; definitely I am opposed to Jim Crow in any form or any aspect of it. I have made no bones of my position on this thing.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Let me ask the gentleman, if he does not mind, and I will yield to him to answer: Is your support of the committee bill due to your enthusiasm—let me put it another way—are you supporting the committee FEPC bill because you believe it will do away with segregation?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I say it will be a tremendous step toward abolishing discrimination in employment.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If I may interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am going to answer the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I hope he will, because you brought in segregation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If it is segregation you are trying to attack, that is, the problem of segregation instead of the problem of unfair employment, let us be honest about it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You cannot separate one from the other. They are integrated because once you establish the proposition that a person cannot be deprived of employment because of the color of his skin, then of course you begin to break down even social segregation. Are you in favor of breaking down social segregation? I ask the gentleman—he has asked me so many questions, I ask him that question: Is he in favor of breaking it down, either by municipal legislation or Federal legislation in any manner, shape, or form?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. My answers will be provided in the choice of policies I make and my action as a citizen in the State and in the locality and not in the Congress.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not think the gentleman is being as frank as he started out to be at the beginning of his speech.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think I have said a good deal about the aspects of segregation that are not consonant with our professions of equality. I have only tried to define the forum in which grievances are to be expressed and adjustments sought. If the gentleman thinks it is the Congress of the United States that must determine whether a bus traveling from the east side of Atlanta to the west side of Atlanta shall have a non-segregation policy, then, of course, it is quite all right for him to entertain that view, but I do not want him to have that in mind and vote with that in mind in voting ostensibly to provide fair employment in the city of Atlanta.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have answered the gentleman, I think, when I stated that once you have prohibited discrimination in employment you are beginning to attack one phase of segregation. But coming back to the gentleman's position, because the gentleman has taken the floor to state his position, and I would like to have it clearly defined, the gentleman seems to find objection to this type of legislation because he says it is not within the province of the Federal Government but within the province of the local authorities. Is that the gentleman's position?

Then, may I ask him this question: Is that the gentleman's only objection to wiping out segregation? Let us assume the gentleman had the power within the local framework of Government to wipe it out, would he do so?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is raising moot questions here which have no relation to the problem.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No, I am not. I am referring to this specific problem.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Then the gentleman will begin to ask me about the dog-license ordinance in the city of Little Rock, and I am not going to discuss that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Of course not.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I simply want to make one statement that I think has some bearing on questions which the gentleman from New York has been raising. In my own district there is one of the greatest Negro medical colleges in the world, Meharry College. I checked the enrollment yesterday. There are more Negroes from the State of New York enrolled in Meharry Medical College in my district than are enrolled in the city of New York in all of the seven medical schools where there is no segregation whatsoever. Why is that true? Because they cannot compete on a competitive basis for admission to those schools in New York. They are away down the list. They come down to Meharry Medical College and become good doctors. I think that has some bearing because it deals with a noncompulsory type of segregation. If the gentleman will check the record, he will find there are more Negro students from the State of New York enrolled in the medical college in my district than are enrolled in the entire city of New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield briefly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am not at all trying to defend New York. As far as New York is concerned, there is more hypocrisy on this question than there is in many other places. We are hypocritical about the problem. We preach a sermon but we practice otherwise. That is, the ruling groups. The ruling economic and social groups of the city of New York have taken the attitude and position that you gentlemen of the South take toward the Negro people. As far as colleges are concerned, there is so much discrimination in those colleges that you can cut the atmosphere of discrimination with a knife. Of course, the Negroes are not excluded from New York colleges because they cannot compete. They are excluded because of the color of their skin, right in the city of New York. I am ashamed to make that confession for my State, but it is true.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. There is not a great deal of time remaining.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. I am sure we all appreciate the splendid statement being made by the gentleman from Arkansas. Several of us have from time to time during the past several weeks, advised and worked with the gentleman from Arkansas in the hope that we could evolve a sane and sound approach to this serious subject.

In asking the gentleman to yield I wanted to make this observation,

Within recent days I have heard words of criticism on rulings made by our distinguished Speaker, as we have approached the subject of the legislation which is expected to reach the floor of the House on tomorrow. I cannot but feel that the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body will support our Speaker in the rulings he has and shall make. The Speaker has been eminently fair in all of his rulings and has thus maintained the dignity and prestige of this House.

On tomorrow, if FEPC is taken up, there will be serious questions, and every parliamentary maneuver possible made to advance or slow up the progress of this legislation. I rise just to voice the hope that I am sure is in the mind of every Member of this distinguished body, that the rulings of the Chair will receive the respect and admiration of every Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this, too, before I take my seat, that I commend the views expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]. In my own State of North Carolina we are paying to our colored teachers the same salaries, based upon their certificates, as we pay to the white teachers. Our distinguished governor has named a Negro to the State Board of Education.

If it be true that the proponents are doing so with the thought of casting reflections on the South they are making a serious mistake. We do not claim to have a perfect economy but our progress does not have the best national press. Somewhere between the Hollywood version of plantation life and the Broadway conception of Tobacco Road lies the real South of today. We read in Life magazine within recent days that the greatest transformation since the opening of the West is taking place in the South today. Surely we can take advice, but the proponents of this legislation will discover that the South is far ahead of many sections of this Nation in its program to assist the Negro.

I wish again, Mr. Speaker, to commend the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas for the fair and impartial way in which he is presenting this subject.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish before the gentleman sits down he would tell us clearly what the Federal Government would do in the event of a violation of what the national policy might be. Are there to be penalties? And also, specifically, would he tell us what the State and municipal governments ought to do with this problem? I have listened with much interest to his discussion and have learned something, but I would like to have the gentleman deal with this phase, the enforcement phase of the proposed legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. With the permission of the House I shall insert in the RECORD an analysis of the bill which

I offered for the consideration of the committee. My bill will be offered as a substitute. I will also offer for publication in the RECORD a bill introduced some time ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], which differs in some respects from my proposed non-penalty bill. Neither the bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania nor my bill include enforcement powers. That states the issue. Under the committee bill, I am satisfied that a jail sentence or heavy fine could be imposed for violation of a cease-and-desist order issued by the FEPC.

With all our good will, with all of our sensibilities against wrong and discrimination, this Congress is surely not going to confer that kind of power. But let me repeat that is the issue; there will be no other issue where the House considers the FEPC. Sincere reasons will be advanced by some for not accepting the plan which I have proposed; in other words, some who have consistently opposed what they call bureaucracy would say, "Why create another agency?"

They ask, Why make this gesture? I would respect that point of view, though I differ with it. I think the opportunity to do something that indicates our sympathies with those who have reason to feel that equal opportunities have not always been afforded, I think that our sympathies should lead us to go this far, that much I propose that we do.

Before I analyze these two bills, the one offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, H. R. 6841, and my own, H. R. 6668, and make a comparison between them and the committee bill, let me say that I consider the committee bill an amazing thing. In an effort to bolster its constitutionality its drafters state that it is to promote the observance of rights and freedoms undertaken by the United States under the United Nations Charter and to further national policy with respect to the universal declaration of human rights proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Is not that a commentary upon the legislative processes? Here we are in a free country under a sovereign government undertaking to justify a questionable statute by saying that because we have agreed with certain other nations many of whom have not come anywhere close to the high standards we have erected in jurisprudence because we have agreed with them about certain rights, we, the Congress of the United States, must adopt a questionable act. It comes under the provision of the Constitution to the effect that the law of the land is the law of treaties that we have entered into; so, because this treaty was made confirming what we have always believed, we will pursue this course, although of questionable constitutionality. That is not my idea of good craftsmanship.

An analysis of the committee bill (H. R. 4453), which I will insert, was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service. But Mr. Freeman Sharp, who prepared it, advises me that the committee made these interesting additions:

It will be unlawful, if this bill is adopted, to discriminate against anyone, not only for reasons of race, creed, or color, but ancestry, which means now that a Hatfield would have to employ a McCoy, and a McCoy could not discharge a Hatfield. That is the bill.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. It has been said over and over again that most of the agitation for this is below Fourteenth Street in New York where they have FEPC. I find that true in my district. Could the gentleman tell us where we can get authentic information about how the colored people of the South feel about this compulsory legislation? Is there anything published or any committees formed that would give us a true picture of their own attitude in the South as distinguished from Fourteenth Street?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman has asked me a very difficult question because if I am going to be true to my standard of honesty I am going to have to tell him that except for a few thoughtful people like former Congressman Mitchell who now lives in Virginia and Dr. Robinson, the Negro physician of my city whom I mentioned and others, I have not found a great deal of support among the colored people of the South for my point of view. I say that not to indicate that they repudiate my approach, but simply in an effort to speak with complete candor to say that the thinking of most Negroes who have had occasion to weigh it, is congealed. And I suppose that observation applies to some extent to all of us.

They are told that FEPC is in their interest. So they are for it. A great many of them have been told that by a Negro press, which is not uniformly serving their interests from my point of view and which because of a rather violent attitude, sometimes a prejudiced attitude, fails to lay the full facts before them. This does not apply to all Negro newspapers by any means. A great many Negroes so advised feel that the issue is much simpler than it really is and that to deny them FEPC is to deny equality. The gentleman knows that is not the case.

Mr. GWINN. I had reference particularly to the compulsory feature. Do they know this means jail, fine, and all that?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I doubt that they do. I doubt that they have been fully advised. What I am trying to say is I have not been able to find, among Negroes except in the isolated instances to which I referred, a great deal of support for my middle-of-the-road position. I am sure they have been very charitable to me. I have spoken of the problem in Negro churches. I have received some support where I have been able to reach them. The warnings I have issued on that point, of course, are valid and they should interest the Negro because he would be the victim.

This bill is not in his interest. The force bills following the Civil War were

not in his interest. They retarded the progress of the Negro and caused a lot of bitterness and hardship. It was not a southern Democrat who said that there was more bitterness caused following the Civil War by utterances in the Halls of Congress than by incidents on the battlefields of the South.

But Thaddeus Stevens' point of view was repudiated by sound-thinking people who observed the injustices growing out of the use of force. I appreciate the efforts made by many outside the South to understand our history and our current problems.

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

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to my colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to also, Mr. Speaker, compliment my colleague for the very fine spirit in which he has approached this problem and the very scholarly way in which he has discussed it to the House today. On the point that was just asked by the distinguished gentleman from New York, so far as our people down in our State are concerned, is it not true that they have been wholly misinformed as to what actually is proposed in the legislation here reported by the committee?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think so, at least in many instances.

Mr. HARRIS. And is it not also a fact that when you have an opportunity to discuss it with those sounder thinking people there they do understand, and then they immediately and automatically reflect the impression that they are not in favor of such a proposal, but to those who are following the leadership and the conjectures of the organizations who get this propaganda sent down to them, it reflects the thinking that was expressed by the gentleman propounding the question a moment ago?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman has made historical reference to Thaddeus Stevens and his position. His position, if adopted, would have solved this problem many years ago. Forty acres and a mule would have given economic implementation to the Emancipation Proclamation, and that is what we are still fighting out now.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Of course, the gentleman knows that he will not find much support for that point of view.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an analysis prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the committee bill, H. R. 4453, and an analysis prepared by the same office of the McConnell bill, H. R. 6841, and the bill that I introduced, H. R. 6668, and other extraneous matter, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder if he would

include a list of the States which have enacted FEPC or civil rights legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I will include that, Mr. Speaker, and will indicate on that list those who have included enforcement power.

I said at the outset that this is a thing that I hope will linger in the minds of every person in this Chamber tomorrow. The real issue is whether or not you are going to enforce an agency's findings with reference to employment, whether or not you are going to impose fines and jail sentences upon employers who have their own employment policies to work out.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just wanted to ask the gentleman to yield to say that I want to congratulate him on the fairness and the impartiality with which he has advocated his position. Whatever Members of the House may disagree as to the solution of this problem, I am sure that none of the Members of the House will disagree with the fact that the gentleman approaches all of these questions sincerely and honestly, and we all respect him very highly for his opinion on this matter as well as other legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is very kind of the gentleman to say it and I propose now to conclude in just a moment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I have been pleased to remain here during the period of this special order because I know of no other man in this House for whom I have a more profound respect than I have for the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas. He is a Christian gentleman, and everyone in this House understands that.

In this week dedicated to tolerance and brotherhood, with commentators and writers all over the country calling attention to the necessity for tolerance in our attitudes and in our thinking and in our speaking, it is refreshing indeed to find in the discussion of this very difficult problem the magnificent manner of approach that has been adopted by our distinguished friend from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KEEFE. May I add just this to my friend. May I say that in the discussion which is to come about tomorrow I hope the high level of intelligent approach and the approach of tolerance that has been manifested by my friend from Arkansas will be maintained during that debate.

I have just one little inkling in the interrogation by the gentleman from New York of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas that leads and points the way to the thinking of some of those who for years have been most militant in the advocacy of those problems that hew close to the Communist Party line, when he raised the question as to whether or not the gentleman from Arkansas is a believer in the gradualist policy of solution of this problem.

I can say that when I was privileged to serve on a committee of this House that brought before it men who were known to be of the Communist philosophy and associating with Communists, they invariably denounced what was known as the gradualist policy of solution of these problems and advocated the sharp break of revolution as the solution.

That came up here inferentially today in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York. It should be pin pointed, and we should put our fingers upon it for what it is here today.

I hope the Members of the House will listen attentively tomorrow to gentlemen of the character of the gentleman from Arkansas in the consideration of this very important and vital question.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to add to what has been said truly with regard to the Christian spirit of tolerance and brotherhood demonstrated by our friend and colleague from Arkansas that perhaps even more impressive, if possible, is his courage, his political courage. In trying to find a middle road of progress which will lead toward a solution of this exceedingly difficult problem and will not create in some areas the exact opposite of what is desired, he inevitably alienates some of his friends and supporters in his own State, who may call him a traitor to the South, and at the same time alienates some of his liberal brethren, who may decide he is just a southern reactionary because he does not believe brotherhood can be achieved by compulsion. Such a stand takes political courage. He doubtless will get little credit and plenty of criticism from both sides because he is trying to find a just and workable solution to a problem for which there is no quick, easy, and ready solution. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is very kind. Whatever my feelings of loneliness when I find myself between two extremes, I have felt in very good company today, among warm-hearted friends, whether they agree with me or not.

I want to say to all in closing that it does move me deeply to have these things said. It does not matter that they are exaggerated and uncalled for.

For example, my friend the gentleman from Minnesota, WALTER JUDD, speaks of courage. I would not regard it at all as courage. What I have tried to do at home is to say, "Now, here is the sensible thing, as I see it." I have taken the people of my district into my confidence, and I have talked this over with them in that spirit. But I am grateful for what you have said.

Let me bring this to a conclusion quickly. I would join with what has

been said here so eloquently by our beloved Speaker when he speaks of this as the highest honor that can come to men, to serve in this House. This idea of representative government is ours to cherish. I have justified my reference to my Negro constituents on that basis. I must not forget their interests. At the same time I have spoken with vigor on the question of force and with complete compatibility, I think, with this other sentiment because we will work against the Negro's interest if we adopt these measures of compulsion. The fact is that the interests of the races are bound together. No social practices can untie them. I have stood at the graveside of too many loved ones of my father's family, the victims of tuberculosis, for example, not to realize that if we conquer disease that has caused such suffering, we must conquer it by fighting it wherever it appears among the Negro race or among the white race. I know that if we advance as a people we must advance educationally by providing opportunities to both races.

It is a wise saying that the white man cannot hold the Negro in a ditch without staying there with him. What I have said of our beloved Southland is, I trust, not from the sectional point of view. We have demonstrated our ability pretty well, I think, to forget the past. We have acknowledged the error of clinging to old traditions which have been outmoded. There is a new South and that South marches on. The South recognizes itself as part of a great Nation. So, while now and then we make mistakes, we may band together at times to protect an idea which might well be discarded, but nevertheless, we are conscious of our responsibilities as citizens of the Nation.

The key to it all is justice. If there has been an element of suffering growing out of our poverty, something we do not speak of often and yet the complete picture requires it, the picture of eroded hills and limited markets, if we speak of suffering, it is because an element of suffering affects us all and draws us together. Emil Brunner put it like this, "All suffering is bitter. Suffering that is unjust is doubly bitter. Suffering that is of destiny unites. Suffering that is unjust divides."

We must heed the cry of suffering wherever it is said that it is the result of a faulty Federal policy. I want to meet that challenge, in order that there may be no suffering among any minority group, whether it is racial or religious, and in order that there should be no feeling that they are not wanted. Our Negro people, and every group, whatever their faith are wanted in this great land.

It is up to us to work toward a policy of perfect justice for all men. And when our labors are done I will be content if we apply that simple standard of justice for both worker and employer and find a greater unity in the happiness of people who resolve their conflicts on such a basis. It will fortify equal justice in the courts in the provision for equal facilities to all people in all public services and in equal opportunities for men of every race.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following:

Ten States have adopted Fair Employment Practices Acts, as follows:

	Enforcement powers
Connecticut.....	Yes.
Indiana.....	No.
Massachusetts.....	Yes.
New Jersey.....	Yes.
New Mexico.....	---
New York.....	Yes.
Oregon.....	---
Rhode Island.....	---
Washington.....	---
Wisconsin.....	No.

#### ANALYSIS OF H. R. 4453 (By Mr. POWELL)

A. Name of act (sec. 1): 1. Federal Fair Employment Practices Act.

B. Findings and declaration of policy (sec. 2): That persons are being denied employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; that it is essential to the general welfare that these rights be protected; and that this act is necessary (1) to remove obstructions to commerce; (2) to insure complete enjoyment of constitutional rights; and (3) to promote observance of rights and freedoms undertaken by the United States under the United Nations Charter and to further national policy with respect to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

C. Definitions (sec. 3): Definitions include:

"Employer"—a person engaged in commerce employing 50 or more, except States and political subdivisions or nonprofit organizations which are of a religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian character.

Exempts employers of aliens working outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions (sec. 4).

D. Unlawful employment practices (sec. 5): It shall be an unlawful practice—

(a) For an employer:

(1) To refuse to hire, to discharge, or discriminate against a person with respect to terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

(2) To utilize in hiring any employment agency, placement service, or other source which discriminates.

(b) For a labor organization:

(1) To discriminate against any persons.

(2) To limit, segregate or classify its membership because of race, color, etc.

(c) For either an employer or a labor organization: (1) To discharge, expel, or discriminate against a person because he has opposed such unlawful employment practice or participated in any proceeding under this act.

E. Fair Employment Practice Commission (sec. 6): Creates a Fair Employment Practice Commission in the executive branch composed of five members appointed by the President with advice of the Senate for 5-year terms.

The Commission shall have—

(a) Powers:

(1) To appoint officers and employees under civil service rules.

(2) To cooperate with regional, State, local and other agencies.

(3) To pay witnesses the same fees as in United States courts.

(4) To furnish technical assistance to further compliance with the act.

(5) To assist an employer whose employees refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effecting the provisions of the act.

(6) To make technical studies to effectuate the act.

(7) To appoint local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils to aid in

effectuating the act and to make studies and recommendations for that purpose.

(b) Investigatory power (sec. 9):

(1) To issue subpoenas.

(2) To administer oaths, examine witnesses and receive evidence.

(3) To apply to United States district courts to enforce subpoenas, etc., against contumacious persons.

F. Self-Incrimination (sec. 9 (e)): No person shall be excused from testifying or producing evidence in obedience to a subpoena on the ground that the testimony or evidence may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture but no such person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture on account of such testimony or evidence except perjury in so testifying.

G. Prevention of unlawful employment practices (sec. 7):

The Commission shall have exclusive powers to prevent unlawful employment practices under the act but may cede jurisdiction to State and local agencies where State and local acts are comparable to this act. The Commission on a written sworn charge shall investigate and endeavor to eliminate the unlawful practices through informal conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

On failure to obtain voluntary compliance by informal methods, a formal hearing may be held before a member of the Commission or designated agent with the right to counsel and to cross-examine witnesses, etc. At conclusion of the formal hearing the record thereof shall be transferred to the Commission (or three designated members) for decision. The Commission shall then issue a cease-and-desist order or an order of dismissal. The whole proceedings hereunder shall conform to the Administrative Procedure Act.

H. Judicial review (sec. 8): Provides for a petition, by either the Commission or a party aggrieved by a final order of the Commission, to the United States Court of Appeals under the procedures established by the Administrative Procedure Act. Decision of the Court of Appeals is subject to a review by the United States Supreme Court.

I. Enforcement of orders directed to Government agencies and contractors (sec. 10):

Authorizes the President to make Federal practice conform to the policies of the act and to prescribe administrative remedies by Executive order with no judicial review. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with the Commission's orders.

Authorizes the President to make regulations to prevent Government contractors (contracts exceeding \$10,000) from continuing unfair-employment practices. The Commission shall enforce such regulations.

J. Notices to be posted (sec. 11): Requires employers and labor organizations to keep a notice prepared by the Commission, with excerpts from the act, posted in conspicuous places on their premises under penalty of a \$500 fine.

K. Forcibly resisting the Commission or its representatives (sec. 14): To forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employees of the Commission in the performance of duties under the act or because of the same is punishable by a \$500 fine and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.

L. Veterans' preference (sec. 12): This act shall not modify Federal, State, Territorial, or local veterans' preference.

M. Rules and regulations (sec. 13): The Commission shall make, modify, and rescind rules and regulations to carry out the act. The regulations must conform to the Administrative Procedure Act.

N. Separability clause (sec. 15): The usual provision.

**FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION—AN ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON OF H. R. 6668 AND H. R. 6841, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS**

H. R. 6668 (HAYS)

A. Name of act (sec. 1): Minorities Employment Act.

B. Declaration of policy (sec. 2): Declares it to be the policy of the United States:

1. To eliminate discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry in regard to: (a) opportunity for employment; (b) tenure, terms or conditions of employment; (c) membership in labor organizations; and

2. To encourage to the fullest possible extent a policy of nondiscrimination throughout industry.

C. Administering agency (sec. 3): The Secretary of Labor (creates a Minorities Employment Bureau to perform functions delegated to it by the Secretary; see F, below).

D. Functions of the Secretary (sec. 3): The Secretary shall—

(1) Receive and investigate complaints charging discrimination because of race, religion, color, etc., in regard to employment opportunities; tenure, terms, or conditions of employment; or membership in a labor organization;

(2) Endeavor by mediation and conciliation to eliminate any discrimination;

(3) Investigate and study the character, causes, and extent of discrimination in general;

(4) Study the best methods to eliminate discrimination and formulate plans to that end;

(5) Publish and disseminate the results of such studies and investigations (exempted from sec. 306, Penalty Mail Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1049) which prohibits distribution of Government documents without a prior request therefor); and

(6) Cooperate with employees, labor organizations, and private and public agencies to formulate programs, educational and otherwise, to eliminate discrimination.

E. None.

F. Minorities Employment Bureau (sec. 4): Creates a Minorities Employment Bureau within the Department of Labor headed by a Director appointed by the President with the advice of the Senate to perform delegated duties under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor.

G. Local advisory councils (sec. 5): The Secretary of Labor may create local, regional or State advisory councils to—

(1) Study the general problem of discrimination and investigate specific instances in their respective areas;

**FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION—AN ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON OF H. R. 6668 AND H. R. 6841, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS**

H. R. 6841 (M'CONNELL)

A. Name of act (sec. 1): Fair Employment Practices Act.

B. Findings and declaration of policy (sec. 2): Declares that the denying of employment opportunities and discrimination against properly qualified persons by reason of race, creed, or color deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, and defense, and burdens, hinders and obstructs commerce. Declares it to be the policy of the United States to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, or color in employment relations.

C. Administering agency (sec. 3): Creates a Fair Employment Practices Commission composed of five members appointed by the President with advice of the Senate for 5-year terms.

D. Powers and duties of the Commission (sec. 3): The powers of the Commission shall be to—

(1) Appoint officers and employees;

(2) Cooperate with and utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to use volunteer and uncompensated services;

(3) Pay witnesses the same fees as in United States courts;

(4) Make, amend, and rescind in such manner as prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, rules and regulations to carry out the act;

(5) Serve processes and other papers, etc.; and

(6) Make technical studies to effectuate the purposes of the act.

The duties of the Commission shall be to (sec. 4)—

(1) Make comprehensive studies of discrimination in various sections of the country and of the best methods of eliminating it;

(2) Formulate plans in cooperation with interested public and private agencies for its elimination;

(3) Publish reports relating to elimination of discrimination;

(4) Cooperate with and furnish technical assistance to employers, labor unions, and other public and private agencies;

(5) Receive and investigate complaints; and

(6) Make specific and detailed recommendations to interested parties for the elimination of discrimination.

The investigatory powers of the Commission shall be to (sec. 5)—

(1) Examine and copy evidence;

(2) Issue subpoenas;

(3) Administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, and conduct investigations; and

(4) Apply to United States district courts to enforce subpoenas, etc., against contumacious persons.

E. Self-incrimination (sec. 5 (f)): No person shall be excused from testifying or producing evidence in obedience to a subpoena on the ground that the testimony or evidence may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture but no such person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture on account of such testimony or evidence except perjury in so testifying.

F. None.

G. None.

H. R. 6668 (HAYS)

(2) Foster good will, cooperation and conciliation in their areas through community effort or otherwise; and

(3) Make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to his functions under the act.

Council members are to be citizens of the area, serve without pay and be assisted by technical and clerical employees appointed by the Secretary without regard to civil-service laws.

H. National Advisory Council (sec. 6): The Secretary may create a National Advisory Council on Minority Problems composed of 7 members representing employees, employers and the public with equal representation as between employees and employers.

The National Advisory Council shall—

(1) Consult with the Secretary; and

(2) make recommendations to the Secretary in regard to his functions under the act.

I. None.

J. None.

K. Annual report (sec. 7): The Secretary shall submit to Congress and the President an annual report covering his activities under the act together with such further information and recommendations for further legislation as he deems advisable.

**BASING-POINT SYSTEM—MARYLAND THE GAINER BY ENDING THE SYSTEM—SUPREME COURT DECISION AN ECONOMIC BLESSING, INSTEAD OF A CALAMITY, AS ALLEGED—MARYLAND'S EXPERIENCE TYPICAL—REGIONAL EXPANSION RESULTS FROM ENDING THE BASING-POINT SYSTEM—IMPARTIAL SURVEY AND REPORT MADE BY MARYLAND STATE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, revise and extend my remarks, and include a statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Maryland State Planning Commission has issued a report which is of great significance in the basing-point controversy. The report is entitled "Survey of the Impact of f. o. b. Mill Pricing on Maryland Manufacturers." I have asked for an analysis and summary of this report, which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, with the permission of the House, as part of my extended remarks.

**MARYLAND BENEFITS FROM ELIMINATION OF BASING-POINT SYSTEM**

In November 1949 the Maryland State Planning Commission issued a report titled "Survey of the Impact of f. o. b. Mill Pricing on Maryland Manufactur-

H. R. 6841 (M'CONNELL)

H. None.

I. Discrimination in employment by the Federal Government (sec. 6): The Commission shall make a study of discrimination in the Federal Government and recommend to Congress a specific plan for its elimination together with the necessary legislation.

J. Willful interference with Commission agents (sec. 7): To forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission in the performance of duties under the act or because of the same is punishable by a \$5,000 fine and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.

K. Annual report (sec. 4 (b)): The Commission shall submit to Congress and the President an annual report describing in detail the investigations, proceedings, and hearings it has conducted and their outcome, the decisions it has rendered and the other work performed by it and may make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable. The Commission may make such other recommendations to the President or any Federal agency as deemed necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act.

ers." This is a factual report prepared by the staff of the Maryland State Planning Commission. It is based in part upon replies to some 1,000 questionnaires sent out in July 1949 to manufacturers accounting for 87 percent of the total industrial employees in Maryland. It is also based upon actual market data for several industries; that is, the known quantities of certain products produced in the State and the known quantities of these products purchased or consumed within the State and within adjoining market areas.

This report should be of interest not merely to Members of Congress from the State of Maryland; it should be of interest to all Members of Congress in their deliberations upon the pending legislation to legalize the basing-point system of pricing, Senate bill 1008. While the factual data presented are applicable only to Maryland, and to some extent to other eastern seaboard and New England States, these data will serve in an illustrative way to clear up many of the general misapprehensions concerning the effects of the Cement and Rigid Steel Conduit decisions upon other areas of the country. One of the quite pointed lessons demonstrated by these data is the general industrial expansion and the increased volume of industrial investment which will be possible throughout the country, provided industry can be rid-

of the restrictive effects of the basing-point system.

One feature which greatly enhances the usefulness of the Maryland study is the simplicity with which it handles the legal issues involved in the present basing-point controversy. It avoids the uncertainties which might arise from varying understandings as to what forms of freight absorption and phantom freight are legal and under what circumstances. In short, it avoids the questions of which, if any, Maryland manufacturers might be participating in an illegal pricing scheme. The investigators simply asked themselves, and asked the Maryland manufacturers, what the effect would be if all industry sold f. o. b. mill. As it turns out, a majority of the industries of the State would not be affected at all by such pricing. Products of these industries are now marketed in the same way agricultural commodities are sold; that is, the producer does not absorb freight and, conversely, does not charge phantom freight. A producer's net price, exclusive of freight, is the same at any particular time for all buyers. Similarly, these industries do not depend upon supplies or materials which are sold on a basing-point system or zone-price basis, or the materials which they do buy on such a basis are so unimportant that a shift to f. o. b. pricing would not affect their production costs. These industries are as follows: Food and kindred products; tobacco; textile mill products; apparel and other finished products; furniture and fixtures; printing, publishing, and allied industries; leather and leather products; machinery and transportation equipment; professional, scientific, and controlling instruments; miscellaneous industries.

On the other hand, several Maryland industries would be, or have been, affected by a shift to f. o. b. mill pricing—either because of their own selling methods, or because of the selling methods of the industries from which they obtain supplies. Some of these would be affected in very slight degree, some in more important degrees. In some instances, the effects would be disadvantageous to Maryland manufacturers; in other instances they would be advantageous to Maryland manufacturers. Those industries which would be affected in any degree are as follows: Iron and steel; lumber and wood products; fabricated metal products; paper and allied products; chemicals and allied products; rubber and allied products; stone, clay, and glass products.

On the whole, manufacturers, employees, and consumers would benefit from the elimination of unnecessary transportation costs, and from a general industrial expansion. But on this point the report speaks for itself. The summary of the findings appearing on pages 81 and 82 is as follows:

The study of the effect on the Maryland manufacturers of a compulsory shift to f. o. b. mill pricing has indicated that a major portion of the manufacturing industries of the State will be affected very slightly.

Some sections of the chemical and fabricated-metals industry could very well be

adversely affected if an f. o. b. mill-pricing system were made compulsory, but the adverse effects should not be large. On the other hand, one might expect a slight expansion in the paper, cement, and lime industries, which might more than overbalance any loss in chemicals or metal fabricating.

The one industry that would be very noticeably affected by a shift to compulsory f. o. b. mill pricing is the iron and steel industry. Maryland steel manufacturers could greatly benefit by f. o. b. mill pricing. An expansion of over 50 percent in Maryland's steel capacity is a reasonable guess if the basing-point system is abolished in favor of f. o. b. mill pricing.

Of course, while over-all sales or employment in an industry may not be seriously affected, a large reshuffling or swapping of customers may well occur under f. o. b. mill pricing. The local mill will tend to sell products in or near Maryland and, where possible, to buy supplies from local producers.

This "drawing in" of sales by local producers will tend to minimize transportation costs, and, consequently, many local firms will either realize a larger average mill-net price or will lower their f. o. b. mill prices so that customers will be able to purchase more cheaply, or a combination of both will occur. This minimization of transportation cost might conceivably result in lower prices to the final consumer or a larger take-home pay for the Maryland industrial worker, or both.

A point-by-point summary of the effect on Maryland follows:

1. A major portion of Maryland manufacturers will not experience any effect because: (a) They do not sell on any identical delivered-price system; and (b) they purchase little or no supplies from firms selling on a basing-point or zone system.

2. Other manufacturers who sell on a basing-point or zone system will experience only a slight loss or gain in sales because the result of swapping customers with competitors will tend to balance. That is, the loss of distant customers will be balanced by the gain in local purchasers.

3. Manufacturers who purchase a major portion of their supplies from firms selling on a zone or basing-point system will shift their sources of supply to the nearest producer wherever possible. If the nearest supplier is not in a position to fill orders placed by a manufacturer, or will not supply him for any other reason, the manufacturer may experience an increase in the cost of supplies.

4. The steel industry may expand as much as 50 percent in the next 10 years, because of the apparent deficit production on the east coast.

5. Transportation costs will tend to be minimized, thereby causing larger mill-net receipts, or lower prices to consumers, or both.

6. Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Anne Arundel County may experience an increase in employment as a result of expansion in the steel industry. The total increase in employment as a result of expansion in the steel industry could be over 10,000 directly, and many more indirectly.

7. The other sections of Maryland should not be noticeably affected, favorably or adversely.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may address the House for 40 minutes, and that he may revise and extend his remarks on that occasion.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 8 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day, and any other special orders heretofore entered.

#### FEPC

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken the floor except for the insistence of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that my remarks, injected into the speech delivered by the very able gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], be pin pointed. What is it exactly that he wants to have pin pointed?

First, that I criticized the gentleman's position as one of gradualism. I do not know if the gentleman from Wisconsin heard my remarks fully. I make no apology for them. I reassert them now in the hope that he will understand them.

I pointed out that the policy of gradualism has brought us nowhere in this problem, and that not a single piece of civil rights legislation has come out of this Congress since 1875; that the objectives of the men who fought for freedom in the Civil War have been completely negated since 1875; that one of the greatest travesties of the history of this country is the calumny that has been heaped on the men who fought to carry out and fulfill the objectives for which many men died in the Civil War. The gentleman infers that it is communism to insist, as I have been insisting, that there must be an end to Jim Crow; that you can never solve this problem by degrees, by gradualism. The Negro people have waited too long and have suffered too much under Jim Crow to wait for the success of gradualistic solutions. He implies that I am intolerant. I am intolerant. I am intolerant of any one who would tolerate conditions of segregation and Jim Crow. I am intolerant of inequality. I am intolerant of those Jim Crow conditions, and I shall continue to do all that I can in my limited capacity to destroy them. So, if that is intolerance, if it is communistic, as the gentleman from Wisconsin would call it, then all I can say about it is that I accept that charge. I do it with pride. There is a fundamental difference of opinion between us. I simply say that I prefer to stand by my position

and I apply that position to FEPC. I say that it is gradualism to come here, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] does, and advocate merely a statement of policy. You cannot have any guaranty against discrimination in employment unless you do give the Fair Employment Practice Commission the power to apply for and obtain cease and desist orders. That is the committee bill. The gentleman's substitute, as well as the substitute of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL], do not provide for enforcement and are therefore gradualism. I am opposed to that because I oppose inequality. I am not for 50 percent equality. I am not for 90 percent equality, because anything less than 100 percent equality is not equality. There is only one kind of equality, I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and that is 100 percent full equality. Call it communism, call it what you please, but that is the only solution to this problem.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the speech which the gentleman from Arkansas made was dedicated to the proposition that involves fair employment practices legislation to come before this House tomorrow. The gentleman from New York, as he always does, attempted to pervert the purposes of that argument so as to include an extraneous argument relating to segregation and Jim Crowism.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have heard the gentleman; I will answer him.

Mr. KEEFE. I just want to answer the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I wish to continue my answer.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to yield; he used my name.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Very well; I will yield to the gentleman, although I do not have to. This is my time and I do not have to yield to him, but I will.

Mr. KEEFE. I would like the gentleman to understand, and the record is clear, that the point at issue is not Jim Crowism or segregation. When he states that, he is stating something which the record will not sustain and which my record in this Congress will not sustain, as the gentleman well knows. The gentleman has admitted that this gradualist policy which he objects to faces the very objection that the Communists of this country have urged time and time again, which they have urged in their writings and in their speeches. They are opposed to the gradualist policy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has answered himself. The Communists are opposed to a policy of gradualism with respect

to this problem. That does not change the validity of the opposition to the policy of gradualism because the Communists oppose it. If the Communists opposed nudist colonies the gentleman would be in favor of them.

Mr. KEEFE. But your Communist friends advocate them and defend them time and time again.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman must be an expert on this subject.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly what they advocated, nudist colonies.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then if the Communists condemned them the gentleman would also advocate nudist colonies. He says the Communists are opposed to gradualism and because the Communists oppose gradualism, therefore, gradualism is good. So if Communists opposed nudist colonies the gentleman would rather have them. That is how sound his argument is. That is his super logic, but that is not the point. The gentleman has left himself wide open. Here is what it is. It is the crux of the entire argument between him and me.

The gentleman says that I injected extraneous matters into this discussion, that I was injecting the question of segregation and Jim Crow. The gentleman says that is extraneous. This demonstrates how shallow his argument is. Is it extraneous? Is FEPC extraneous to Jim Crow and segregation? Are we not dealing with Jim Crow and segregation when we are dealing with the problem of discrimination in employment? The two are simply different phases of the same problem: One is the phase in the industrial life of the Nation; Jim Crow and segregation exists in the industrial life, and FEPC is aimed at that; so, Jim Crow and segregation are not extraneous to this problem; and the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin says that they are extraneous demonstrates that the gentleman from Wisconsin does not have any real understanding of the whole issue involved. He has a superficial attitude toward this issue. This issue is much more fundamental than FEPC. FEPC is just a phase of it. This issue goes back to the days of the thirteenth amendment. When the thirteenth amendment was under consideration that issue was raised in this House by a man whose memory has been done violence here and by Hollywood, Thaddeus Stevens; and it was raised by Republicans, by real Republicans, the anniversary of whose leader you have just been celebrating this last week. Those real Republicans stated right here in this House that emancipation meant nothing if there was no economic implementation; in other words, you did not free the Negro if you did not give him full equality and the wherewithal with which to live. It was proposed right here in this House by Thaddeus Stevens that every emancipated slave be given a 40-acre farm and a mule. It would have meant breaking up the big landed feudalism of over 200 acres. Radical, is it not? If that policy had been adopted, if there had been no betrayal of the ideals for which men died in that Civil War, we would not be having this problem here today. You would not be having,

for instance, the so-called Black Belt of the South with 5,000,000 Negroes exploited and subjected to the vilest form of racism, with 180 counties in which the Negro people constitute a majority ranging from 50 to 85 percent, subjected to the Bourbon rule of a minority.

What is this business you are perpetuating? You have perpetuated a political and social and economic scheme to deprive the Negro people of the democracy to which they are entitled, to deprive them of that political power with which they can protect themselves from economic slavery. So this system has been solidified, it has been perpetuated. Do you want to deal with that system gradually? Do you want to temporize with it? Do you want the bill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the bill offered by the gentleman from Arkansas which says that we declare for the principle of equality here in this Congress but we refuse to enforce that principle; we refuse to have any power given to the Federal Government to step in. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] made a statement. Maybe I misunderstood him. He referred to it as a police-state system? Does the gentleman think that is a police-state system? Did the gentleman refer to it as a police-state system?

Mr. JUDD. No; I did not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the struggle that is going on here in reference to FEPC is an old struggle. It goes back to the very establishment of slavery in the United States. We witnessed that struggle in the enunciation of the Declaration of Independence, we witnessed the debate on continuation of the slave trade in the Constitutional Convention, we witnessed the debates in Congress. You remember the Dred Scott decision which said that no Negro had any right that any white man must respect. We saw Americans shed their blood in the Civil War to wipe out that vicious decision of our Supreme Court. But then all that was negated. A presidential election took place, the Tilden-Hayes election, a dubious presidential election which was won only by agreeing to the withdrawal of Federal troops from the South and as a result the implementation of emancipation, the economic, political, and social implementing of that emancipation was stopped. Since 1875 not a piece of civil-rights legislation has come before this House.

Mr. Speaker, if it is communism to fight against temporizing with inequality, then I accept the challenge.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JUDD. I should like to make this comment on what the gentleman from New York has said. He apparently equates legislation with social progress. He implies that because no legislation has been enacted on civil rights since 1875, there has been no progress in civil rights for the Negro people in this country. Yet no people in history has made more progress in education, health, better living standards and employment of skilled, as well as unskilled, employment than the Negro people have made in this country in the last 90 years. Everyone admits the task is far from complete and there is a long way to go, but it is not right to allow the impression to go out that lack of legislation on this point means no progress has been made.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly why I asked for this time to answer the spurious argument of the gentleman from New York which I have heard him repeat almost weekly ever since I have been a Member of Congress, 12 years.

There is nothing new in the statements of the gentleman from New York. He has been making the same type of argument in all the years I have been here and the remarks which he has made are an indictment, whether he meant it or not, of the colored people of this country whom he attempts to champion. He let the impression go out that there has been little or no progress since 1875 because he challenges the fact that the Congress of the United States has not legislatively developed this program in accordance with his concept as to what ought to have been done. He fails to realize that this whole great question is one of human relationships, and I say to him that the colored people of this country have made tremendous strides economically, physically, mentally, morally, spiritually, and every other way beyond any comparable race that I know of anywhere. And, they have done it because they have had the courage and the ambition even in the face of frustration, which I well know about and which the gentleman from New York knows I have tried in my humble way to eliminate in various aspects of this problem. They still have made tremendous progress and they have been encouraged to make that progress gradually just as the States and the citizens of those States have gone along with the gradual policy of providing security, economic and otherwise, for the colored people of this country.

The gentleman assumes in his argument that because the Congress of the United States has not legislated in this field that therefore the colored people have been denied any opportunity for progress. Now, I am not so naive as to stand here and not admit that so far as I am concerned I know the frustrations incident to Jim Crowism and incident to segregation. You do not have segregation in New York, so I am told, but you have voluntary segregation by which the

colored people themselves are located substantially in one area in the great city of New York.

I do not know what the answer is unless it is education, constant and everlasting education, and the opportunity given to the colored people of this country to secure education and the right to prepare themselves for economic advancement in their jobs and in their positions, and I have fought for that very situation as the gentleman well knows in my work as a Member of the Congress to see to it that they have opportunity for advancement, and I have not got over two or three colored people in my district. I am not motivated by political implications nor by political expediency, perhaps, as some Members are who have large foreign-born populations in their districts to whom they must constantly appeal in order to get votes.

So, when I made the statement which I did this afternoon as to the attitude of Communists—you find it in book after book, paper after paper, speech after speech, all of which are part of the records of this Congress, it indicates that as one of the basic party lines, "We are through with gradualism; we cannot wait for constitutional processes to take place." They advocate the sharp break of revolution and they have done so for years, and the gentleman well knows it, and that is one of the fundamentals of the Communist Party line. I am surprised to hear him attack the integrity, if you please, of the gentleman from Arkansas, because he has the courage to stand here and advocate what he has described as a policy of gradualism. I will say to the gentleman that in my humble opinion, from my observations of this problem in the North and in the South, if the people were to follow the leadership of the gentleman from New York, the minorities would be in a much worse position than they are at the present time by following the policy that has been indulged in all these years, which has lifted the economic opportunity of these minority groups, and is gradually breaking down the age-old intolerance that has existed and, may I say to the gentleman in my humble opinion, when you attempt to jam it down the throats by force you are attempting to create just what the gentleman from Minnesota well described as the utilization of police state methods. I do not want any part of that so far as I am concerned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. WHEELER), for 1 day, on account of illness.

To Mr. GARY (at the request of Mr. HARDY), for Tuesday, February 21, on account of official business.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1990. An act to amend section 429, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the act of

August 5, 1882, as amended, so as to substitute for the requirement that detailed annual reports be made to the Congress concerning the proceeds of all sales of condemned naval material, a requirement that information as to such proceeds be filed with the Committees on Armed Services in the Congress.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 22, 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:

1250. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to assure that expenditures under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for education and training yield a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1251. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 3, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Deep Creek, Accomack County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 477); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1252. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 22, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Guadalupe River, Tex., with a view to providing a harbor of refuge for fishing craft at or near Seadrift, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 15, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 478); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1253. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels,' approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c)"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1254. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the status of permanent residence to the subjects of such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1255. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation, as well as a list of the persons involved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### 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. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report pursuant to House Resolution 22, resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation

of the problems of small business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1675). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 507. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2125. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J. N. Jones and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1082. A bill for the relief of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1673). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4041. A bill for the relief of Paris Bros.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1674). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 7374. A bill to prohibit annuity payments under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, in the case of any person hereafter convicted of a felony committed while serving as a Member of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 7375. A bill to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the amortization deduction for emergency facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. R. 7376. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide full annuities at half salary or wages, based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who shall have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 7377. A bill to authorize the commercial operation of the vessels *Cornwall*, *Johnstown*, and *Saucon* on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 7378. A bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 7379. A bill to provide pension for certain widows of recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 7380. A bill to assure that expenditures under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for education and training yield a proper return both to the veteran and to the Nation as a whole; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 7381. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as

to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7382. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7383. A bill to repeal section 2385 of title 18, United States Code (54 Stat. 670); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 7384. A bill exempting from tax the transportation of Boy Scouts and Scouters to the National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America to be held at Valley Forge, Pa.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 7385. A bill to amend section 410 of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to cooperation with State commissions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7386. A bill to extend and protect the rights of Federal employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7387. A bill to provide for the payment of severance pay to certain officers and employees separated from the service of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7388. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. Res. 483. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Works to determine a policy to govern the use of public land acquired in the course of the construction of flood-control dams; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. Res. 484. Resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit to the Abraham Lincoln Association at Springfield, Ill., copies of certain Abraham Lincoln documents; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to the Senate urging the defeat of the attempt to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance now made in connection with income taxes on producers of natural resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to the House urging the defeat of the attempt to eliminate or reduce the depletion allowance now made in connection with income taxes on producers of natural resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7389. A bill for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:  
H. R. 7390. A bill for the relief of Erika Kuebart and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:  
H. R. 7391. A bill for the relief of Bernard R. Novak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:  
H. R. 7392. A bill for the relief of Columbus Finley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:  
H. R. 7393. A bill for the relief of Francisco Blanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
H. R. 7394. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Celine Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:  
H. R. 7395. A bill for the relief of Endel Jakob Kolde; 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:

1881. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress with relation to the amendment of the retirement requirements as they apply to soldiers, sailors, marines, and National Guard men so that those otherwise eligible for retirement after 20 years of service may receive the benefits for which they would be entitled without having reached the minimum age therefor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1882. Also, resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress in plea for cooperation by the United States Army engineers for the removal of wrecks in Narragansett Bay and Providence Harbor; to the Committee on Public Works.

1883. By Mr. HALE: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, urging the Members of Congress to pass legislation authorizing the issue of a postage stamp and the striking of a coin to mark the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox, friend of George Washington, who held the distinguished position of head of the Department of Artillery in the American Revolution, 1776-83, and was Secretary of War in the National Government, 1785-94; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1884. By Mr. JENISON: Petition of the property owners of that part of the village of Palestine, Ill., that is endangered by flood from the Wabash River, petitioning for assistance from the Federal authorities in building protection necessary to protect their lives and property; to the Committee on Public Works.

1885. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petitions of residents of Cooperstown, N. Y., advocating passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising and its broadcasting over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1886. By Mr. RICH: Petition of members of St. Agnes Parish, Lock Haven, Pa., in opposition to Barden and Thomas Federal aid-to-education bills; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1887. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of Holmes, Curran, Bennett Unit, No. 361, American Legion Auxiliary, Ashby, Mass., against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1888. Also, petition of American Legion Auxiliary Post, No. 159, Westford, Mass., against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine

designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1889. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, to remove existing taxes on admissions to high-school athletic contests or athletic contests conducted by charitable and nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1890. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Welton Chambers, president, Brown County local unit, Texas State Teachers Association, Bangs, Tex., opposing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1891. Also, petition of Rear Adm. William Rea Furlong, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D. C., relative to resolutions pending before the Congress proposing world government or proposing a change in the United Nations, and stating its opposition to any form of supergovernment, being contrary to the essentials of liberty and national independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1892. Also, petition of Helen S. Kurtz, president, Women's Board of Doctors Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio, opposing any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1893. Also, petition of Paul Wooton, president, Society of Business Magazine Editors, Washington, D. C., opposing the continued use of the facilities of the periodical press galleries by representatives of the State Department or any other Government agency and asking that no relaxation of the rules regarding admission be permitted; to the Committee on Rules.

1894. Also, petition of S. M. Felton, president, American Railway Car Institute, New York, N. Y., relative to excise taxes on railroad fares and shipment of freight and requesting that these excise taxes be abolished immediately; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1950

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

Our fathers' God, with clamorous voices demanding our ears we would this day listen again to the calm and reassuring voice of the first President of the Republic, who still stands among us in lofty reserve. Being dead, he yet speaketh, with unerring judgment exhorting us to union and harmony. May his warning sentiments bequeathed for the meditation of all future generations come to us with undimmed freshness as a message for these troubled times. By patience and faith may we, like him, rise above the difficulties, discouragements, and dangers which confront us, in this day of desperate battle around the world, between truth and falsehood, liberty and tyranny.

So, as the ages roll on, may a grateful Nation cherish the luster of his virtues and the greatness of his service. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 21, 1950, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### 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. 2734) to promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 633. An act for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg;

H. R. 677. An act for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli;

H. R. 714. An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis ten Wolde and family;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of the Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc.;

H. R. 1133. An act for the relief of Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle;

H. R. 1170. An act for the relief of Mrs. John Kaudy (formerly Stella Cappler);

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of W. B. Terry;

H. R. 1606. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States;

H. R. 1697. An act for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler;

H. R. 1699. An act for the relief of the estate of William Kraus;

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Honorio Canciller and Nancy Ting Evangelista;

H. R. 2705. An act for the relief of Martin Kenneth Ikeda;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 2929. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Manious;

H. R. 3080. An act for the relief of Earl L. Doss;

H. R. 3330. An act for the relief of Therese Hohman;

H. R. 3506. An act for the relief of Louis P. Murphy, United States immigrant inspector, El Paso, Tex.;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Gardner;

H. R. 4015. An act for the relief of Kate Laursen;

H. R. 4301. An act for the relief of Y. S. Hu;

H. R. 4380. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay;

H. R. 4532. An act for the relief of Dr. Ta Fu Wu;

H. R. 4604. An act to authorize the admission into the United States of certain aliens possessing special skills, namely, Teodor Egle, Karlis Fogelis, Vasily Kils, and Aleksanders Zelmenis;

H. R. 4608. An act for the relief of William J. Drinkwine;

H. R. 4720. An act for the relief of Stella Avner;

H. R. 4781. An act for the relief of Veronica Jolly;

H. R. 5274. An act for the relief of Francis A. Gunn;

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

H. R. 5541. An act to amend Private Law No. 463, Seventy-sixth Congress;

H. R. 5566. An act for the relief of Dr. Agostino DeLisi;