SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

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

Rev. E. Felix Kloman, rector, St. Albans Protestant Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, grant to this, the Senate of the United States, the vision of the new world as Thou wouldst have it. Then in the knowledge of the greatness of their present opportunity may they know their own impotence to rise to the height of the opportunity save as they put their trust completely in Thee. May they know themselves to be pledged to but one thing, the establishment of Thy kingdom on earth by the method of sacrifice, and the application of brotherhood as lived and taught by Jesus Christ their Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 18, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 454) relating to the continuance on the pay rolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF AESENCE

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAVEZ was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate Thursday and Friday of this week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Ecton	Kilgore
Anderson	Ellender	Langer
Benton	Ferguson	Leahy
Brewster	Flanders	Lehman
Bricker	Fulbright	Lodge
Bridges	Green	Lucas
Butler	Hayden	McCarran
Byrd	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Cain	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Capehart	Hill	McFarland
Connally	Holland	McKellar
Cordon	Hunt	McMahon
Darby	Ives	Malone
Donnell	Jenner	Martin
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Millikin
Dworshak	Kem	Morse
Eastland	Kerr	Mundt
Neely	Stennis	Wherry
O'Conor	Taft	Wiley
Robertson	Thomas, Okla.	Williams
Russell	Thomas, Utah	Withers
Schoeppel	Thye	Young
Smith, Maine	Tydings	
Sparkman	Watkins	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this being Patriots' Day, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, 175 years ago this morning, Sam Adams heard the sounds of guns firing at Concord Bridge and was moved to exclaim: "What a glorious morning is this!"

Sam Adams' exclamation was prompted by the sound of the "shot heard round the world." He knew that the minutemen were making a stand and that the American Colonies were committed to a struggle, the outcome of which could result in only one of two destinies for America: utter defeat or independence.

The country, whose strength 175 years ago was that handful of Middlesex County farmers, now is the most powerful democracy, as well as the most powerful Nation, of history. Our strength, our ideals, our instinctive devotion to freedom trace back to that "glorious morning," when simple men, standing firm in the April sun, turned the course of history.

The echo of the shot heard round the world is not yet still. Faint though it may be over the span of years, it still evokes in us all a profound and grateful pride. Fortified by conviction of mind and spirit, the men of Lexington and Concord acted boldly and decisively to preserve for themselves and their children the blessings of freedom. Some might think it was only a skirmish on a country road in the Bay State Colony, but we know it today as an act of courage and fearless honesty. The "glorious morning" that dawned 175 years ago today has not as yet reached its sunset.

The ideals of courage and devotion to human dignity and freedom which inspired these Massachusetts men in their little farming community later gave birth to the United States of America. These same ideals subsequently carried us through the dangers of wars, civil and foreign. It is these very ideals which, now that we are a mighty world power, will guide us safely through the valley of the shadow. As long as we remain true to the ideals of Concord and Lexington, we can face the future without fear.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 2 minutes to speak on the same subject on which the Senator from Massachusetts has just spoken.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request of the able Senator from Connecticut. But I now give notice that I shall object to all additional unanimous-consent requests to make speeches under the present order of business.

It was agreed that the calendar should be considered today. If a speech-making marathon such as daily prolongs the submission of requests for printing in the RECORD is now tolerated, the calling of the calendar will be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that he appointed the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] to attend the celebration of Patriots' Day in Masschusetts. The Senator from Massachusetts, who has just spoken, and the Senator from Connecticut were unable to go to Massachusetts for that purpose, and they now desire to make brief remarks.

Mr. BENTON. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for excluding me from the general statement which he has just enunciated, because my comments on the floor of the Senate have been few and far between.

Mr. President, it is an honor for me to have been appointed by our beloved Vice President as one of the three Senate Members of the Patriots' Day Celebration Commission. Further, it is a pleasure as well as an honor for me to be so associated with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is speaking today at

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Lexington and Concord, and with the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has just spoken, in observance of the celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day. For both Senators from Massachusetts I developed affection as well as deep respect during my service as Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has just spoken, is held in high regard by his colleagues in this Chamber for many reasons, not the least of which is his constructive and farsighted leadership in fashioning a united and unpartisan approach to the great issues of foreign policy which confront us in this critical hour of our history.

On this day, which commemorates the beginning of this Nation's unity in the cause of independence and freedom, it is altogether fitting that all of us in the Senate and the House of Representatives should join together in tribute to the events that took place on April 19, 1775.

The spirit of Lexington and Concord is indeed the symbol of the resolution and determination of the American people to stand as one against all threats to liberty, at home or abroad. Once again today it is incumbent upon us to stand shoulder to shoulder, on a minute's notice if need be, in defense of our principles.

The shot heard round the world 175 years ago today has echoed and reechoed in the subsequent struggles for the democratic survival of mankind. The high sense of patriotism demonstrated on that occasion by the Minute Men of Massachusetts—and this is a most suitable day to remember it—is worth remembering in these times, and worth measuring against alternatives which divide and weaken our ranks.

The unity cradled at Lexington and Concord eventually spanned a continent and matured under fire at the far ends of the globe.

Today we, the people of the United States, must stand before the world as an example of strength. As a free Nation our strength is in the vitality and integrity of our institutions.

Therefore, Mr. President, on this one hundred and seventy-fifth Patriots' Day let us stand strong and united and firm in our resolve to emulate the unselfish example of those early defenders of the American Commonwealth. Let us here in Congress remind ourselves again today that united we can stand, and divided we shall fall.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

AMERICAN SHIPPING INDUSTRY—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF MARYLAND

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, through the great port of Baltimore, the State of Maryland is directly and intensely concerned in the condition both of American shipping and of the American ship-construction industry.

Taking official cognizance of the chaotic conditions now existing throughout the United States merchant marine and its related industries, the Maryland House of Delegates has formally expressed its concern in conditions in this field and has adopted a resolution asking the Congress to support and expedite S. 2786, introduced by the junior Senator from Maryland for himself and the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], to provide assistance to the shipping industry toward rehabilitation of the United States merchant marine.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee in Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 4

Resolution requesting Congress to assist and support the American shipping industry

Whereas the maritime industries of this Nation are integrated in the economy of the Nation directly leading to the employment of approximately 10 percent of this Nation's people either in those industries or allied and supporting industries; and

Whereas this Nation's experience after World War I in permitting the Nation's merchant marine to decline to an alarming point proved to be a costly error when the Nation was confronted with the need for a bridge of ships in waging war for survival in World War II; and

Whereas a permanent shipbuilding and replacement program for obsolete ships is generally conceded as being an absolute necessity to provide this Nation with a merchant marine ever ready for the defense of this Nation; and

Whereas the State of Maryland and the port of Baltimore particularly are largely dependent upon all phases of the Nation's maritime industries as the economic keystone of the well-being of the citizens and Government; and

Whereas the present decline in shipbuilding and ship repairs, with the resulting serious effect on the Nation's merchant marine, within the State of Maryland portends a grave economic crisis for thousands of citizens of the State of Maryland; and

Whereas it has been authoritatively estimated that 250,000 persons are either affected directly or indirectly by the maritime industries in the port of Baltimore, using the usual average of four persons per family (figures supplied by former Congressman Hugh A. Meade, now deceased); Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress be requested to support and expedite bill No. S. 2786 presented by Maryland Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR which is designed to provide direct assistance to the American shipping industry to bring the Nation's merchant marine to a point to properly uphold America's foreign trade and to maintain America's merchant marine at a sensible point of preparedness in event of a national emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of delegates is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Maritime Commission, and to all Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress.

By the house of delegates, February 10, 1950.

C. FERDINAND SYBERT,
Speaker of the House of Delegates.
RAYMOND H. MILLER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates.

PROTECTION AGAINST CERTAIN UNAMERICAN AND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on April 16, 1950, in Lansing, Mich., under the leadership of the Wolverine All-American Conference, representing 35 patriotic, business, and professional organizations, a resolution was adopted paying tribute to our colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for his good work in advancing the approval of the so-called Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston-Nixon bill, and urging the Senate of the United States to act promptly on this subversive control measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

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

We are meeting here today as citizens representing several organizations from every nook and corner of our great State of Michigan for the purpose of fighting an insidious foe that has as its aim the destruction of our way of life.

This group realizes that in order to accomplish this program we are mindful of the fight being carried on by our elected representatives in Washington. Our own great Senator FERGUSON in cooperation with Senators MUNDT and JOHNSTON have introduced a bill in the United States Senate known as Senate bill 2311 which will assist greatly the curbing of subversive activities. An outstanding feature of the bill is the registration of persons who seek to overthrow our American way of life.

Let us here today resolve to give moral support and backing to those courageous men in Washington by endorsing unanimously the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston Senate bill 2311, and I so move you, Mr. Chairman. And I further move that a copy of this be sent to each of the three Senators sponsoring the bill.

Does the conference go on record an endorsing the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill? All in favor say "Aye."

This endorsement was passed unanimously by the Wolverine All-American Conference, representing 35 organizations, at the Olds Hotel, Lansing, Mich., on April 16, 1950.

JOHN L. DENMAN,
Chairman, All-American Conference.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 3049. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1509).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2996. A bill to authorize loans to make available in any area or region credit formerly made available in such area or region by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1510);

H. R. 829. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept buildings and improvements constructed and affected by the Buffalo Rapids Farms Association on project lands in the Buffalo Rapids water conservation and utilization project and canceling certain indebtedness of the association, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1511); and

H. R. 4641. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept title to certain land owned or to be acquired by the county of Plumas, State of California, and in exchange therefor to convey to Plumas County certain land owned by the United States in said county; without amendment (Rept. No. 1512).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 3446. A bill to authorize the restoration of Edwin M. Rosenberg, lieutenant commander, retired, to the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. YOUNG introduced Senate bill 3447, to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of North Dakota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LUCAS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 166, to authorize the award posthumously of an appropriate decoration to members of the crew of the United States Navy Privateer who lost their lives in or over the Baltic Sea on April 8, 1950, while in the performance of their duty, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

RECONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF ROADS AND PUBLIC FACILITIES DESTROYED BY FLOODS IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill and ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 1 minute to explain it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, North Dakota is presently experiencing its worst flood in the history of the State. There are thousands of people driven from their homes. The service on the main lines of the railroads is interrupted at the present time because of wash-outs.

It is estimated nearly 100 bridges will be lost completely on Federal, State, and county highways. The damage will be extremely heavy to all property. Shields, a small town, is almost completely under water. Many other towns and cities have large sections partially or completely inundated. Millions of acres of rich farmland are flooded. The loss to buildings and livestock on these farms will be terrific.

No flood in the history of our State has covered such a vast area. Presently the worst situation is in the Red River Valley from Grand Forks north, the James River Valley, Jamestown and north, and in the valleys of the Heart and Cannon Ball Rivers. This bill would provide assistance to all political subdivisions for roads, bridges, and other facilities.

The bill (S. 3447) to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of North Dakota, which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' REGULATIONS AND WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT OF 1924—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6562) to amend the Veterans' Regulations and the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide additional compensation for the loss or loss of the use of a creative organ, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Nan Wood Honeyman, of Portland, Oreg., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 29, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg. (reappointment).

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him relative to the order issued by the Postmaster General curtailing mail deliveries, and so forth, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT TO AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt at the convention banquet of Americans for Democratic Action in Washington, D. C., April 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR WILEY IN THE WISCONSIN JEWISH CHRONICLE

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "For Enlightened Statesmanship," paying tribute to Senator WILEY, published in the March 25, 1950, issue of the Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle, which appears in the Appendix.]

A REVIEW AND A WARNING—ARTICLE FROM THE BULLETIN OF THE METAL TRADES DEPARTMENT, A. F. OF L.

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Review and a Warning," published in the Bulletin of the metal trades department, American Federation of Labor, of March 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BONNIE MAY MATHEWS—STATEMENT BY RADIO STATION WWL IN RESPONSE TO RED CROSS APPEAL

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by radio station WWL, in New Orleans, La., in response to the appeal of the Red Cross to save the life of Bonnie May Mathews, of Coushatta, La., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION—ARTICLE FROM BUSINESS WEEK

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The ITO Charter Should Be Ratified," from Business Week for February 25, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT FINANCING—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Deficit Grows—And Still Congress Votes Spending," from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

A SALUTE TO THE GLORY THAT IS GREECE — ARTICLE BY HARRY H. SCHLACHT

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Salute to the Glory That Is Greece," written by Harry H. Schlacht, and published in the New York Journal-American of March 24, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CARROLL BINDER REPORTS FROM EUROPE

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two additional articles in the series of reports on conditions in Europe, written by Carroll Binder, editorial writer of the Minneapolis Tribune, which appear in the Appendix.]

A VOTE FOR INTEGRITY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WILMINGTON JOURNAL

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Vote for Integrity," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Journal of April 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

MY DEAR MR. TRUMAN—EDITORIAL FROM SUSSEX COUNTIAN, OF GEORGETOWN, DEL.

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "My Dear Mr. Truman," published in the Sussex Countian, of Georgetown, Del., on April 13, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPENDITURE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS FOR PURPOSE OF HEARING DISCUSSION OF BRANNAN PLAN

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the April 15, 1950, issue of the Richmond News-Leader, entitled "Eight Dollars a Day To Listen to Mr. Brannan," which appears in the Appendix.]

TEXAS CITY BOOMS AGAIN—ARTICLE FROM BUSINESS WEEK MAGAZINE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from Business Week magazine of April 15, 1950, concerning the progress made in rebuilding Texas City, Tex., which appears in the Appendix.]

M. D. ANDERSON HOSPITAL FOR CANCER RESEARCH

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a University of Texas news-service release on an article by Dr. R. Lee Clark, Jr., on the status of today's cancer treatment, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY T. RUSS HILL BEFORE THE NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an address entitled "Bulwarks," delivered by T. Russ Hill, of Detroit, Mich., at the opening of the Fifty-ninth Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCESS ROADS TO GOVERNMENT TIMBER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is pending in the House of Representatives a bill providing for construction of access roads into Government timber. The bill was introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon, and was passed by the Senate last year.

There appeared in the issue of the Washington Daily News of April 7, 1950, an excellent article entitled "Timber Access Battle," written by Peter Edson. I ask to have this article published in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, adding this additional sentence, that this access-road bill is needed in connection with American defense, because, as I have been advised by our Defense Establishment, in case of war access roads into Government timber would be of essential importance to the security of the Nation in the prosecution of the war.

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

TIMBER ACCESS BATTLE

(By Peter Edson)

Forty percent of all remaining United States virgin timber is in the Northwest. Twenty-five percent is in Oregon. This is the last big area in which there is a chance to practice sustained yield forestry—cutting timber no faster than it grows. But there are complications. The big fight now is over road rights-of-way to timberlands.

Oregon Senator WAYNE MORSE has a bill in Congress to provide $25,000,000 worth of public-access roads in big timber areas. The Morse bill has passed the Senate and is now before the House. And the Interior Department has just issued new regulations on the use of roads through Bureau of Land Management acreage.

What happens on the public lands may set a precedent for what happens on United States Forest Service preserves. So the whole business is coming to an important head.

Representatives of the Lumber Manufacturers' Associations, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, and the Western Pine Association have been much in Washington to tell their side of this story. It is the big lumbermen's position that the Government shouldn't build or manage these forest roads. They say private industry can do it better and cheaper, and save the Government money.

About one-sixth of the Northwest's virgin timber is on 2,500,000 acres of what is known as the O. & C. land in the Douglas fir belt. This land originally was given as a grant by the Government to the old Oregon & California Co. It consists of every odd section of land, checkerboarded in a 30-mile-wide strip on either side of a right-of-way over which a road was supposed to be built.

The road was never built, so in 1915 the Supreme Court gave title back to the Government. It was assigned to Bureau of Land Management to administer. Under a 1937 law, the Bureau was directed to manage this land so as to sustain the region's economy. In a way, this was an original full employment act for this area.

The Forest Service timberlands in this area are mostly beyond the O. & C. sections, on the higher slopes. So whoever controls the roads across the O. & C. land also controls access to the larger Forest Service preserves.

Because of this checkerboarding of O. & C. land, private owners of the intermingling sections saw a chance to control all these rights. Only a big operator can afford to build an access road.

The situation that developed was something of a monopoly in which the smaller operators were frozen out. They found it impossible to bid for Government timber, because they couldn't get at it. There are now roughly 30 big timber cutters in the Northwest, as against 1,200 smaller operators.

Interior Department regulations now give every bidder access to timber rights over public roads or private roads on public lands.

The big lumber companies are protesting this move. They maintain that the builders of the roads should have absolute control over the roads, and that the Government should accommodate its program of opening up public timberlands to the private operators.

SHIPMENT OF WAR MATERIALS TO RUSSIA AND ITS SATELLITES BY MARSHALL PLAN COUNTRIES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEM

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding the shipment of war materials to Russia and its satellites by Marshall-plan countries.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEM REGARDING SHIPMENT OF WAR MATERIALS TO RUSSIA AND SATELLITES BY MARSHALL-PLAN COUNTRIES

There has come to me hitherto undisclosed evidence regarding shipments of war materials, including arms, to Russia and her satellites by Marshall-plan countries. These facts come to me as a shock and a surprise. In view of the tense international situation, I shall not delay in bringing this information to the attention of the Senate and the country.

With heavy hearts we have followed the search for the American plane and its crew, recently shot down in the Baltic. The question now arises whether this plane may not have been shot down with materials provided by us.

During World War II our ships and planes were blasted with scrap iron furnished by us to the Japs. Millions of American men risked their lives facing it. Tens of thousands were killed or maimed for life.

We are again supplying, indirectly, materials of war to an unfriendly nation. The figures which I now present indicate that we are repeating again our errors of the past. They show that Marshall-plan nations in Europe are making substantial shipments of war materials—to Russia and the Russian satellites—materials which we ourselves have refused to ship to those countries. At the very same time that we are making gigantic efforts to rearm the countries of western Europe, some of these nations are furnishing materials for the Russian rearmament program.

Let's take a look at the picture. It won't be a complete look for I have been unable to obtain figures on shipments from Sweden which is perhaps more involved than any other beneficiary of our generosity. My information covers shipments from Belgium-Luxemburg, France, and England to Soviet Russia and the satellite countries.

It was furnished to me yesterday by the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce. The compilation shows that during the year 1949 Belgium-Luxemburg, the United Kingdom, and France shipped the following items to Russia and the satellite countries:

Partial list of exports from Belgium-Luxemburg during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations [1]

Item	Amount in dollars [2]	Amount in thousands of francs	Metric tons [3]
Arms (to Czechoslovakia)	6,040	302	-------
Iron, cast iron, and steel	19,782,840	989,142	151,749
Copper	11,028,820	551,441	23,523
Lead	1,583,160	79,158	4,836
Zinc	3,003,780	150,189	10,413
Tin	941,060	47,053	485
Other base metals and alloys	1,387,360	69,368	623
Boilers, machinery, mechanical apparatus and appliances, and parts	7,937,880	396,894	6,273
Electrical machinery and apparatus, and articles for electrotechnical use, and parts	5,840,660	292,033	-------
Railway and tramway rolling stock and material	430,600	21,530	872
Optical, measuring, precision, and other instruments and apparatus	2,480	124	-------
Chemical products	1,709,540	85,477	8,573
Explosives, fireworks, matches and other inflammable materials	1,447,960	72,398	2,014
Rubber and manufactures	942,600	47,130	1,355

[1] Complete list available in my office, including a break-down of exports by importing country.
[2] Computation based on current exchange rate of 50 francs to the dollar.
[3] 1 metric ton is equal to 2,204.6 pounds.

Partial list of exports from United Kingdom during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations

Item	Amount in dollars [1]	Amount in thousands of pounds sterling	Quantity
Ball and roller bearings and parts	243,600	87	[2] 2,000
Iron, steel, and manufactures (total)	12,140,800	4,336	[2] 88,000
Steel bars and rods, not alloy	1,736,000	620	[2] 20,000
Bars and rods of alloy steel	504,000	180	[2] 1,000
Hoop and strip	422,800	151	[2] 3,000
Railway and tramway construction material	708,400	253	[2] 10,000
Barbed wire	420,000	150	[2] 3,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Partial list of exports from United Kingdom during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations—Continued

Item	Amount in dollars [1]	Amount in thousands of pounds sterling	Quantity
Iron, steel, and manufactures (total)—Con.			
Cable and rope (except insulated telegraph and telephone cable)	425,600	152	[3] 1,000
Nonferrous metals and manufactures (total)	4,062,800	1,451	
Aluminum and alloys	618,800	221	[2] 21,000
Brass and other alloys of copper, other than nickel alloys	1,142,400	408	[2] 63,000
Copper	694,400	248	[3] 1,000
Electrical goods and apparatus	6,806,800	2,431	
Machinery (total, excluding ball and roller bearings and parts)	45,172,400	16,133	[2] 867,000
Electric generators	11,986,800	4,281	[2] 181,000
Electrical machinery, other than motors and generators	2,864,400	1,023	[2] 46,000
Machine tools (metal-working) other than portable power tools	5,138,000	1,835	[2] 129,000
Vehicles (total, including locomotives, ships, and aircraft)	13,361,600	4,772	
Rubber tires for motor vehicles, other then motorcycles and tricars)	229,600	82	9,000
Chassis for motor vehicles, with engines	1,660,400	593	1,000

[1] Computation based on present exchange rate of $2.80 to the pound sterling.
[2] Hundredweight (112 pounds).
[3] Long tons.

Partial list of exports from France during 1949 to Russia and satellite nations

Item	Amount in dollars [1]	Amount in thousands of francs	Metric tons
Chemicals:			
Inorganic	1,546,759	533,365	23,425
Organic	983,283	339,063	610
Rubber and rubber products	1,678,616	578,833	1,426
Steel-mill products, hot-rolled, sheets and plates	4,198,881	1,447,890	41,096
Steel-mill products, cold-rolled, tubular products and wire	3,087,703	1,064,725	19,283
Aluminum, crude and semi-manufactures	369,245	127,326	815
Aluminum alloys	408,688	140,927	833
Lead and lead alloys	316,349	109,085	1,115
Metal manufactures	2,046,376	705,647	3,985
Machinery and apparatus	10,272,238	3,542,151	6,771
Machinery, electrical and apparatus	2,015,239	694,910	525
Transportation equipment	8,281,011	2,855,521	7,913
Optical, surgical, scientific, and photographic instruments and apparatus	1,113,145	383,843	115

[1] Computation based on current exchange rate of 350 francs to the dollar.

It will be remembered that these figures cover shipments from only three of the Marshall plan areas: Belgium-Luxemburg, France, and Great Britain. I am endeavoring to obtain similar information for other countries, including Sweden, which in 1948 was the second largest western European exporter to countries behind the iron curtain. (Great Britain has the dubious distinction of being first.) However, so far, the Administration is unable or unwilling—to make this further information available to me.

Last year, in accordance with policy laid down by the Congress, the United States Office of International Trade placed drastic restrictions on exports from the United State to Russia. As a result, according to the Department of Commerce, "domestic merchandise exported to Russia during the year amounted to only $6,434,000, the lowest annual figure since 1923, and only about one-fourth of 1948 exports."

Since March 1, 1948, the United States has placed stringent restrictions on the export to eastern Europe of commodities regarded as having direct or indirect military significance.

It is essential to our national security that this country continue to ban shipments of war material to the Soviet Union. It is tragically absurd for us to pour into western Europe vast quantities of war materials under the Marshall plan and the arms-aid program, only to have our friends export the same materials to Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain.

Apologists for these shipments should be reminded that it takes only one bullet, only one piece of shrapnel, to kill a man. It takes only one shell to bring down a plane.

RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATION TRUST LIQUIDATION — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the Vice President lay before the Senate for immediate consideration the conference report on Senate bill 930. There is no opposition to it. The conferees have agreed to it unanimously.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 930), to provide for the liquidation trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes, which was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the "Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act".

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be appropriate and necessary to liquidate, as expeditiously as possible but within three years from the effective date of this Act, trusts under the transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations, and is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate with responsible officials to that end.

"(b) The Secretary, insofar as is necessary to protect the interests of the United States and the corporation shall proceed forthwith to the conversion to cash of investments constituting the trust assets by sale of real and personal properties, and by collection of loans and accounts receivable according to the tenor of such obligations.

"(c) An application for the return of such properties may be made to the Secretary by the State rural rehabilitation corporation pursuant to appropriate resolution of its board of directors. The application shall contain a covenant, binding upon the applicant when accepted by the Secretary on behalf of the United States, that the applicant will abide by the determinations and apportionments of the Secretary provided for in this Act and the payments made by the Secretary pursuant to this Act, that the returned assets and the income therefrom will be used only for such of the rural rehabilitation purposes permissible under the corporation's charter as may from time to time be agreed upon by the applicant and the Secretary; and that not to exceed 3 per centum of the book value of the corporation's assets will be expended by the applicant for administrative purposes during any year, without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the rural rehabilitation corporation of any State has been dissolved and is not revived or reincorporated or, for any other reason, is unable to make such application or to accept and administer such properties, the application and subsequent agreements (conforming to the second sentence of this subsection) may be made by such other agency or official of that State as may be designated by the State legislature. The Secretary may transfer the trust funds of properties of such corporation to such successor agency or official if adequate provisions are made by the State legislature for holding the United States and the Secretary free from liability by virtue of the transfer to such successor agency or official.

"(d) Except as hereinafter provided, upon receipt of appropriate application meeting the requirements of this Act, the Secretary shall do all things necessary to return to each such applicant all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all cash, real and personal property, or the proceeds thereof, held on the date of the approval of this Act by the Secretary as trustee for the account of such State corporation, except that the Secretary may deduct from the funds of each such State corporation the expenses incident to completion of such transfer: *Provided*, That such transfer shall, insofar as possible, be accomplished in a manner consistent with the provisions of the trust agreement with each State rural rehabilitation corporation.

"(e) In the event no application is made, as provided for in this Act, within three years from the effective date hereof or upon receipt of a disclaimer or release of interest under the trust transfer agreement by any State through its legislature, the Secretary shall cause all proceeds from assets held under or for the account of the transfer agreement with that State to be covered into miscellaneous receipts in the United States Treasury.

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with any State rural rehabilitation corporation or other State agency or official having jurisdiction of the trust assets which have been returned pursuant to application made therefor under section 2 (c) hereof, and upon such terms and conditions and for such periods of time as may be mutually agreeable, to accept, administer, expend and use in such State all or any part of such trust assets or any other funds of such State rural rehabilitation corporation or State agency, which are transferred to the Secretary for carrying out the purposes of titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and in accordance with the applicable provisions of title IV thereof as now or hereafter amended. Funds appropriated for the administration of said Act shall also be available for carrying out such agreements.

"SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act shall apply also to all properties and assets of State rural rehabilitation corporations held by Federal agencies other than the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of Executive Order Numbered 9070, or otherwise. For the purposes of this Act the assets of other corporations, derived through the use of Federal Emergency Relief Administration funds, and made available to them through State rural rehabilitation corporations or otherwise acquired by them for rural rehabilitation purposes, shall be considered as a part of the trust property of the State rural rehabilitation corporations in their respective States.

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall have the power to—

"(a) employ on a contract basis (without regard to the provisions of the civil-service

laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but the contract shall in each case specify what civil service and related laws, if any, shall be applicable to the employment after it has been made) such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel as he may deem necessary, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to aid in the liquidation and transfer of the properties and assets pursuant to this Act, and in the entering into of agreements with the corporations, or other agencies or officials designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof, regarding the rural rehabilitation purposes for which the property and assets shall thereafter be used by them, and in determining that such agreed purposes are being carried out. The fees, salaries, and expenses of such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel shall be equitably apportioned by the Secretary among the respective corporations and the amount so determined to be applicable to each such corporation shall be paid by the Secretary from the trust fund of such corporation until the trust is liquidated, and thereafter by the corporation or other agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof. Attorneys so employed, and their fees and expenses, shall be subject to the approval and under the supervision of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture;

"(b) accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and with the consent of the agency concerned, utilize the officers, employees, equipment, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, or of any State, Territory, or political subdivision;

"(c) make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"SEC. 5. None of the properties or assets held on the date of the approval of this Act by the Secretary as trustee pursuant to trust agreements with the various State rural rehabilitation corporations may be used by the Secretary for any purpose after the effective date of this Act, except for the purposes authorized under section 2 (d) of this Act, and for loans made prior to July 1, 1949, and to be repaid in full no later than May 1, 1952, but otherwise consistent with the provisions of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. A. 1007), where necessary to supplement credit already extended to borrowers from corporation trust funds.

"SEC. 6. (a) The determination of the Secretary with respect to the assets to be returned to each State rural rehabilitation corporation or other agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof including, but not limited to interests in properties held jointly for such corporation and the United States, the partition of real property, the expenses incident to each transfer, the liabilities applicable to such properties, and all other phases of the transfer shall be final and conclusive upon each State rural rehabilitation corporation or such successor agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof, and upon all officers and agencies of the United States.

"(b) The Secretary shall be saved harmless against any personal liability he may incur in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 7. Section 2 (f) of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1062), is hereby repealed."

And the House agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
STEPHEN PACE,
W. R. POAGE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, of course the distingished Senator from Louisiana will explain what the conference report does.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just stated the conferees were unanimous in their findings. The bill seeks to settle a trust of $50,000,000 which is now in the hands of the Department of Agriculture. Each State is permitted to make application for its share of this trust. I can go further into the matter if the Senator desires.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I believe the statement made by the Senator is completely satisfactory. The conferees were unanimous in their decision, were they?

Mr. ELLENDER. They were.

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

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF APPROPRIATE DECORATION TO MEMBERS OF THE CREW OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY PRIVATEER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a very important joint resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration. I ask that the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 166), to authorize the award posthumously of an appropriate decoration to members of the crew of the United States Navy Privateer who lost their lives in or over the Baltic Sea on April 8, 1950, while in the performance of duty, was read the first time by title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to award posthumously to the officers and crew of the United States Navy Privateer who lost their lives while on a flight between Wiesbaden, Germany, and Copenhagen, Denmark, in or over the Baltic Sea on April 8, 1950, an appropriate decoration in recognition of their outstanding and heroic services in the performance of duty.

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby tenders its condolences to the families of the deceased and expresses its gratitude for their gallantry and devotion to duty.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of each of the deceased.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it has become very clear that the Government of Soviet Russia is responsible for the disappearance of an American Navy plane which vanished after a flight over the Baltic Sea near a region occupied by Soviet military forces.

This barbaric action by the ruthless forces controlled by the totalitarian government in Moscow has shocked the decent people of the world. Soviet military aircraft fired upon an unarmed American plane over the open sea, and the American plane was lost. Such an attack upon a plane which carried no arms cannot be justified. The provocative statement issued by the Soviet government, which declared that this American plane had invaded Soviet territory, cannot be accepted in the light of the statement issued by our own Government.

Mr. President, this criminal action by the Soviet Union is a warning to the free world. It is a warning to all Americans that the time has come to place the interests of our country above the interests of any political party. It is a warning to Members of Congress that we cannot afford the luxury of partisan wrangling at this grave hour in history.

In defending the free world, we must stand together upon fundamental principles. We must support the bipartisan foreign policy which is designed to meet the terrible threat of aggressive communism.

Mr. President, we cannot bring back the lives of the brave men who were shot down in that Navy plane; but we can express, through this joint resolution, to their families and to their fellow citizens the deep feeling of the Congress of the United States for the gallant and devoted service they have rendered to their beloved country.

Mr. President, I hope every Senator will vote in the affirmative upon a yea-and-nay vote upon this resolution. Such a vote will advise the Kremlin that we here in the Senate of the United States stand united behind these men, who gave their all for their country.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that there is no objection to the present consideration of this joint resolution, so far as the minority leader is concerned. Any other Senator can object if he chooses to do so.

I think it is a fine thing to grant these awards to the families whose husbands or other relatives lost their lives in this plane.

At a later date I should like to make some comment about the responsibility in this matter of the bipartisan foreign policy. I think it has been a lack of bipartisan policy that has gotten us into the difficulty we are in now. I should like to make that statement, in connection with the expression of condolences at this time, so far as the junior Senator from Nebraska is concerned.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and of course I shall not object—I wonder whether the majority leader has in mind doing something a little more objective, far reaching, and significant than simply taking the proposed action of awarding posthumously the proposed citations. I have in mind, for example, representations through the United Nations against this kind of action, because if the official statement made in the remarks of the

Senator from Illinois is accurate—and I assume it is—then we have every reason to believe that Russia is responsible for the destruction of the Navy plane. Then, should not we do something more than pass the joint resolution conferring the awards posthumously upon the men who lost their lives?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think there is something to what the Senator from South Dakota says, but he knows that the State Department has protested in vigorous and rather vehement terms against this deplorable incident. The Senator from Illinois thought, for the moment, at least that might be sufficient, and that any additional protestations on the part of the Senate might be inadvisable at this time.

However, it seemed to me we could do this one thing, which would demonstrate to the free world, and especially to those who operate out of the Kremlin, that the Senate of the United States is unanimously behind these boys and what they represented. By doing this I think we shall have done indirectly what the Senator from South Dakota seeks to have us do directly.

If the Senator from South Dakota desires later to offer such a resolution, I certainly would go along with him on it 100 percent.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator agree with me that a declaration of war would be more far reaching, but not necessarily more effective?

Mr. LUCAS. A declaration of what?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator agree with me that a declaration of war would be more far reaching than this joint resolution, but not necessarily more effective?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary to talk about a declaration of war, in connection with this joint resolution. I do not think war is inevitable as a result of this situation. I would not wish to discuss that phase of the matter at this time with my friend the Senator from Virginia.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to make a brief comment. I am very much pleased that both the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, and the Senator from Nebraska, the minority leader, already have expressed themselves on the floor of the Senate in support of the objectives of this particular joint resolution. It is a symbol of the sadness which exists in the hearts of all patriotic Americans today. These men have died in the service of their Nation in the midst of a cold war. I believe it would be very wise to have a careful discussion of the joint resolution. I think the situation which has developed over this particular incident ought to cause every thinking American to recognize that not only is war not inevitable, but likewise this incident shows how true it is that peace is not inevitable, either. Mr. President, today all of us are sitting on a tinder box, because some incident such as this, on many fronts in this cold war, might very well suddenly plunge this Nation and other nations into a war. Some spark in the form of a violation of international law taking the life or lives of innocent people might start the fires of war unless we keep calm and urge the use of all peaceful procedures available to us, first.

I happen to be one who believes that this incident is of such magnitude and seriousness that it is incumbent on the Government of the United States to make perfectly clear to the rest of the world that one of the great historic principles of the United States, namely, that American lives are going to be protected from violations of international law, wherever such violations take place, will be maintained. We must make clear that we are ready to stand now, as our forefathers have always stood throughout our history, for the protection of American lives from loss due to violations of international laws by any nation including Russia.

I therefore agree with the suggestion contained in the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], that, sound as the resolution is, it also behooves our Government today to use all the existing machinery of international organization, including the United Nations, and including, if jurisdiction can be established within it, the World Court, itself, which is an agency of the United Nations, in finding the facts about this incident. We must calmly but persistently call upon existing international law tribunals and agencies to investigate this matter in order to find out whether we are confronted with a powerful nation which intends from time to time to take American life in violation of international law. We must find out if Russia thinks that because the cold war is going on, we shall not do anything to protect American lives on the cold-war front if that might precipitate us into a hot war.

No lover of peace in the Senate more ardently loves it more than I do, Mr. President, but, after all, we must make clear to Russia that if incidents like this are going to arise, American honor will be protected. We must make clear that we do not intend to stand by to see American lives sacrificed in a cold war, only to be followed by a diplomatic protest. I do not want that protest to be an empty one. I want to see exhausted in this incident all the existing machinery for the settlement of international disputes by peaceful procedures under the United Nations Charter. I believe that when American boys start dying in this cold war, we as a people, must make clear to Russia that she will either conform to the peaceful procedures for settling international disputes, or we shall have to take such course of action as may be necessary in order to protect American citizens the world around, when they are where they have a right to be, from violations of international law by Russia or any other nation.

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

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Washington obviously will vote for the joint resolution, because it simply says that decorations shall be given to those Americans who have lost their lives while in the performance of duty. Every American will approve of this intention. But I am by no means prepared to associate myself with some of the views expressed by the majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. My reason is a very deep-seated one: Has it been established that this aircraft was actually shot down and destroyed by the Russians? Where did the act of destruction take place? I think if it has been established as an undeniable fact that the Russians shot down this American aircraft, then there should accompany the statement just made by the senior Senator from Illinois a complete and detailed explanation of every factor involved in the incident; which, in itself, if not properly understood and explained, can be of tremendous potential disaster, not alone for the Russians, but for ourselves and for the world.

If the senior Senator from Illinois will permit a question, Is he absolutely certain that the Russians are completely and solely responsible for the destruction of the American aircraft, which, according to the press—and that is our prime source of information—was following a normal routine training course? And can the Senator from Illinois tell us how that American aircraft came to be so far off its course, as it presumably was, if we accept as a fact the statement that the Russians destroyed it while on this routine flight? I know the Senator from Illinois will answer me factually if he can.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in answer to the question raised by the Senator from Washington, I may say I presume the Senator has read, as I did, what the State Department had to say about the incident. I rely upon, and this joint resolution is based upon, the vigorous protest the State Department has made to Russia. I cannot give the Senator any further information than that. I think we have to rely upon the State Department, which took some little time before finally making a statement. In fact, the State Department was criticized by certain Members of Congress for failing to speak up sooner. All I can say to my friend from Washington is that I am sure the State Department made a very thorough search and a very careful examination and went as far as it could go with respect to this incident.

Linking all the factors together, the State Department made a very serious protest to Russia about the entire situation. On that basis, the Senator from Illinois thought that perhaps a joint resolution of this kind was in order, in view of the fact that the Russians for propaganda reasons decorated their men for shooting down the defenseless men who were in our Navy plane.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask one other question, if I may. Does the Senator from Illinois think the statement of the State Department answered the several questions just raised by the junior Senator from Washington, as to where the incident occurred, how it happened

that our aircraft was where it is presumed to have been when shot down, and as to all the other circumstances?

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator wants to be technical as to the very point at which the plane was shot down or the very minute it was shot down, I do not suppose anyone can answer such questions.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I do not hold against the Senator from Illinois the statement he has just made, but he will, I believe, permit me to say that the junior Senator from Washington does not seek to be technical; he merely seeks to be careful and cautious in this matter of accusing others, out of which accusations there might come a war which could result in the total destruction of mankind. All the junior Senator from Washington seeks is information. I think that any statement offered before all the facts are available is not in the public interest. The majority leader, by his own admission, has been unable to provide answers to these simple questions which are in the minds of all Americans.

Mr. LUCAS. I am satisfied they are very simple questions, in the opinion of the Senator from Washington. All the questions he asks are very simple, of course. But I have given the Senator from Washington all the information I have. I am relying upon the State Department. Some Senators do not care to rely upon the State Department in this particular crisis, since they probably have better information as to what happened than has the State Department. I am depending upon the report made by the State Department, and the resolution is based upon its statement. I do not see why there should be all this quibbling about a joint resolution to give honor and to render devotion to the heroic men who went down in the Baltic—without doubt in my mind, as the result of shell fire by Russian gunners.

Mr. CAIN. There is nothing in the joint resolution but what will cause every American in this Chamber to vote affirmatively and enthusiastically for it. It says only that brave men have died in line of duty. I was referring to the uncertainty included in the comments of the Senator from Illinois which he made in offering the resolution for which I shall vote, even though the Navy can award appropriate decorations without seeking congressional approval.

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

Mr. DONNELL rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Missouri reserving the right to object?

Mr. DONNELL. No, Mr. President; I do not reserve the right to object. I ask unanimous consent that I may address a question to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. I am not reserving the right to object, as I have said, because I shall not object. But the Senator from Illinois has referred very appropriately to the note which has gone forward from the State Department to Moscow relating to this incident. I respectfully ask the Senator from Illinois if he does not agree with me that it would be appropriate at this point in the RECORD, prior to the passage of the joint resolution which the Senator has presented, that the text of the note of the State Department be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I should be delighted to cooperate with the Senator from Missouri along that line. I think it is highly proper and appropriate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the text of the note of protest of the State Department will be included at this point in the RECORD.

The protest of the State Department is as follows:

The Ambassador of the United States of America presents his compliments to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and, with reference to the note of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of April 11, 1950, has the honor to state that the only American military aircraft which was in the air in the Baltic area on April 8, 1950, was a United States Navy Privateer airplane which disappeared on that date and no trace of its crew has since been found.

The United States Navy airplane carried 10 persons. It was wholly unarmed. It left Wiesbaden at 10:31 a. m., Greenwich time, for a flight over the Baltic Sea, and 2½ hours later reported by radio crossing the coast line of the British zone of Germany. All American military aircraft operate under strict instructions to avoid flying over any foreign territory in the absence of express permission for such a flight from the appropriate foreign government. The investigation conducted by the United States Government has convinced it that the United States Navy airplane in question complied strictly with these instructions and did not fly over any Soviet or Soviet-occupied territory or territorial waters adjacent thereto.

"SOLEMN PROTEST" MADE

In the Ministry's communication under reference the Soviet Government acknowledges that one of its fighter aircraft fired upon an American plane on April 8, 1950, at 5:30 p. m., Moscow time. In view of the fact that the only American military airplane which was in the air in the Baltic area on that date was the unarmed United States Navy airplane mentioned above, and that this airplane was at no time after it crossed the coast line of Germany over any foreign territory or territorial waters, it must be concluded that Soviet military aircraft fired upon an unarmed American plane over the open sea, following which the American airplane was lost.

The Ambassador of the United States has been instructed to protest in the most solemn manner against this violation of international law and of the most elementary rules of peaceful conduct between nations. The United States Government demands that the Soviet Government institute a prompt and thorough investigation of this matter in order that the facts set forth above may be confirmed to its satisfaction. The United States Government further demands that the most strict and categorical instructions be issued to the Soviet Air Force that there be no repetition, under whatever pretext, of incidents of this kind which are so clearly calculated to magnify the difficulties of maintaining peaceful and correct international relationships.

The United States Government confidently expects that, when its investigation is completed, the Soviet Government will express its regret for the unlawful and provocative behavior of its aviators, will see to it that those responsible for this action are promptly and severely punished, and will, in accordance with established custom among peace-loving nations, pay appropriate indemnity for the unprovoked destruction of American lives and property.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas reserve the right to object? We are not now considering the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that I may make an observation.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true, I ask the Senator from Illinois, that the Russian Government itself, in the first statement it made on this matter, admitted that Russian planes had fired on an American plane in that area?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. That admission has been made by the Russians themselves, and heralded to the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the State Department advised us that there was no other American plane in that area, and the Russians have admitted firing on it.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Texas for his contribution.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the majority leader a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to have explained what the resolution contemplates in the way of award. Some of us were absent from the floor when the Senator presented his resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution merely authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to make an appropriate award.

Mr. MARTIN. The reason I am bringing this matter up is because I am very much interested that the award of the Navy, the Army, and the Air Corps may be in accordance with the long-established principles followed in awarding our various citations and medals.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that I may address a further question to the distinguished majority leader and to make a brief observation.

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

Mr. DONNELL. With respect to the colloquy between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Washington, I observe in the text of the note the fact that at one point the State Department has this to say:

It must be concluded that Soviet military aircraft fired upon an unarmed American plane over the open sea, following which the American airplane was lost.

It might be concluded from that statement that there is no direct allegation to the effect that the loss of the plane was the result of the firing. However, I observe a further statement, upon which, to my mind, if the Senator will permit me to make the observation, the Senate is amply justified in acting. I

refer to the concluding sentence in the note:

The United States Government confidently expects that, when its investigation is completed, the Soviet Government will express its regret for the unlawful and provocative behavior of its aviators, will see to it that those responsible for this action are promptly and severely punished and will—

I call attention particularly to these words of the note—

in accordance with established custom among peace-loving nations, pay appropriate indemnity for the unprovoked destruction of American lives and property.

I understand from that statement the State Department is making the unequivocal statement that there has been an unprovoked destruction of American lives and property, for which it is hoped the Soviet Government will pay appropriate indemnity.

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely so. Part of the language which the Senator read in the beginning was used by the State Department in their note of protestation to Russia, and I have used the same language in a part of my remarks.

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

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if I am correct in assuming that he is making the proposal officially in his capacity as majority leader of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. I am making it on my own individual responsibility, not as majority leader, and not in connection with the State Department. I merely thought that this was a very important and necessary thing to do. I have discussed it only briefly with the State Department, in order to make certain that there would be no question about the facts involved. However, the State Department did not ask me to do it. The President did not ask me to do it. I am doing it on my own initiative and responsibility, and I am very happy to do it.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] would vote "yea" on the passage of this joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would each vote "yea."

The result was—yeas 66, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—66

Aiken	Hendrickson	Martin
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler	Hunt	Neely
Byrd	Ives	O'Conor
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Darby	Kilgore	Sparkman
Donnell	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Leahy	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McCarran	Thye
Ellender	McCarthy	Tydings
Ferguson	McClellan	Wherry
Flanders	McFarland	Wiley
Fulbright	McKellar	Williams
Green	McMahon	Withers
Hayden	Malone	Young

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—30

Benton	Hoey	Murray
Brewster	Humphrey	Myers
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Downey	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Frear	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
George	Lehman	Taylor
Gillette	Long	Tobey
Graham	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Gurney	Maybank	Watkins

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). On the question of agreeing to the joint resolution, the yeas are 66, the nays are none, and the resolution is unanimously agreed to by the votes of all Senators present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) to correct the formula used in computing the income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1947, 1948, and 1949; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. FORAND, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KEAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I believe the order of business is the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Alabama that an order for the call of the calendar has not been entered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning at Calendar No. 1259, on page 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama for unanimous consent to proceed to the call of measures on the calendar to which no objection is entered, beginning with Calendar No. 1259?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, with the understanding that no measures

prior to Calendar No. 1259 shall be considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that if there is objection we shall not be able to call up any bills on the calendar prior to No. 1259?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to state that a great many Members of the Senate wanted the calendar to be called only from that point. Therefore, measures shown on the calendar prior to that point would not be called. That was the request which I submitted to the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely want to say to the Senator that measures are listed on the calendar before No. 1259, and which have been on the calendar much longer than measures beginning with No. 1259. I reserve the right to call up one or two prior bills and I want to give notice of that fact now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and so that we may have a clear understanding, let me limit the unanimous-consent request to the call of the calendar commencing with Calendar No. 1259.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much. I am glad that he has modified his request.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I correct in understanding that in the announcement made by the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], it was specifically pointed out that there would be no reference on the calendar call to measures previous to Calendar No. 1259, or preceding the call of the calendar on February 1, 1950?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In connection with the statement of the Senator from Kansas, I invite his attention to the fact that, of course, any unanimous-consent agreement may be modified by another unanimous-consent agreement. Furthermore, after we complete the call of the calendar any Senator would be free, regardless of any request which had been made prior to that time, to request consideration of any bill on the calendar which he desired to have considered. It is for that reason that I suggested the unanimous-consent request be limited to my later statement.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, after the calendar call is completed, and that order of business is concluded, the Senate will return to the consideration of the ECA bill. Am I not correct in stating that if any Senator desires to have considered bills other than those on the calendar following Calendar No. 1259, he must ask unanimous consent to have the unfinished business temporarily laid aside? Is that not the only way in which another bill may be brought up?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suppose that is true. It would rest with whether or not unanimous consent was given.

Mr. TAFT. What concerns me is the growing practice, after the calendar has been called and when Senators have departed from the Chamber, to bring up bills of which no notice has been given, and which are considered, apparently, as a part of the calendar call. I do not understand that they can be considered as a part of the calendar call, but that when the last bill on the calendar has been called, the Senate must return to consideration of the ECA bill. Do I correctly understand the situation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is my understanding. However, it is also my understanding that the Senate may at any time proceed to the consideration of any matter by unanimous consent.

Mr. TAFT. But such a unanimous-consent proposal must include the request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for that purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

CHARLES G. McCORMACK, CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS, UNITED STATES NAVY

The bill (H. R. 5361) for the relief of Charles G. McCormack, captain, Medical Corps, United States Navy, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF SELECT BASE MATERIAL AT THE FORT BENNING MILITARY RESERVATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2895) to authorize the sale of select base material at the Fort Benning Military Reservation to Muscogee County, Ga., for use on country roads, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the words "rate of", to insert "not less than."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENDING TIME LIMITS FOR AWARD OF CERTAIN DECORATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2855) to extend the time limits for the award of certain decorations, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an identical bill (H. R. 6825).

Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6825) to extend the time limits for the award of certain decorations and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Senate bill 2855 will be indefinitely postponed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 73) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In connection with this concurrent resolution, has the committee investigated each one of these cases separately?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Let me be specific in answering the Senator's question. The staff of the committee went meticulously into each case.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. It was.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withhold objection.

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

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 73) favoring the suspension of the deportation of certain aliens, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

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

A-6294779, Bertagni, Hugo or Ugo Bertagni.

A-2651565, Bochicchio, Cristino or Nick De Mario or Nick DiMario or Nicola De Maria.

A-6321689, Clarisse, Abraham Anthonie.

A-4568034, Dietl, Marta Maria or Martha Maria Dietl.

A-6570621, Dolan, Hilda Ena Louise (nee Phang), formerly Orinitcheff.

A-5661548, Ehlers, Mary Helen.

A-5324917, Harvey, Fredrick Herbert or Frederick (or Fredrick), Herbert Harvey or Fred Harvey.

A-1731581, Hriczo, Yanos Ferencz or John Frank Hriczo or Janos Hriczo or John Kriszo.

A-6989303, Latoff, Catherine Hage.

A-3448878, Lyras, George Nicholas or Georgios Nicholas Lyras.

A-5569906, Lyras, Angeliki George, or Angela Lyras (nee Angela Joan Lyras).

A-4638126, Kong, Leet Tung or Lee Chung Kwong.

A-5316626, Lee, Mary Anne or Kwan Chong Yen (maiden name).

A-6214506, Mercer, Clare Nelson.

A-6887754, Moran, Mary Joyce (nee Rooney).

A-6825230, Nowitsch, Silvia Marianna.

A-6799268, Prideaux, Charles Stephen Anstice.

A-1812178, Siiskonen, Evert.

A-6389051, Szefner, Feliks or Felix Shafner.

A-6389052, Szefner, Paulina or Pauline Shafner (nee Geszychter).

A-4324669, Tang, Doris or Chu Pui-Fong or Tang Pui Fong.

A-5995999, Tang, Harry, Tang Kim Man or Tang Kim-Man.

A-5995002, Tang, Ruth or Tang Wan Yin or Tang Wan-Yin.

A-4324670, Tang, Paul or Tang Sik-Pui or Tang Sik Pui.

A-5994998, Tang, Peggy or Tang Wan-Yon.

A-5995001, Tang, Helen or Tang Wan-Yim.

A-5995000, Tang, Andrew or Tang Sen-Man.

A-5903987, Tigeleiro, Jose.

A-6018586, Wojciechowska, Zofia Jadeiga.

A-6018587, Wojciechowska, Maria Teresa.

A-6018588, Wojciechowska, Christopher Richard.

FEES OF UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The bill (S. 1838) to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to increase and equalize the fees for services by United States marshals, which are chargeable as costs in both civil and criminal cases.

This does not mean the marshals are to get more money, because under present law, the marshals and deputy marshals are paid fixed salaries, and all the fees they collect go into the general fund.

Payments to marshals for mileage traveled on official business was increased during the first session of this Congress, and the corresponding increases provided in this bill will help to more adequately reimburse the Government for the cost of services rendered by the marshals.

It is my understanding an amendment will be offered on behalf of the minority calendar committee, which amendment has been cleared by the Department of Justice. If such an amendment is offered, and the sponsor of the amendment can give assurance that it has been so cleared by the Department of Justice, I shall accept the amendment on behalf of the committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the minority calendar committee has decided to withhold the amendment, but I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point a statement in support of what the Senator has just said, prepared by Mr. George M. Miller, Assistant Chief, Accounts Branch, Administrative Division, Department of Justice.

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

The bill proposes to amend the marshals' fee bill which prescribes charges for services by marshals and their deputies. The amounts collected under the fee bill are deposited into the Treasury and do not benefit the marshal or his deputies in any respect.

For years it has been the feeling in the Department that the fee bill was in need of overhauling. Prior to September 1948 it had been in substantially the same form and with the same rates since enactment of section 829, Revised Statutes, which in turn was derived from acts passed in 1853 and 1855.

The reviser of title 28 of the United States Code, aside from dropping certain little-used provisions and without consulting this Department, made two changes as regards mileage, which are of extreme importance. Mileage is involved only in the service of process and previously was restricted to 6 cents per mile in going only. The new code removed the one-way restriction so now it is charged both ways. While this would seem to double the mileage receipts, and place the Government in a much better financial position, actually it does not have that ultimate result because previously there was a right of election to receive either the specified mileage or actual expenses of service. Hence, since the marshals were under instructions always to elect the greater, the mileage rate ordinarily was of little importance. Travel was charged on the basis which best protected the Government. The right of election having been eliminated, mileage only can now be charged.

Privately owned automobiles are the means of transportation in serving process. Since passage of the act of June 19, 1948 (Public Law 673, 80th Cong.), deputies are entitled to claim 7 cents per mile for official travel which they retain as a commuted expense allowance. Therefore, since they collect 7 cents from the Government and the private litigant pays only 6 cents per mile, there is an actual loss to the Government of 1 cent for each mile of travel in serving private process. In addition, the Government must pay certain other items of expense of service which are not collected from the litigant, such as bridge and ferry tolls and per diems in lieu of subsistence up to $8 per day. In certain types of cases, expenses of service need not be prepaid and if the plaintiff does not recover there may be no collection of the service charges, including mileage. All these factors build up hidden costs against the Government which are not now reflected in the mileage allowance.

Marshals coming to Washington were consulted relative to the mileage rates their sheriffs were allowed. Using the information thus obtained, it was concluded to request an amendment of the fee bill so as to allow a 10-cent mileage charge instead of the 6 cents. The attached tabulation shows that 41 States allow mileage rates ranging from 5 cents to 40 cents per mile, the average being about 10½ cents. In some States the rates vary by counties; e. g., in North Carolina they range from 5 cents to 10 cents.

In asking for a flat mileage rate, the Department had in mind the simplicity of computation and the elimination of the clerical effort that would be involved in computing the service charge on both a mileage and an actual expense basis to determine which should be claimed. The right of election is work producing and cumbersome since it delays computation of bills until after service is rendered, whereas it would be possible under present practice to make an accurate computation as to expenses prior to service if nothing but a flat mileage rate were involved. Decentralization of record keeping and the need for certain additional field reports have combined to place a clerical burden on the office help of the marshals which was never contemplated in the earlier years of the operation of the marshals' fee bill. Hence, anything that can streamline the office work is much to be preferred. The right to elect actual expenses creates an additional burden on the office force which the 10 cents per mile flat rate would void. Furthermore, the rate seems to be very much in line with the average rates of the States.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1838) to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to fees of United States marshals, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of section 1921 of title 28, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"For serving a writ of possession, partition, execution, or any final process, the same mileage as is allowed for the service of any other writ, and for making the service, seizing or levying on property, advertising and disposing of same by set-off or otherwise according to law (except by sale) and receiving and paying over the money, the same fees and poundage as are or shall be allowed for similar services to the sheriffs of the States, respectively, in which the service is rendered;

"For sale of property and for receiving and paying over the money, 2½ percent on any sum under $500 and 1¼ percent on the excess of any sum over $500;

"In all cases in which property is sold by a public auctioneer or by some party other than the marshall or his deputy, the fee herein authorized to be paid to the marshall shall be reduced by the amount paid to said auctioneer or other party;".

SEC. 2. The last paragraph of the said section is amended to read as follows:

"For necessary travel in serving any process in civil or criminal cases, 10 cents a mile, to be computed from the place where the service is returned to the place of service or where more than one person is served to the place of service which is most remote, adding thereto any additional travel necessary to serve the others. When two or more writs of any kind required to be served in behalf of the same party on the same person may be served at the same time, compensation for travel on only one such writ shall be taxable. The clerk shall insert in each subpena the names of as many witnesses in each case as convenience of service will permit."

J. M. ARTHUR

The bill (2338) for the relief of J. M. Arthur was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, a question. I note that in the report the Department of Justice opposes the passage of the bill, first on the ground that more than one and a half million dollars have already been paid on meat subsidy claims, and that the enactment of the bill would establish a precedent. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if the committee went into that phase of the matter? If so, I should be glad to have the committee chairman make a statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Department of Justice objects to the bill on purely technical grounds. The first of these is that large sums have been paid as subsidies. The committee does not believe that objection is relevant to the issues in this case.

The second objection of the Department of Justice is that payment of this claim might establish a bad precedent. On this point the committee takes the view that, since there are equitable grounds for payment of this claim, it should be paid; and that if there are in fact other claimants with similar equitable grounds, they also should be paid. As a practical matter, the committee is informed that there are very few, if any, claimants similarly situated, and therefore the committee feels that the use of the word "precedent" is too broad under the circumstances.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2338) for the relief of J. M. Arthur was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. M. Arthur,

Ocoee, Tenn., the sum of $1,448.04. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said J. M. Arthur against the United States for losses which he sustained as a result of the failure of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make subsidy payments to him for the slaughter of cattle and hogs during July and August 1945: *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.

SGT. BLAINE W. HUGHES

The bill (S. 2807) for the relief of Sgt. Blaine W. Hughes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Sgt. Blaine W. Hughes, AF 19086079, 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.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES FOR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The bill (S. 2864) to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill by the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill contains certain authorizations with respect to administrative expenses of the Department of Justice. Heretofore, authorization for these expenditures has been carried in legislative language in successive appropriations bills. Under the Reorganization Act, it has become the policy to eliminate such legislative language from appropriations bills, and accordingly these provisions, respecting the Department of Justice, which falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, were referred to that committee. The committee has determined that these are all authorizations which have been repeatedly approved by the Committee on Appropriations; and in view of the fact that the approval of specific appropriations under any of this authorization language will still be subject to the scrutiny of the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Judiciary recommends that this bill be enacted.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2864) to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That appropriations now or hereafter provided for the Department of Justice shall be available for payment of (a) notarial fees, including such additional stenographic services as may be required in connection therewith in the taking of depositions, and compensation and expenses of witnesses and informants, all at such rates as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his administrative assistant, and (b) when ordered by the court, actual expenses of meals and lodging for marshals, deputy marshals, or criers when acting as bailiffs in attendance upon juries.

SEC. 2. Appropriations now or hereafter provided for salaries and expenses of United States marshals shall be available for actual and necessary expenses incident to the transfer of prisoners in the custody of such marshals to narcotic farms.

SEC. 3. In the procurement of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, the Department of Justice is authorized to exchange or sell similar items and apply the exchange allowances or proceeds of sales in such cases in whole or in part payment therefor.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General is empowered to investigate the official acts, records, and accounts of United States marshals, United States attorneys, clerks in the United States courts and of the district courts of Alaska, Canal Zone, and Virgin Islands, probation officers, referees, trustees and receivers in bankruptcy, United States commissioners and court reporters, for which purpose all the official papers, records, dockets, and accounts of said officers, without exception, shall be examined by agents of the Attorney General at any time. Appropriations now or hereafter provided for the examination of judicial offices shall be available for carrying out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 5. Appropriations now or hereafter provided for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be available for expenses of membership in the International Commission of Criminal Police and, when so specified in the appropriation concerned, for expenses of unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, who shall make a certificate of the amount of any such expenditure as he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended. None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee.

SEC. 6. Appropriations now or hereafter provided for the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be available for payment of (a) hire of privately owned horses for use on official business, under contract with officers or employees of the Service; (b) pay of interpreters and translators who are not citizens of the United States; (c) distribution of citizenship textbooks to aliens without cost to such aliens; (d) payment of allowances (at such rate as may be specified from time to time in the appropriation act involved) to aliens, while held in custody under the immigration laws, for work performed; and (e) when so specified in the appropriation concerned, expenses of unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, who shall make a certificate of the amount of any such expenditure as he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

SEC. 7. Appropriations now or hereafter provided for the support of United States prisoners shall be available for the payment of all expenses incurred in caring for any Federal prisoner who becomes insane during the period of his imprisonment, and if he had no relatives or friends to whom he can be sent, for continuing such care after the expiration of sentence until such prisoner is pronounced sane.

SEC. 8. When authorized in an appropriation or other law, the Attorney General may acquire land adjacent to any Federal penal or correctional institution if, in his opinion, the additional land is essential to the protection of the health or safety of the inmates of the institution.

SEC. 9. Collections in cash for meals, laundry, barber service, uniform equipment, and any other items for which payment is made originally from appropriations for the maintenance and operation of Federal penal and correctional institutions, may be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation currently available for such items when the collection is made.

DORIS M. FAULKNER

The bill (H. R. 3769) for the relief of Doris M. Faulkner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELIZABETH MARY C. MANGLE

The bill (H. R. 4411) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Mary C. Mangle was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. NORA JOHNSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3536) for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$504", and insert "$388.88."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1056) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L.

Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished Senator from Nevada submit to a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is not the effect of the bill to waive the statute of limitations?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I object.

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

CLAIM OF JAMES I. BARTLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1510) which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

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 James I. Bartley, of Surry County, N. C., the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the personal injuries sustained by the said James I. Bartley on January 29, 1938, in an accident occurring on a bridge on the highway between Rush and Dobson, N. C., and involving a Civilian Conservation Corps truck: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such payment only after receipt of evidence satisfactory to him that the judgment in the sum of $3,500 entered in the Superior Court of Surry County, N. C., in favor of James I. Bartley and against Paul Flynn has been satisfied and discharged of record: *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 agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of James I. Bartley."

PROVISION FOR ADDITIONAL ARMY AND NAVY NURSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5876) to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, to provide for additional appointments, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 9, line 18, after the word "thereof", to strike out "except that that portion of the amendment to subsection (a) of section 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 set forth in section 3 (a) hereof relating to the minimum authorized officer strength of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, shall, in the case of the comparable organization of the Air Force, be not less than fifty-three."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT OF 1946

The bill (S. 2724) to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (b) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong.), approved August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 963), as amended, is amended as follows:

Change the period at the end thereof to a comma and insert: "except that leave actually taken during any fiscal year may be charged to leave accruing during such fiscal year without regard to such 60-day limitation: *Provided*, That no cash settlement shall be made for unused or accumulated leave in excess of 60 days upon discharge or retirement subsequent to August 31, 1946."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective August 31, 1946.

PUBLIC AIRPORT IN THE VICINITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 456) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or Senators acting for him, if the bill does not establish an additional airport, and if in fact the Washington National Airport is not presently operating under certain rules and regulations which will not apply to the airport proposed to be established under the bill, thereby leaving a great variance between the two exact types of installation?

Mr. McFARLAND. It was my understanding that both airports are to be operated in the same manner. The second airport is to be operated just as is the airport which is now in operation. That was the intent of the proposed legislation. If the Senator has any question about it and has an amendment to offer on the subject I shall be happy to accept the amendment, because it is the intent of the bill that the two airports shall be operated in the same manner.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may mention one thing to the distinguished Senator in that regard. I do not believe the pending bill covers that point, and it has been brought to our attention that an amendment possibly should be offered to the measure.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to such an amendment, because it is the intent of the bill, I believe, to operate the new airport in the same manner as the present airport. The amendment would be acceptable.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Will the Senator have any objection to the bill going to the end of the calendar, so that during the interim of time we may submit to the Senator a proposed amendment for his consideration?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think I have the amendment here, if the Senator will offer it. I believe it is acceptable.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Very well. Do I correctly understand that the committee has an amendment which is to be offered first?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, on page 7, after the dollar mark in line 18. At that point I move to insert the sum "14,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair notes that the calendar shows that the bill was reported with amendments.

The Chair inquires of the Senator whether the amendment he stated is one of the committee amendments?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; it is not.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes, reserving the right to object, let me say that unless the amendments which I send to the desk are acceptable, I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that he has a right to state his objection at any time during the consideration of the bill and prior to its passage.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it proposed that we now have two commercial airports for the city of Washington, or is the new airport proposed to replace the existing one? What is the program, and how much money is proposed to be spent on the new airport?

Mr. McFARLAND. The proposal is to have two airports. Traffic at the present airport has become so saturated as to be dangerous. A second airport will take care of the larger-plane traffic, the traffic by four-engine planes, for instance, whereas the smaller planes would operate at the present airport.

Mr. TAFT. Is it considered to be efficient to operate two commercial airports for one city?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think such a policy is a great deal safer. Because of the saturation of traffic, it is a great deal safer to have the smaller aircraft, particularly the private planes, operate from a different airport than that used by the large commercial aircraft.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator think that perhaps the danger at the present airport arises from the operation of Army and Navy aircraft in that area, although certain such aircraft have no particular reason for being in the immediate vicinity of the city of Washington?

Mr. McFARLAND. That might be partially the difficulty, but it is not altogether the whole problem. The present

airport is simply too small to take care of the present and anticipated volume of traffic. It is expected that the traffic will increase some 40 percent in the near future.

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us how much the bill is likely to cost?

Mr. McFARLAND. The amendment I have just proposed provides for an expenditure of $14,000,000.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment beginning on page 4, in line 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the committee amendments will be considered first.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Very well; I shall offer this one immediately thereafter.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 456) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 8, after the word therefor", to strike out "which, together with the Washington National Airport, will be adequate to meet the civil aviation needs, immediate and future, of the District of Columbia and surrounding area"; on page 2, line 11, after the word "airport", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That before making commitments for the acquisition of land, or the transfer of any lands, the Administrator shall consult and advise with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as to the conformity of the proposed location with the Commission's comprehensive plan for the National Capital and its environs, and said Commission shall, upon request, submit a report and recommendations thereon within 30 days."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 14, after the word "public", to strike out "No such contract shall extend for a period of longer than 10 years, and the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to such contracts or the leases authorized under section 5 hereof" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No such contract, except contracts involving the construction of permanent buildings or facilities, shall extend for a period of longer than 10 years. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to contracts authorized under this section, to leases authorized under section 5 hereof, or to contracts for architectural or engineering services necessary for the design and planning of the airport."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the first amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas is directed to the pending committee amendment.

The clerk will state at this time the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 4, in line 17, it is proposed to delete the word "except", appearing as the last word in that line, and to insert in lieu thereof the words "not including"; on page 4, in line 19, it is proposed to delete the word "ten" appearing as the last word in that line, and to insert in lieu thereof the word "five"; and on page 4, in line 20, it is proposed to delete the period following the word "years" and to insert in lieu thereof a comma and to add the following: "except the restaurant."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have his amendments to the committee amendment considered en bloc or separately?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish them to be considered en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I accept the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments to the committee amendment are agreed to.

Without objection, the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I notice the following statement in the report of the committee:

> We have been advised by the Department of Defense that the military airport existing at Andrews Field will be exclusively required for military purposes within the foreseeable future. Thus it is concluded that an additional terminal airport for the Washington metropolitan area must be constructed.

Did the committee go into the question of whether it was really necessary for the Army to have a field in the middle of the city of Washington or whether Andrews Field itself might be used as a second commercial airport?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is my understanding that the hearings were very extensive and that the military authorities absolutely insisted that they require the use of all their fields, including Andrews Field, and that there simply seems to be no alternative other than the construction of the proposed field in order to assure the safety of the traffic for the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent does the District of Columbia contribute to the construction of this airport?

Mr. McFARLAND. The District of Columbia does not contribute to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does that differ from the policy in the States?

Mr. McFARLAND. This is a national airport at the Capital of the United States. It differs, just as the regular appropriations for the District of Columbia differ. A greater responsibility falls upon the Federal Government in regard to the construction of airports in this case than in the case of airports in the various States and municipalities throughout the United States.

Furthermore, the District of Columbia was not included in the Federal airport program, and therefore special legislation is required in this case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was not the present National Airport built entirely with the use of Federal funds?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator think that is sufficient?

Mr. McFARLAND. The present airport is not sufficient.

Mr. ELLENDER. I mean does not the Senator think that was a sufficient contribution from the Federal Government?

Mr. McFARLAND. The present airport is too small, and it will not adequately take care of the traffic, and there is no existing provision permitting the construction of another airport here.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not also true that the National Airport serves not only Washington, D. C., but Alexandria, Va., and Silver Spring, Md., Silver Spring now being the second largest city in the entire State of Maryland?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; it is true that it does serve them. However, there is no way by which the Federal Government could provide the machinery whereby those municipalities could contribute to the construction of the airport.

Mr. MORSE. They could volunteer to contribute, could they not?

Are not we in fact faced with the situation that some metropolitan areas outside Washington, D. C., in the States of Maryland and Virginia, are sponging on the taxpayers of all the rest of the United States for municipal services for which they should pay a part of the expenses themselves?

Mr. McFARLAND. From that standpoint, perhaps there may be some merit in the Senator's contention. On the other hand, some of the municipalities outside of Washington feel that they are furnishing to the people who are employed by the Federal Government schools and roads, for the employees of the Federal Government, and that they are, at least to that extent, being sponged upon.

Let me say this legislation is the only way by which an airport can be constructed here. The adjoining States have not requested one; they are satisfied with the situation which now exists.

There is no suitable ground area available in the District of Columbia, and we are faced with the necessity of either building this airport or of not having one.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator says that Virginia is sponging upon the Federal Government, I say that we do not have

need for the airport, and we have not asked for it. Washington is the Capital of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me further, I may say to the Senator from Arizona and to the Senator from Virginia that we know what we would hear from the Chambers of Commerce of Silver Spring, Md., and Alexandria, Va., if it were suggested that some of the Federal Government employees should be taken away from this area and placed in other parts of the country, where I think some of the departments of the Government should be located.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Did the Senator from Kansas have another amendment to offer?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes, after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered from the floor by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] comes next, and it will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, in line 18, after the dollar mark, it is proposed to insert the figures "14,000,000."

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 3, it is proposed to delete the parentheses and the phrase "not to exceed 10 years," which appears within such parentheses; and on page 4, line 5, immediately following the word "airport", it is proposed to strike out the period, substitute therefor a colon, and insert the following: "*Provided,* That no lease for the use of any hangar or space therein shall extend for a period exceeding 3 years."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the amendment.

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

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL TO S. 456, TO AUTHORIZE CONSTRUCTION OF ANOTHER DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AIRPORT

The report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce sets forth on pages 7 and 8 thereof the comments of the Comptroller General concerning S. 456, in response to the Committee's request for views of the General Accounting Office on that legislation.

In those comments the Comptroller General directs attention to a limitation upon the authority of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to execute leases in connection with operation of the Washington National Airport. This limitation was imposed in the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act for Fiscal 1941 and provided: "That in the operation of such airport no agreement shall be entered into for the use of any hangar or space therein for a period exceeding 3 years nor shall any agreement be entered into for the operation of any concession for a period of 5 years except the restaurant."

The Comptroller General stated with respect to this proviso, as follows: "Inasmuch as the proposed airport would operate under conditions similar to those under which the Washington National Airport operates, it would appear that the period which such leases and contracts would cover should be limited at least to the period provided for the similar contracts and leases contemplated by such prior legislation, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Congress that such contracts enumerated in section 6 should provide for a longer period of time. In this connection, attention is invited to section 3735, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 13), making it unlawful for executive departments to execute contracts for a term longer than 1 year, except as otherwise provided by law."

Inasmuch as the bill as reported by the committee contains no such limitation and since the views of the Civil Aeronautics Administration with respect to the Comptroller General's comments noted above did not appear in the committee report dated February 10, 1950, request was thereafter made for such views.

In a letter to our staff member, dated March 30, the acting Administrator stated as follows:

"The Civil Aeronautics Administration has reviewed S. 456 in light of the limitation appearing in the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act for fiscal 1941 (Public Law 812, 76th Cong.). While this Administration does not favor the limitations on its authority to lease space and grant concessions contained in the above-referred to appropriation act, nevertheless it agrees that it is undesirable to create a conflict between the law governing the administration of the Washington National Airport and the law proposed for the administration of the second terminal airport set forth in S. 456. Such a conflict would be created if S. 456 in its present form was passed by Congress. Consequently, in order to remove such conflict and to make the laws governing the administration of both airports uniform with respect to leases of space and grants of concessions, the Civil Aeronautics Administration would not object to the following amendments:

"Amend S. 456 in the following two respects:

"(1) On page 4, line 3, delete the parentheses and the phrase 'not to exceed 10 years' which appears within such parentheses; and

"(2) On page 4, line 5, immediately following the word 'airport', strike the period, substitute therefor a semicolon, and insert the following clause: '*Provided,* That no lease for the use of any hangar or space therein shall extend for a period exceeding 3 years.'

"Amend the first sentence of the amendment to S. 456 recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce appearing on page 4, lines 17, 18, 19, and 20, in the following three respects:

"(1) On page 4, line 17, delete the word 'except' appearing as the last word of line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the words 'not including';

"(2) On page 4, line 19, delete the word 'ten' appearing as the last word of line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the word 'five'; and

"(3) On page 4, line 20, delete the period following the word 'years', insert in lieu thereof a comma, and add the following phrase: 'except the restaurant.'

"If the amendments indicated above are made, the provisions of S. 456 pertaining to the lease of space and the grant of concessions on the airport will be in all respects identical to the existing provisions of law governing the operation of Washington National Airport. I believe all of the amendments are self-explanatory when read in conjunction with the proviso clause appearing in the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public Law 812, 76th Cong.), with the possible exception of the first suggested amendment to S. 456 which deletes the phrase 'not to exceed 10 years.' The reason for the deletion of this phrase is that no such limitation with respect to the lease of space appears in the legislation governing the operation of the Washington National Airport. That legislation authorizes the Administrator to lease 'upon such terms as he may deem proper, space of property within or upon the airport * * *.' It has been the policy of the Administration during the operation of Washington National Airport for the past 8 years to follow the practice of restricting leases of space to periods of 10 years or less. The Administration will continue to follow this policy, but in order to assure uniformity in the legislation governing the operation of both airports, it is deemed advisable to delete the specific legislative limitation which would put in statutory form the current administrative policy of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

"Sincerely yours,

"DONALD W. NYROP,
"Acting Administrator of Civil Aeronautics."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill. Without objection, the bill——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amendments which have gone into this bill in the past few minutes seem to me to have changed the tenor of the bill. To pass, during the Unanimous-Consent Calendar, a bill proposing the expenditure of $14,000,000 for the construction of an airport, seems to me to be a little hasty. Therefore, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill is passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar 1278, Senate bill 456, be printed with all amendments included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 456) with the amendments which were adopted is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is hereby authorized and directed to construct, protect, operate, improve, and maintain within or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, a public airport (including all buildings and other structures necessary or desirable therefor).

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out this act, the Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise (including transfer with or without compensation from Federal agencies or the District of Columbia, or any State or political subdivision thereof), such lands and interests in lands and appurtenances thereto, including navigation easements or air-space rights, as may be necessary or desirable for the construction, maintenance, improvement, operation, and protection of the airport: *Provided,* That before making commitments for the acquisition of land, or the transfer of any lands, the Administrator shall consult and advise with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as to the conformity of the proposed location with the Commission's comprehensive plan for

the National Capital and its environs, and said Commission shall, upon request, submit a report and recommendations thereon within 30 days.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act, the Administrator is empowered to acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise (including transfer with or without compensation from Federal agencies or the District of Columbia, or any State or political subdivision thereof), rights-of-way or easements for roads, trails, pipe lines, power lines, railroad spurs, and other similar facilities necessary or desirable for the construction or proper operation of the airport.

The Administrator is authorized to construct any streets, highways, or roadways (including bridges) as may be necessary to provide access to the airport from existing streets, highways, or roadways. Upon completion of construction of any street, highway, or roadway within the District of Columbia, such street, highway, or roadway shall be transferred to the District of Columbia without charge, and thereafter shall be maintained by the District of Columbia. Upon construction of any street, highway, or roadway within a State or political subdivision thereof, such street, highway, or roadway may be transferred to such State or political subdivision thereof, without charge, on the condition that such street, highway, or roadway thereafter be maintained as a public street, highway, or roadway by such State or political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 4. The Administrator shall have control over and responsibility for the care, operation, maintenance, improvement, and protection of the airport, together with the power to make and amend such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to the proper exercise thereof: *Provided*, That the authority herein contained may be delegated by the Administrator to such official or officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration as the Administrator may designate.

SEC. 5. The Administrator is empowered to lease under such conditions as he may deem proper and for such periods as may be desirable space or property within or upon the airport for purposes essential or appropriate to the operation of the airport: *Provided*, That no lease for the use of any hangar or space therein shall extend for a period exceeding 3 years.

SEC. 6. The Administrator is authorized to contract with any person for the furnishing of supplies or performance of services at or upon the airport necessary or desirable for the proper operation of the airport, including but not limited to, contracts for furnishing food and lodging, sale of aviation fuels, furnishing of aircraft repairs and other aeronautical services, and such other services and supplies as may be necessary or desirable for the traveling public. No such contract, not including contracts involving the construction of permanent buildings or facilities, shall extend for a period of longer than 5 years, except the restaurant. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to contracts authorized under this section, to leases authorized under section 5 hereof, or to contracts for architectural or engineering services necessary for the design and planning of the airport.

SEC. 7. Any executive department, independent establishment, or agency of the Federal Government or the District of Columbia, for the purposes of carrying out this act, is authorized to transfer to the Administrator, without compensation, upon his request, any lands, interests in lands (including avigation easements or air-space rights), buildings, property, or equipment under its control and in excess of its own requirements, which the Administrator may consider necessary or desirable for the construction, care, operation, maintenance, improvement, or protection of the airport.

SEC. 8. (a) The Administrator, and any Civil Aeronautics Administration employee appointed to protect life and property on the airport, when designated by the Administrator, is hereby authorized and empowered (1) to arrest under a warrant within the limits of the airport any person accused of having committed within the boundaries of the airport any offense against the laws of the United States, or against any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant to this act; (2) to arrest without warrant any person committing any such offense within the limits of the airport in his presence; or (3) to arrest without warrant within the limits of the airport any person whom he has reasonable grounds to believe has committed a felony within the limits of the airport.

(b) Any individual having the power of arrest as provided in subsection (a) of this section may carry firearms or other weapons as the Administrator may direct or by regulation may prescribe.

(c) The United States Park Police, may, at the request of the Administrator, be assigned by the Director of the National Park Service in his discretion subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to patrol any area of the airport, and any member of the United States Park Police so assigned are hereby authorized and empowered to make arrests within the limits of the airport for the same offenses and in the same manner and circumstances as is provided in this section with respect to employees designated by the Administrator.

(d) The officer on duty in command of those employees designated by the Administrator as provided in subsection (a) of this section may accept deposit of collateral from any person charged with the violation of any rule or regulation prescribed under this act for appearance in court or before the appropriate United States Commissioner; and such collateral shall be deposited with such United States Commissioner.

SEC. 9. The Administrator may enter into agreements with the State, or any political subdivision thereof, in which the airport or any portion thereof is situated, for such State or municipal services as the Administrator shall deem necessary to the proper and efficient operation and protection of the airport, and he may from time to time agree to modifications in any such agreement: *Provided, however*, That where the charge for any such service is established by the laws of the State, the Administrator may not pay for such service in excess of the charge so established.

SEC. 10. Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any rule, regulation, or order issued by the Administrator under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 or to imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 11. Unless the context otherwise requires, the definitions of the words and phrases used in this act shall be the definitions assigned to such words and phrases by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $14,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, said appropriation to remain available until expended. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from year to year such sums as may be necessary for the proper development, improvement, maintenance, protection, control, and operation of said airport or as may be otherwise necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

REVISION OF SURVEY RULES FOR PUBLIC LANDS

The bill (H. R. 3150), to revise and repeal certain acts relating to rules of survey to permit departures from the system of rectangular survey when necessary on all public lands, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the enactment of this bill becomes necessary because of the surveys in some of the mountainous areas, including Alaska. In those areas, it is very difficult to make surveys by means of the present system.

Enactment of the bill was recommended by the Department of the Interior for that purpose. That is why it is necessary for the bill to be passed, but only for surveys where the present system cannot be used.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3150) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMED SERVICES CIVILIAN RECREATION PROGRAMS

The bill (S. 2859) to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the Army would like very much——

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, perhaps I can shorten the discussion by asking a question. As I see it, the purpose of the bill is to permit the Military Establishments, particularly the Department of Air, to employ personnel to provide civilian recreation programs in certain isolated locations. Is that substantially the purpose of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. Yes; that is substantially its purpose.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Then I think the bill should clearly state that purpose; and I shall submit an amendment, to be considered after the committee amendments are considered.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "That", to strike out "personnel" and insert "not to exceed 10 persons"; in line 8, after the word "employed", to insert "within the Department of Defense at any one time"; in line 9, after the word "authorization", to strike out "only to promote and maintain civilian recreation programs," and insert "and such programs shall be promoted or maintained only", and on page 2, line 3, after the word "Defense" and the period, to insert "The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress, at the end of the year follow-

ing the effective date of this legislation, the number and cost of the full-time personnel employed under the authority of this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 1, after the word "where", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "by virtue of their isolation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretaries of the military departments are authorized to provide for the promotion and maintenance of civilian recreation programs within their respective departments by employing such personnel as may be deemed necessary for such purposes: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 persons shall be employed within the Department of Defense at any one time under this authorization and such programs shall be promoted or maintained only in localities where, by virtue of their isolation, recreational facilities are unavailable or inadequate, as determined by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Congress, at the end of the year following the effective date of this legislation, the number and cost of the full-time personnel employed under the authority of this act.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 153) for the authorization of a contribution by the United States to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East was announced as next in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me say that I have asked that the joint resolution be passed over because it is included in the pending ECA bill, not because I have any objection to this particular measure.

DECORATIONS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE BERLIN AIRLIFT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2353) to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 1, line 11, after the word "him", to strike out "by any foreign government", and on page 2, line 1, after the word "service", to insert "by any foreign government which was a cobelligerent with the United States in World War II and was a coparticipant in such airlift", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That any member of the armed forces of the United States participating in the Berlin airlift, for the period during which a medal for participation therein is authorized to be awarded to such person by this Nation, and for a 2-year period thereafter, may accept and thereafter wear, subject to the approval of the head of the department of which he was a member at the time of his participation in the Berlin airlift, any decoration, order, medal, or emblem tendered him in recognition of such humane service by any foreign government which was a cobelligerent with the United States in World War II and was a coparticipant in such airlift.

SEC. 2. The express consent of the Congress, as required by clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution, is hereby granted to carry out the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF GRADES OF CERTAIN RETIRED NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1151) to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 1, beginning on line 3, to strike out:

That chapter 310 of the laws of the Sixty-ninth Congress, Public Law 713 of March 3, 1927 (title 10, 604a U. S. C.), is hereby amended by adding thereto the following:

"SEC. 2. The following noncommissioned officers on the retired list of the Regular Army are placed in the second grade (now sixth pay grade under Public Law 351, 81st Cong.): All other sergeants (first class) retired as such and all other sergeants (first class) who were changed to staff sergeants pursuant to the act of June 4, 1920, and who continued as such or who continued as staff sergeants or who became technical sergeants until retirement in either the second grade or the third grade before July 1, 1922."

And insert:

That the act entitled "An act placing certain noncommissioned officers in the first grade," approved March 3, 1927, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Noncommissioned officers of the following groups whose names were placed on the retired list of the Regular Army prior to July 1, 1922, are placed in the sixth enlisted pay grade established by section 201 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.)—

"(1) all sergeants (first class), other than those sergeants (first class) referred to in section 1, who were retired as such;

"(2) all sergeants (first class), other than those sergeants (first class) referred to in section 1, who were changed to staff sergeants pursuant to the act of June 4, 1920, and who continued as such staff sergeants, or who became technical sergeants prior to their retirement, and who were retired in the third pay grade established by subsection 4 (b) of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 761)."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act placing certain noncommissioned officers in the first grade," approved March 3, 1927, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Noncommissioned officers of the following groups whose names were placed on the retired list of the Regular Army prior to July 1, 1922, are placed in the sixth enlisted pay grade established by section 201 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.)—

"(1) all sergeants (first class), other than those sergeants (first class) referred to in section 1, who were retired as such;

"(2) all sergeants (first class), other than those sergeants (first class) referred to in section 1, who were changed to staff sergeants pursuant to the act of June 4, 1920, and who continued as such staff sergeants, or who became technical sergeants prior to their retirement, and who were retired in the third pay grade established by subsection 4 (b) of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 761)."

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the first of the month following the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AUTHORIZATION TO DISPOSE OF EASEMENT NEAR FORT BELVOIR, VA.

The bill (H. R. 4502) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere on the same property was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon requests an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this bill would permit the Secretary of the Army to exchange a road easement located on a parcel of land located immediately north of Fort Belvoir, Va., for a similar easement located a few feet to the west of the present one.

In acquiring the Fort Belvoir Military Reservation the Federal Government secured an easement for a right-of-way for a possible access road extending from the northern boundary of the reservation to the southern end of Bonniemill Lane. However, the Government has never utilized the easement because the contiguous area of the reservation has been selected as the site of the Engineers' Board testing area and an access road is not essential in that vicinity at this time.

Meanwhile, the joint owners of the three parcels of land through which this unused easement runs have planned to improve their property and expect to locate their own access road a few feet to the west of the original Government right-of-way.

The proposed bill will permit the Government to convey its easement to the joint owners. The right of the Government is protected by imposing the condition that the joint owners dedicate the new right-of-way to public use. This right-of-way is well situated so far as providing access to Fort Belvoir is concerned. The road to be built by the property owners terminates approximately 150 feet from the reservation boundary. To avoid a bottleneck in this area, the bill provides that the Government shall receive an easement from the owners across this portion of the property. There is no cost to the Government involved in this bill.

The Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget interpose no objection to its enactment.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Virginia assures the Senator from Oregon, does he not, that this is a fair trade of property, whereby the Federal Government is in fact getting fair value in return for value given and in no way violates the principle for which the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Oregon have stood for so many years in the Senate, namely, that Federal property shall not be given away?

Mr. BYRD. I may say the Committee on Armed Services, of which the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Virginia are members, went very fully into that phase of the bill. Every member was convinced it was a fair trade, and that the State of Virginia would get no advantage whatever, as the road is entirely for public use, in any case.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

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

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

QUITCLAIM OF RIGHT-OF-WAY EASEMENT, LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VA.

The bill (H. R. 5503) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to release and quitclaim a portion of a right-of-way easement to Langley Air Force Base, Va., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, could we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BYRD. This is a bill somewhat similar to the one the Senate has just passed. The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to release to the Commonwealth of Virginia the westerly portion of a 70-foot right-of-way easement connecting Langley Air Force Base with the nearby State road leading to Hampton.

When Langley Field was acquired as a military reservation in 1917 the Federal Government secured a 70-foot easement for right of way for an access road and access railroad. The easement was obtained for a total cost of $3.

At the time Langley Field was established as a military reservation the surrounding property through which the easement runs was almost completely undeveloped. However, as Langley Field has developed into the important installation which it now is, this community has built up quite extensively. As a consequence what was originally simply an access road to the base is now as much a civilian thoroughfare as a military access road.

The Commonwealth has assumed the responsibility and borne the costs of maintaining the road and of policing it. However, obvious questions of legality and jurisdiction have arisen. The Commonwealth has, therefore, purchased the underlying fee and is willing to assume the highway easement. The Air Force is very anxious that this transfer of jurisdiction should be accomplished because it is no longer economical for the Federal Government to maintain the highway, and it is considered improper by the military authorities to assume police jurisdiction over the large volume of civilian traffic.

The bill, therefore, would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey the westerly 43 feet of the easement and the road to the Commonwealth. The easterly 27 feet remaining in the original 70-foot easement remains with the Federal Government inasmuch as it is the railroad right-of-way.

The Department of Defense recommends enactment of the bill, and the Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator will not object at all to my asking these questions, because he knows the position in which the junior Senator from Oregon finds himself.

Mr. BYRD. Oh, not at all. I do not recall that the Senator was present at the meeting of the Armed Services Committee, but the subject was thoroughly considered by the committee, and it comes within the scope of the resolution which the Senator from Oregon introduced and which the Senator from Virginia supported.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Virginia. I merely wanted to keep the record straight, so that no one in the future can say that I have ever violated the principle I have stood for of not permitting Federal property to be given away.

Mr. BYRD. It is being transferred in the public interest. It is being maintained by the State of Virginia and is being used as a thoroughfare for military purposes at Langley Field. I think the Federal Government received a much better deal than did the State of Virginia.

Mr. MORSE. I think it was a very good trade. The highway will be used for military purposes in connection with Langley Field.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5503) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4453) to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. I wish the RECORD to show that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is unavoidably detained, and he requested that I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TERMINATION OF LUMP-SUM BENEFITS PROVIDED BY LAW TO CERTAIN RESERVE OFFICERS

The bill (H. R. 5921) to terminate lump-sum benefits provided by law to certain Reserve officers of the Navy and Air Force was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT LIFE INSURANCE ACT—REGULATION OF LIFE INSURANCE BUSINESS

The bill (H. R. 4393) to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4394) to amend sections 10, 11, and 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia" was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will withhold for a moment his objection with reference to House bill 4394 in order that I may make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. LANGER. Temporarily.

Mr. TAFT. The bill simply provides for the writing of group life insurance in the District of Columbia. The bill is a uniform bill approved by all the bar associations and insurance companies in the United States. It is merely proposed that the same practice be extended to the District of Columbia.

The last law dealing with insurance in the District of Columbia was passed in 1934, and it is quite out of date, much more so than the laws of a great many States. This is a uniform law to which, so far as I know, there is no objection. I am wondering if the Senator will withdraw his objection.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he will withhold his objection to Calendar 1291, House bill 4393, until an explanation can be made.

Mr. LANGER. I withdraw it temporarily. But I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Is there a matter of reciprocity between the District of Columbia and the States?

Mr. TAFT. As to group life insurance, I do not think there is any question of reciprocity. The bill was drafted by a committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, namely, State commissioners of insurance throughout the United States. So far as I know, there would be no question of reciprocity in connection with group life insurance. I do not think the Senator will find any real objection to House bill 4394.

Mr. LANGER. Was House bill 4393 also prepared by the insurance commissioners of the various States?

Mr. HUNT. It was. The bill provides a standard technical amendment adopted by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, recommended by the District of Columbia Insurance Commissioner, and recommended by the District Commissioners. It simply brings the insurance laws of the District of Columbia into harmony with the insurance laws throughout the rest of the United States.

I am glad to say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that the amendments are to the advantage of the individual.

Mr. LANGER. I withdraw my objection to both bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 4393?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4393) to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 4394?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4394) to amend sections 10, 11, and 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia" was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 2113) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to clarify the status of freight forwarders and their relationship with motor common carriers was announced as next in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAYMON H. MASSEY—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1025) for the relief of Waymon H. Massey was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not true that but for the enactment of this bill relief would be barred by contract law?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Then I should like to ask the distinguished Senator why we should confer jurisdiction to grant a right barred by contract law?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it involves a question of negligence which, in the judgment of the committee, could be tried in the Court of Claims.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ARTHUR HOLBERT AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 3138) for the relief of Arthur Holbert, the estate of Ernest L. Gass, deceased, and the estate of James L. Thomas, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERVIN HAAS AND LENO VESCOVI

The bill (H. R. 6694) for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN ROWLAND

The bill (S. 298) for the relief of John Rowland, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws John Rowland, presently residing with his nephew, Msgr. Charles E. Hagerty, in West Hartford, Conn., who entered the United States on a temporary visa on November 19, 1947, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of November 19, 1947, upon payment by him of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. Upon 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 of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Ireland.

MRS. JOHANNA DAGNALL

The bill (S. 915) for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Dagnall was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Mrs. Johanna Dagnall, of Berkeley, Calif., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Japan.

CHRISTINA SHALFEIEFF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1169) for the relief of Christina Shalfeieff.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I think it is stated in the report on this bill that there is very definite objection as to certain phases of it on the part of the Department of Justice. I am wondering if the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee might have some explanation which takes this bill out of the ordinary category.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is the case of a woman past 60 years of age, who was born in Japan, of a Swedish father and a Japanese mother. She is the widow of a white Russian who died in Japan in 1943. She has six children, two of whom reside in the United States, one in Germany, and three in Japan. She is presently living with one of her daughters, who is married to a United States citizen. The son who is in Japan is employed there by the United States Army. He was formerly a major in the Australian Army, and is a citizen of Australia.

Because she is half Japanese, this woman cannot remain in the United States unless legislation of this nature is enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws the alien Christina Shalfeieff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 19, 1947, upon payment 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.

MARIE LOUISE ARDANS

The bill (S. 1261) for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Marie Louise Ardans, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 17, 1948, the date on which she was admitted as a visitor, upon payment of 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 appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JULIANA MENDIOLA ALASTRA

The bill (S. 1262) for the relief of Juliana Mendiola Alastra was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Juliana Mendiola Alastra, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 7, 1949, the date on which she was admitted as a visitor, upon payment of 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 appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

AUGUSTINO MARLIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1484) for the relief of Augustino Marlia.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is the case of a young man 19 years old who came to the United States in 1948. The boy's father is dead, and he is presently living with his uncle, who operates a laundry. The boy is working in the laundry during the daytime, without pay, in order to learn the laundry business, and is attending night school in order to learn the English language. He is of good moral character, and his uncle has stated his willingness to support him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Augustino Marlia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 20, 1948, the date on which he

was admitted as a visitor, upon payment of 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 appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

EDITH SCHEIBER

The bill (S. 1524) for the relief of Edith Scheiber was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Edith Scheiber, of Pittsburgh, Pa., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of States is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Hungary.

SISTER EDELTRUDIS CLARA WESKAMP

The bill (S. 2156) for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Clara Weskamp was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, Sister Edeltrudis Clara Weskamp, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 14, 1946, the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SUMIKO KATO

The bill (S. 2431) for the relief of Sumiko Kato was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Sumiko Kato, the Japanese fiancée of Thomas D. Jacobs, Jr., a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Sumiko Kato may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Sumiko Kato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Thomas D. Jacobs, Jr., 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 Sumiko Kato, 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 the entry of said Sumiko Kato, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Sumiko Kato as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required fees and head taxes.

A. D. STRENGER AND CLAIRE STRENGER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2479) for the relief of A. D. Strenger and his wife Claire Strenger.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the proposed beneficiaries of this bill are both natives of Germany. The man is 62 years old, and his wife is 46. The man is engaged in the import and export business, and in connection with that business has had to make numerous trips abroad.

Both these aliens filed their declaration of intention to become citizens in 1944. However, because their residence in this country has been broken by temporary absences, they are not eligible for naturalization.

During the war, this man worked as an expert consultant for the Office of Intelligence of the War Department, and the committee files show that he is a recognized authority on European affairs, and that his services have been of much value to this Government in the war efforts. The purpose of this bill is to let this man and his wife become naturalized citizens.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I withhold objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the provisions of section 307 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940 shall not be held to apply to A. D. Strenger and his wife Claire Strenger.

CARMEN E. LYON

The bill (S. 2568) for the relief of Carmen E. Lyon, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, 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 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Carmen E. Lyon, wife of Captain Charles A. Lyon, an American citizen, and that the said Carmen E. Lyon may be permitted to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

ROLAND ROGER ALFRED BOCCIA, ALSO KNOWN AS ROLAND BARBERA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2611) for the relief of Roland Roger Alfred Boccia, also known as Roland Barbera.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nevada inform us whether this bill and fifteen others he has reported were unanimously approved by his committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, they had the unanimous approval of the committee, and the careful and diligent study of the full staff of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Roland Roger Boccia, also known as Roland Barbera, of Buffalo, N. Y., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 31, 1948, the date on which he last entered the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota.

MRS. ALICE WILLMARTH

The bill (S. 2071) for the relief of Mrs. Alice Willmarth was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provision of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Alice Willmarth, a native and citizen of Japan, and who is the wife of Benjamin Willmarth, a citizen of the United States. If otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, said Mrs. Alice Willmarth shall be granted the status of a nonquota immigrant.

IMPORTATION OR TRANSPORTATION OF OBSCENE MATTERS

The bill (S. 2811) to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1462. Importation or transportation of obscene matters.

"Whoever brings into the United States, or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or knowingly deposits with any express company or other common carrier, for carriage in interstate or foreign commerce—

"(a) any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, motion-picture film, paper, letter, writing, print, or other matter of indecent character; or

"(b) any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy phonograph recording, electrical transcription, or other article or thing capable of producing sound; or

"(c) any drug, medicine, article, or thing designed, adapted, or intended for preventing conception, or producing abortion, or for any indecent or immoral use; or any written or printed card, letter, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind giving information, directly or indirectly, where, how, or of whom, or by what means any of such mentioned articles, matters, or things, may be obtained or made; or

"Whoever knowingly takes from such express company or other common carrier any matter or thing the depositing of which for carriage is herein made unlawful—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 71 of such title, immediately preceding section 1461, is amended by striking out the item "1462. Importation or transportation of obscene litera-

ture.", as set out in such analysis, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "1462. Importation or transportation of obscene matters."

TRANSPORTATION OF OBSCENE MATTER IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2812) to prohibit the transportation of obscene matter in interstate or foreign commerce, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the analysis of chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately after and underneath item 1464, as contained in such analysis, the following new item:

"1465. Transportation of obscene matters for sale or distribution."

SEC. 2. Chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately following section 1464 of such chapter, a new section, to be designated as section 1465, and to read as follows:

"§ 1465. Transportation of obscene matters for sale or distribution.

"Whoever knowingly transports in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of sale or distribution, any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, film, paper, letter, writing, print, silhouette, drawing, figure, image, cast, phonograph recording, electrical transcription or other article capable of producing sound, or any other matter of indecent or immoral character, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"The transportation as aforesaid of two or more copies of any publication or two or more of any article of the character described above, or a combined total of five such publications and articles, shall be presumptive evidence that such publications or articles are intended for sale or distribution, but such presumption shall be rebuttable.

"When any person is convicted of a violation of this act, the court in its judgment of conviction may, in addition to the penalty prescribed, order the confiscation and disposal of such items described herein which were found in the possession or under the immediate control of such person at the time of his arrest."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of this measure.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill, like the bill next preceding it on the calendar, deals with the transportation of lewd or obscene matter. By existing law, the transportation of obscene matter through either the mails or by common carrier, or the importation of such matter, is prohibited. However, the present law does not make it a crime to transport obscene matter by private vehicle. Traffickers in obscene matter take advantage of this loophole in the law. Enactment of this bill would close the loophole.

The bill would make it a crime to knowingly transport in interstate commerce, for the purpose of sale or distribution, any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, film, paper, letter, writing, print, silhouette, drawing, figure, image, cast, phonograph recording, electrical transcription or other article capable of producing sound, or any other matter of indecent or immoral character. The bill also provides that transportation of two or more copies of any publication or two or more of any article of the character described above, or a combined total of five such publications and articles, shall be presumptive evidence that such publications or articles are intended for sale or distribution. However, the bill makes this a rebuttable presumption.

Creation of some such presumption was deemed necessary in order to facilitate enforcement of the proposed law. The question has been raised whether the creation of this presumption is constitutional. In the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada, it is a constitutional provision; and I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this is not a conclusive presumption, but one which can be overcome by showing extenuating circumstances, if such circumstances exist.

I am informed that the objection has been raised that this proposed law is a bad law because it would be possible to "frame" an innocent person by placing certain obscene matter in his possession without his knowledge, as for instance, putting such obscene matter in his luggage or slipping it into one of his pockets. Of course, it might be possible to do this. However, that is no argument against the proposed law, which has a very salutary purpose. There are many penal statutes under which innocent persons could be framed, but that is no reason for repealing such statutes. To cite just one example, which is, perhaps, a good illustration, it would be possible to frame an innocent person by placing counterfeit money or counterfeit coins or counterfeit revenue stamps in his pocket or in his luggage; but that is no reason to repeal the laws against counterfeiting.

Senators will note that the offense which would be constituted by this bill involves knowingly transporting obscene material. The transportation which constitutes presumptive evidence of intention to sell or distribute such material must be knowing transportation. If we are going to enact a law on this subject—and such a law should be enacted—I do not know how it can be made any clearer, or afford any more protection to innocent persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

JULIUS ELZAS

The bill (S. 2934) for the relief of Julius Elzas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Julius Elzas, of A 42 Kamerik, The Netherlands, the sum of $242.64, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him as the result of the taking of his automobile by American soldiers in Nice, France, on or about August 30, 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.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 75) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which was read, as follows:

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

A-4048507, Alvarez, Jose Gonzalez.
A-2095740, Arrighi, Arrigo.
A-4648315, Augustine, Albert Gustave.
A-6872585, Ballingall, William.
A-4582467, Barriero, Modesto, or Modesto Barriero Pereiras.
A-4761012, Baxter, Mary (nee Mary Ramsay or Mary Robertson).
A-6844274, Beaumont, Richard Louis.
A-1209360, Bernd, Karl Johan, or Carl Johan Bernd.
A-3220706, Bokwa, Josef.
A-5429061, Bouma, Anna (Anna Novak) (nee Anna Vojtova).
A-4238831, Bronk, Margaret Elizabeth (nee Blackwell).
A-5940317, Brown, David Emanuel.
A—6262197, Calengas, Leonardos Petros, or Leonardos Kalengas.
A-6052567, Chang Shou-Lien, or Sheldon Shou-Lien Chang.
A-6172679, Chiotelis, Anna, or Anna Hiotelis (nee Anna Hadjinicolaou).
A-4337869, Chow, David Ta Wei, or Chow Ta Wei or David T. W. Chow.
A—4587482, De Gonzalez, Carmen Pardo, or Carmen Pardo Vda De Vega.
A-5346987, De Putter, Theodule Joseph, or George De Putter.
A-3526012, De Regt, Leendert, or Leo De Reget or Leo De Regt.
A-3884367, Divitcoff, Petre George, or Petros Georgios Divitcoff.
A-5081920, Drechsler, Karl.
A-5724435, Espeneda, Nellie (nee Scholes aka Nellie Peterson or Nellie Perry or Nellie Churchill).
A-6788094, Fieber, George John.
A-5906975, Fong, Wone, or Fong Wone or Harry Wone or Rev. Harry Wone.
A-6960675, Gomez-Diaz, Parfirio, or Porfirio Gomez-Madina.
A-4709443, Grenoski, Joseph Frank, or Frank Stroda or Franzisek Grenowski or Frank Grenowski.
A-6083456, Herman, Josephine Moreno.
A-5164076, Jasnoch, Felix Bruno or Jassnoch.
A-5422397, Johansson, Nils Sigvard, or Nils Hohansson or "Nick" Johansson.
A-9618508, Johnson, John Moore.
A-9702404, Knutsen, Bernt Mathias.
A-6262159, Koufoudakis, Aristides Dimitrios.
A-6245684, Koufoudakis, Eftihia Aristides.
A-6843908, Larsen, Sigurd.
A-6743645, Lee, Anna Dorothy.
A-5924981, Lefert, Joseph Emil.
A-5829039, Lettsome, Ellen Rebecca, or Ellen Rebecca Jennings.
A-4769464, Lettsome, Hueroy Alpheous, or Hugh Roy Lettsome "Angel."
A-5931974, Lolax, Einar William, or Einar Lolax.
A-6261601, Lucas, Vaia Stamati (nee Asime).
A-4580115, Luzzi, Domenico.
A-4052215, Makritzky, Alexander Edward or Makritsky or Makrickits or Makricki or Mokricki or Makrickys.
A-3764722, Makritzky, Michalina Maria.

A–1074052, Mallis, Antonios Apostolis.
A–4869382, Marshall, George Falkner.
A–1793554, Migliore, Caterina (nee Dionigi or Catherine Migliore or Leonarda Savoiardo or Saviordo or Guiseppa Bagarella).
A–1783420, Migliore, Anthony, or Antionino or Antonino Migliore or Salvatore Migliore or Antonino Joseph Migliore.
A–2307727, Migliore Rose, or Rosa Migliore or Guiseppa Migliore or Rose Mary Migliore.
A—2155981, Min, Ng Yick, or Ng Yik Nin, or Eng Yick Min.
A–9190465, Morfessis, Telemachos (alias Telemachos Morfessis).
A–7118357, Muller, Carl Christian Frederick Vilhelm, or Carl Fred Lem or Carl Fred Muller Lem.
A–3993801, Nevarez-Alarcon, Ninfa.
A–1959816, Nigo-Gonzalez, Leonardo, or Leon Nigo.
A–6795961, Noakes, Romkje Anna.
A–6972143, Ojeda, Domingo.
A–6972142, Ojeda, Manuel.
A–4793221, Paraskevopulos, Peter Kostas (alias Peter Kostas Parras).
A–5967020, Patronas, Minas.
A–5678915, Peavey, Fred Washington, or Fred W. Peavey.
A–5648749, Perry, Amy Jane (nee Donaldson).
A–3316027, Petersen, Alice Marie.
A–6664488, Peterson, Dorothy (nee Arron or Dorothy Lewis).
A–3800060, Petrone, Domenico, or Dominick alias Leonardo Ricciardi.
A–5642085, Piovesan, Vittorio Giovanni.
A–4683822, Propst, Anna (nee Perrault or Ethel Georgeanna Perrault Propst).
A–6768116, Puhansky, Joseph.
A–6767390, Pustelnik, Stefan Pawel.
A–4996573, Rausch, Eva (nee Bieler or Evette Rausch or Chawa or Ewa Bieler).
A–3392003, Reyes, Jose Billegas.
A–4461206, Roland, Elizabeth Allen (nee Allen).
A–6138932, Rosario, Maximo.
A–7044243, Rose, Maria Alexandra.
A–6392231, Salgado, Jorge, or Jorge Salgado-Rodriguez.
A–6868037, Sandoval-Silva, Epitasio.
A–4721106, Schachter, Herman Max.
A–6344539, Schulhof, Bernard or Bernat.
A–4671903, Seeber, Eugene John.
A–6735481, Sikaras, Helen (nee Martoulas or Helen Stelios Martoulas).
A–5045298, Silver, Isidore aka Icko Iola, or Izzo or Izzi or Icek or Itcko Igla.
A–5970137, Simmonds, Delia Hortencia.
A–1170976, Simone, Tommaso (also Thomas Simone).
A–1904276, Skordas, Lambros.
A–6958757, Smith, Emma Maria Valdes (nee Valdes).
A–1701220, Stathapoulos, Stephanos, or Steve Stathes.
A–4640449, Stettler, Emma (nee Emma Sbaschnig).
A–6097430, Stevens, Peggy Joan (nee McCartney).
A4510827, Taberlet, Fred Romolo, or Romolo Taberlet.
A–6817646, Touliatos, John.
A–5138238, Tronrud, John, or John Wilhelm Tronrud.
A–1161491, Tschinkowitz, Valentin, or Walter Bayer.
A–4398037, Vaz, Manuel Viegas.
A–6921094, Warwick, William.
A–3263373, Weissgarber, Barbara (nee Spanier).
A–3263372, Weissgarber, Nikolaus.
A–4634372, Wolff, Hedwig Sadie (nee Schauer).
A–6172745, Zakos, Sophie Kretekos, or Sophie Kretekos (nee Perides).
A–6318230, Zachou, Theodota (nee Theodota Goussi).
A–5074052, Zaremsky, Isaac, or Zarebski or Zarembsky.
A–C905274, Just, Reinhard.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada whether the individuals involved in this concurrent resolution, and those involved in the next one on the calendar, order of business 1315, were investigated separately and independently?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, to the best of its ability, the staff of the committee went into each individual case involved in these measures. I am not saying that that is as careful a screening as might be brought about, but let us remember that each of these cases is first screened by the Department of Justice, and then it comes to the committee. Under the law the cases must come to Congress if they are to be deferred from deportation. We do the very best we can with the cases we have to deal with. We take each individual case and go into it, assign members of the staff to make a study of it, and bring to our task everything in the way of proof that we can reach out and get. That is also carried out by the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, I do not like these measures, and I have so stated time and again on the floor of the Senate. I am sorry they are here, but the law puts them in our hands, and we are doing the best we can with them. I believe the persons are screened as carefully as they can be, under the circumstances.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I presume that the individuals covered in these bulk concurrent resolutions, as I would describe them, receive exactly the same treatment as individuals provided for in private, individual bills, do they not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, I think that can safely be said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to, as follows:

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

A–5291156, Becerra, Jose Guadalupe.
A–2960766, Bianco, Anthony Lo.
A–6336755, Cochran, Graham Rayman, or Graham Reginald Boske.
A–4600090, Colantonio, Michele.
A–6592617, Conran, Judy Lynne.
A–1265760, Cumelia, Raymond, or Raimondo Cumella.
A–9771239, Giatrakos, Elefterios.
A–4426384, Ginararis, Avgerinos George.
A–6721979, Klimenko-Gurewska, Helene (now Helen Kuntz).
A–4757164, Koesling, Grete Hedwig.
A–2246831, Lam, Carolina Han Fang Wang (alias Carolina Han Fang Wang Lim).
A–4088687, Liu, Len Hee (alias Len Hee Lee or Liu Hen Hee).
A–9776877, Loolam, August Reginald.
A–3894104, Mavrakis, Stratos Antoniou.
A–1536223, Merani, Giobatta Alessandro, or Emilio Giobatta Merani, or Emilio G. Merani.
A–5438346, Mitchell, Aurelia.
A–4751973, Oh, Sydney Bah, or Sydney Scott Bahoh.
A–4691270, Rodrigues, Jose.
A–1371419, Rupa, Amir Bin.
A–3171881, Schneider, Victor.
A–7145695, Squazza, Assunta, or Assunta Giungi.
A–7145696, Squazza, Fernanda, or Fernanda Giungi.
A–5242646, Teijeiro, Olegario, or Olegario Teijeiro Garcia.
A–6062104, Young, Virginia Josephine.
A–4490814, Cividanes, Jesus Vieiro.

ANNA SAMUDOVSKI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1929) for the relief of Anna Samudovski, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "the", to insert "alien", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Anna Samudovsky who is presently residing in Malcicebe, Czechoslovakia, and who has been adopted by Dr. and Mrs. John M. Rinda, of Bridgeport, Conn., shall be deemed to be the alien child of said Dr. and Mrs. John M. Rinda.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. MINDA MOORE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1798) for the relief of Mrs. Minda Moore, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to insert "$4,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Minda Moore, of 578 Forrest Avenue, Rye, N. Y., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as the result of an accident which occurred when the United States Army bus in which she was riding was forced off the road by a United States Army truck in Nuremberg, Germany, on April 22, 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 amendment was agreed to.

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

WILLIAM ALFRED BEVAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2308) for the relief of William Alfred Bevan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, William Alfred Bevan, minor adopted son of Frederick W. Bevan, a citizen of the United States and his wife, Margarita Llacer Bevan, shall be

deemed to be the alien natural-born child of said Frederick W. Bevan and his wife, Margarita Llacer Bevan.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MARTIN ALBRECHT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2393) for the relief of Martin Albrecht, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Martin Albrecht shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence on June 18, 1949, 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 in which such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. EVELYN M. HRYNIAK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2655) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak, of Cleveland, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, pain and suffering, permanent disability, and loss of earnings sustained by her and arising out of an accident which occurred at Gudensberg, Germany, on October 21, 1948, while she was riding in an Army reconnaissance car, and against all officers, agents, or employees of the United States whose acts or omissions caused or contributed to the personal injuries, pain and suffering, permanent disability, and loss of earnings, sustained by the said Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak: *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.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I introduced this bill in behalf of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hryniak, a young lady from Cleveland, Ohio, who was injured in an accident in Germany. The claim which she made originally was for $10,000, and the committee has simply cut the amount in half, apparently on the recommendation of the Department of the Army. I quote from the report of the Army, as follows:

The Department of the Army, therefore, believes that Mrs. Hryniak should be compensated in a reasonable amount for the personal injuries sustained by her, the disfigurement resulting therefrom, and the medical, hospital and dental expenses incurred or that may be required as the result of her injury. The proposed award of $10,000 provided in S. 2655 appears to be somewhat excessive. Considering the age of the claimant at the time of her injury, the nature of the injuries sustained by her, which have left a marked degree of disfigurement and which may require plastic surgery, and the medical, hospital, and dental expenses incurred and to be incurred, it is the view of this Department that an award in an amount not exceeding the sum of $5,000 would constitute a fair and reasonable settlement for all of the damages sustained by the claimant as the result of this accident. The Department, accordingly, would have no objection to the enactment of this bill if it should be amended to provide for an award to the claimant in an amount not exceeding $5,000.

So far as I know, the committee simply took the recommendation of the Army. I have pictures which were taken of the girl before she was injured. They show her to have been an exceedingly pretty girl. The pictures which were taken after the accident show that her face has been permanently disfigured. Her nose was broken, and some teeth were broken. As the Secretary of the Army suggests, if anything like her former appearance is to be restored, she will require a series of operations to be performed by plastic surgery, which would not only be expensive, but extremely painful.

It seems to me that the committee has simply accepted the amount which the Army suggested, without any attempt to compromise the two points of view as to the amounts involved. Even on the report issued by the Department of the Army, it appears to me that the reduction which was made by the committee is somewhat excessive. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the committee would consider increasing the amount of the award.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is another case of an accident which took place outside the United States, for which reason the claimant cannot bring suit under the Federal tort claims act. The amount of payment provided has been reduced from $10,000 to $5,000 in line with the recommendations of the Department of the Army. The Army admits liability and there is no question about the fact that the claimant has been permanently disfigured about the face as a result of the accident.

As to the question of the committee's considering the amount to be awarded, I am willing to confess that the committee took the figures suggested by the Army. The photographs which the Senator from Ohio now has on his desk were not before the committee, and we were not fully advised in the matter. Certainly, so far as I am concerned, I would not object to increasing the amount of the award.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the report disclose whether the lady in question was riding on official business or was merely a licensee?

Mr. TAFT. The Army admits responsibility and that she was entitled to ride as a passenger. She was the wife of a serviceman and the Army undertook to see to it that she was transported. I do not know the exact circumstances.

Mr. ROBERTSON. She was not riding in the vehicle on official business?

Mr. TAFT. She is the wife of a serviceman.

Mr. President, I suggest that a reasonable compromise figure of $7,500 would be entirely satisfactory to me, if it is to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am willing to accept such an amendment, if the Senator is willing to offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the Chair). The Chair did not understand the statement of the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I offer an amendment to the amendment reported by the committee, providing that the figure of $5,000 be amended to read "$7,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, an amendment to the amendment of the committee to increase the amount from $5,000 to $7,500.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

CONSTANTIN E. ARAMESCU

The bill (S. 274) for the relief of Constantin E. Aramescu was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the arrival of Constantin E. Aramescu at the port of New York on April 29, 1948, as a transit visitor, shall be taken, deemed, and regarded as an arrival under the immigration laws for permanent residence in the United States: *Provided,* That, upon the approval of this act, one number shall be deducted from the Rumanian quota when such quota shall be available.

GEORGE A. VOREGARETHSOS (GEORGE SPIRO CHATMOS)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2277) for the relief of George A. Voregarethsos (George Spiro Chatmos), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, George A. Voregarethsos (George Spiro Chatmos), of Larsia Thiselia, Greece, the adopted son of Mr. and Mrs. George A. Voregarethsos, of Minot, N. Dak., shall be considered to be the alien child of Mr. and Mrs. George A. Voregarethsos, of Minot, N. Dak., citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MASAE MARUMOTO

The bill (S. 2427) for the relief of Masae Marumoto, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Masae Marumoto, the Japanese fiancée of Captain Harry Ost, of Fredonia, N. Dak., and that the said Masae Marumoto may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Masae Marumoto is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Captain Harry Ost, 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 the said Masae Marumoto, 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 that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Masae Marumoto, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Masae Marumoto as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

JACOB BROWN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1024) for the relief of Jacob Brown, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "such sum", to strike out "and interest."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

COMPACT RELATING TO THE WATERS OF THE CANADIAN RIVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3482), granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 9, after the word "States", to strike out "from the Department of the Interior."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert a statement on the bill at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this bill is noncontroversial.

The bill affects only three States—New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma—and interested officials of these three States unanimously agree on the desirability of this legislation.

H. R. 3482 gives congressional consent to the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico to negotiate a division of water of the Canadian River. This is necessary now because of the increased need for water conservation measures along the Texas portion of this stream.

The Canadian River is the only river of consequence in the whole vast area of the Texas Panhandle and south plains. Diminishing underground supplies of water have made it necessary for residents of the region to look to the Canadian River as their future salvation.

Naturally, Texans along the stream have no desire that any actions taken by them have an adverse effect upon the citizens of New Mexico on the west or Oklahoma on the east. We want to be able to meet together with our neighbors and negotiate a fair and just division of these precious waters. We are asking that Congress by giving its consent make it possible for us to enter into a compact.

The State officials of the affected States are strongly in favor of this compact.

The congressional representatives of the affected States are strongly in favor of this compact.

The compact has won the unanimous support of the House of Representatives. It has received the full support of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the Senate. It is entirely noncontroversial. I believe it should pass at this time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SALARIES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 4408) to amend the act approved May 27, 1924, entitled "An act to fix salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, United States Park Police force, and Fire Department of the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOLLY MANASSE

The bill (S. 593) for the relief of Solly Manasse was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Solly Manasse, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., the sum of $383, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred by him for necessary treatment of his teeth upon his release from 3½ years' incarceration by the Japanese as a prisoner of war: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The bill (S. 2872) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should very much appreciate an explanation of the purposes of the bill and the need for it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under existing law, the War Claims Commission is required to file a report with the President, for transmission to Congress, by March 31, 1950, covering the scope of the problem of war claims and recommendations as to the nature of claims which should be received. It was the intention of the Congress that this report should be the basis for possible future legislation.

Because the War Claims Commission was delayed in being activated, it is contended the deadline for this report comes too early. Members of the War Claims Commission appeared before the committee and urged an extension, and the committee felt that an extension of 3 months was reasonable. This bill provides that the report shall be filed not later than June 30, 1950.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, in line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "January 3, 1951" and insert "June 30, 1950.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 8, Public Law 896, Eightieth Congress, approved July 3, 1948, as amended, be further amended by striking out the words "March 31, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1950".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. GEORGETTE PONSARD

The bill (S. 2443) for the relief of Mrs. Georgette Ponsard was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration and naturalization laws which exclude from admission into the United States persons of the Japanese race, shall not be held to apply to Mrs. Georgette Ponsard, the wife of Paul Ponsard, who is residing in Mexico City, Mexico.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 78) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to, as follows:

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

A-9573883, Albertsen, Erik Albertus, or Erik Albertus Albertson.

A-4769516, Amey, Herbert Augustus.

A-5884856, Andor, Frank, or Francisc Andor.

A-6007541, Avalos, Jesus Flores.

A-4874684, Bailey, William Nathaniel.

A-6447786, Balot, Francisco.

A-5067439, Barker, Ethel (nee Beesley).

A-4084313, Barton, Beatrice Ethel Gwendolyn (nee Linton, formerly Demarest).
A-6790371, Basarow, Eduard.
A-1670554, Boikos, Alexandros, or Aleck or Alex Boikos.
A-6920650, Borowicz, Jeannine, or Jeanine Borowiecz.
A-6200606, Bradley, Dominga (nee Hipolito).
A-4198712, Brodauf, Lina Agnes (nee Pohler).
A-4812080, Brokos, Georgios or George.
A-6354831, Burgess, Mary Fraser (nee Fraser).
A-6838464, Camarena-Limon, Pedro, or Jose or Pedro Kliman.
A-4545624, Campbell, Allan George.
A-5618539, Candela, Filippo, or Vincenzo Di Bella or Phillip Candela.
A-4668883, Candela, Providenza (nee Providenza Di Bella).
A-6268383, Caracostis, Evangelos.
A-6227082, Cardaris, Catherine or Katherine (nee Glavas).
A-6688784, Cazabon, John Charles.
A-6868119, Chavez-Perez, Venancio.
A-5959131, Christian, Hilda Juanita.
A-3134485, Christoff, Stoina.
A-7632246, Chung, Sylvia Ssu-Yi Liang, or Sylvia Chang nee Liang or Chang Liang Ssu-Yi or Ssu-Yi Liang or Chung.
A-6172766, Collios, Hariklia, or Hariklia Gallinis or Hariklia Pappanicolaou.
A-6489042, Connell Dalia Philomene, or Dalia or Dahlia Magetti.
A-3208736, Coray, Claudine Helene (nee Wiesmann).
A-6754556, Crisan, John George Julius, or Ioan Gheorghe Iuliu Crisan.
A-6700029, Cristobal, Juan Urbino, or Johnny or Chris Cristobal.
A-4034158, Crovetto, Andrea, or Andrew Crovetto.
A-6838471, Cruz, Guillermo.
A-6817782, Cruz-Ortega, Narcizo.
A—3919865, De Caballero, Luisa Guerra.
A-4988558, De Carpio, Teresa Torralva, or Teresa Falcon or Teresa Falcon Zamora or Teresa Torralva or Teresa Torralva De Zamora.
A-3016147, De Luca, Stanislao, or Stanley De Luca.
A-7626818, De McClure, Griselda Jaimes.
A-4518876, Discart, Marie Morren.
A-2530651, Dmitrasinovich, Stojan Bude, or Steve Dmitrich.
A-5735677, De Duarte, Adela Leon.
A-6768535, Duggan, Linda Jane Rosa.
A-3948402, Dunne, Hop Hee.
A-6688424, Ebanks; George Robert.
A—6455581, Eugenios, Markos.
A-6482570, Farkas, Armin.
A-6743248, Farnes, George Theodore, or George T. Farnes.
A-5532334, Finkel, Samuel Abraham.
A-6903401, Fisher, Josephine Thelma.
A-6742832, Frugone, Oretta Caterina, or Oretta Frugone Kuwana.
A-2680057, Gam, Moi Nguk, or Nguk Gam Moi.
A-6095599, Gee, Quan Dong, or Quan Yew Moon.
A-5501035, Gentile, Atanasio.
A-4126913, George, Eduardo, or Eppoletta Edward George.
A-4702644, Giankopoulos, Christos Lazarou or Yankopoulos.
A-6198514, Gladych, Boleslaw Michael, or Michael Gladych.
A-2896461, Gomez, Domingo Garcia, or Domingo Garcia.
A-6798463, Gonzales-Cardenas, Santana.
A-6877467, Gonzalez-Quintero, Inez.
A-5634981, Goranson, Carl Emil.
A—6425998, Grant, Herman Josiah.
A-4386180, Green, Sarah (nee Marshall or Edelstein).
A-3596701, Greenberg-Shaffer, Rachel, or Rachel Shaffer-Greenberg (nee Brott).
A-6921390, Guigli, Doriana Mary.
A-4980618, Guzman, Maria Modesta Cancholla, or Maria Cancholla Munoz or Modesta Maria Cancholla Silva.
A-4957912, Haberl, Max (alias Walter Schoen or Max Walter Schoen).
A-1854073, Heras, Vasilios John.
A-5505487, Herman, Pesia Gitkis.
A-6878607, Hong-Tuan, Dominique, Anne Marie.
A-5444715, Honig, Paul (alias Paul Hoenig, alias Hoenig, alias Hoenigue, alias Paul Montefiore).
A-6018692, Hudziec, Ernest Rudolph.
A-6018691, Hudziec Hedwig (nee Jadwiga Kumeczko).
A-6781685, Hughes, Desmond Connell.
A-6280991, Jahrblum, Beila, (nee Reichenthal, alias Beila Heart, alias Blanche Heart).
A-6280992, Jahrblum, Herz Naftali (alias Henry Norman Heart).
A-6860811, Jaquez, Manuel, or Manuel Jaquez Martinez.
A-5133204, Jorgensen, Peter Gunerius.
A-1129695, Joseph, Freidrich, or Josef Deutsch.
A-2679918, Kalomaris, Gerasimos Peter, or Jerry Kalomaris.
A-3650178, Karalis, Chresanthy or Chrisanthe (nee Chrysanthe John Kosmethes).
A-2127097, Katorsky, Hugo Ernest.
A-4042289, Kindness, Christina (nee Gunn).
A-5065236, Kontacostas, Kostas, or Gus Kontos.
A-6897613, Kudszus, Wolfgang Peter, or Peter Kudszus.
A-7577098, Kui, Ng.
A-6753353, Law, Fred, or Law Fook or Fook Law.
A-7589792, Lawrence, Percy James, or Cyril Lawrence.
A-3827794, Lee, Chin Shee, or Lee Fung Thin or Chin Leu Gay or Shin Wai King.
A-1492567, Lopez, Rafael Duarte, or Rafael Lopez-Duarte or Rafael Lopez or Raphael Lopez or Ralph Lopez.
A-6815956, Low, Phyllis Eva (nee Eng or Sue Yook Eng).
A-5623265, Luehr, Walter Adolph Georg.
A-6458411, Luppi, Enrico.
A-6458423, Luppi, Giovanni.
A-6498267, Lyden, Hazel Mae (nee Chunn).
A-2047098, Lyras, Stavros Aristides.
A-1545542, Maisus, Jewel.
A-6210531, Martinez-Rivera, Juvenal, or Juan Martinez.
A-7523598, Mau, Wei-Hui Huang, or Wei-Hui Huang.
A-5755020, Medovich, Ralph or Antonio or Anthony.
A-4720871, Mendez, Jesus Valdez.
A-4588008, Mithalopoulos, Nicholas, or Nicholas Michalopoulos.
A-2980169, Monasterio-Sagasti, Leon, or Leon Monasterio or Sagasti Leon Monasterio.
A-6868195, Montelongo-Gonzalez, Santiago.
A-6458231, Murillo, Manuel, or Manuel Sermeno.
A-9690675, Nagtegaal, Johannes Christianus.
A-2387838, Nahm, Alice.
A-5901303, Nahm, Doris.
A-2387837, Nahm, Jakob, or Jacob Nahm.
A-3478388, Neisloss, Jecheskilis, or Ezekiel Schloss or Ezekial or E. Schloss.
A-5520936, Nicholas, Demetrius, or James Nicholas Samaras.
A-5874844, Palero, Raffaele, or Ralph Polera (alias Frank Ciraco).
A-4382193, Papadopoulos, Stelios, or Stylianos or Papazoulos, Stanley, or Papas or Pappas, Steve.
A-2103213, Pashalis, Anthony Demetrios.
A-6083580, Pauly, Anabelle Jane.
A-6083578, Pauly, Catalina Aviles.
A-6083579, Pauly, Howard John.
A-6759939, Percel, Henry Oliver.
A-2105178, Petrecca, Giovanni (John), or Giovain Petric.
A-7005288, Pistolakis, Nicholas Stelianos.
A-6362653, Plasencia-Ortega, Ernesto (also Ernest Plasencia).
A-6286715, Porras, Reyes.
A-1666793, Puccioni, Otello, or Nino Gini or Adolfo Dovicchi.
A-4921273, Pulido-Estrada, Martin.
A-4528502, Quong, Rose, or Quong Ru-Ssu.
A-1298028, Reid, Joseph George Menzie.
A-5185918, Reid, Reginald Sinclair.
A-5453164, Rendon-Benavides, Olaya.
A-6435783, Rivas, Carmen Natalia.
A-6428426, Rivas, Josefina Elena.
A-6428425, Rivas, Jr., Victor Manuel.
A-4395138, Rod, Olaf, Martinson.
A-5151512, Ruppert, David, or Davidas Rapoportas or David Rapaport.
A-6827870, Rusciano, Constantino.
A-6774663, Salaney, Dorothy Augusta.
A-6924331, Salovardos, Stamatios Konstantinos.
A-4604542, Sapata, Alfredo De Pinho, or Alfredo Pinho Sapata.
A-9801198, Saul, Lembit.
A-5435509, Schanabel, August Josef.
A-5524716, Scopetani, Luigi.
A-6016388, Seleman, George.
A-1489980, Shultz, Charles, or Karls Alksne or Karlis Alksinis.
A-1552469, Silva, Leandro Tavares, or Leandro Tavares or Leandro Silva or Leandro Tavo.
A-6245223, Skias, Maria (nee Misigi or Maria G. Skias or Maria J. Missigi).
A-6716198, Simmonds, Claude Hubert.
A-5953790, Simmonds, Leona.
A-4343933, Stamatiou, Constantinos.
A-2823759, Stratis, John Stefanos.
A-6928185, Theofiles, Nicholas George, or Nick George Theofiles.
A-2252841, Torbarina, Sam, or Sime Torbarino.
A-3164059, Tountasakis, Nicolaos, or Nick or Nicholas Tountasakis or Nick Totisikis.
A-4506013, Tracy, George Courtenay.
A-6756001, Trujillo, Liliane Maria (nee Medina).
A-1996713, Tsagaris, Evangelos, or Angelo Twagris.
A-5047368, Tsolainos, Theodore Panaghiotis.
A-4492389, Ulfers, Frederick Adolf Emil (alias Frederick Ulfers alias Frederick Schaefer).
A-3309666, Ullah, Joban, or Abdul Aziz.
A-6324738, Urzua-Lopez, Manuel, or Miguel Urzua-Lopez.
A-2478333, Valino, Manuel Romay.
A-5244850, Varela, Roman Pardo, or Ramon Pardo Varela or Raymond Pardo Varela or Varella.
A-6990518, Velarde, Juana.
A-7787924, Viada, Angel Gabriel Patricio or Gimenez.
A-7787904, Viada, Pilar (nee Fernandez, also known as Berman and Ferrer).
A-3487602, Wagner, Eddie, or Andrzej Zielas or Andrew Zielas.
A-4961294, Wegner, Max John.
A-6855170, Zambrano-Serrano, Carlos.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4800) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral interests, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over at this time. I am not sure I have objection to it, but there is some information I should like to obtain.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have prepared a short statement in explanation of the bill. I headed the subcommittee which considered the matter and

went into it very thoroughly. There are quite a few Senators interested in the bill because it covers land in 38 different States. The bill seeks to establish a policy, which I shall explain. Will the Senator withhold his objection for a while?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I withhold my objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, House bill 4800 establishes a nationally sound, equitable, and uniform policy for transferring Government-reserved mineral rights to the present landowners. I desire to point out to Senators that the measure relates only to mineral rights retained by the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in the disposal of farm lands acquired pursuant to agricultural improvement and agricultural credit programs. Lands purchased under title 3 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act and permanently retired from production, and lands acquired pursuant to the laws permitting the liquidation of wartime labor camps, are specifically excluded.

This proposed legislation has been prompted by the following history: Prior to 1946, certain agricultural lands were acquired by two Government agencies, the old Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration; these lands were acquired for resale to farmers. They were sold with all or a major part of the minerals reserved to the Government. Moreover, during this period a Government-owned corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, followed the same policy in disposing of agricultural lands which it had acquired in the course of its farm lending operations. With, however, the enactment of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, the policy was changed by the Congress with respect to the disposal by the Agriculture Department of farm lands of the type I have mentioned.

In other words, in all Government sales after 1946 the persons who purchased the land acquired all the mineral rights. The purpose of the present measure is simply to put all farm owners, or people who purchase that land in the same category. That is all the bill seeks to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement I prepared on House bill 4800 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MINERAL RIGHTS BILL, H. R. 4800

Mr. President, H. R. 4800, establishes a nationally sound, equitable and uniform policy for transferring Government-reserved mineral rights to the present landowners. I desire to point out to Senators that the measure relates only to mineral rights retained by the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in the disposal of farm lands acquired pursuant to agricultural improvement and agricultural credit programs. Lands purchased under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act and permanently retired from production, and lands acquired pursuant to the laws permitting the liquidation of wartime labor camps, are specifically excluded.

This proposed legislation has been prompted by the following history: Prior to 1946, certain agricultural lands were acquired by two Government agencies, the old Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration; these lands were acquired for resale to farmers. They were sold with all or a major part of the minerals reserved to the Government. Also during this period a Government-owned corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, followed the same policy in disposing of agricultural lands which it had acquired in the course of its farm-lending operations. With, however, the enactment of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, the policy was changed by the Congress with respect to the disposal by the Agriculture Department of farm lands of the type I have mentioned. In this latter connection, Mr. President, section 9 of the 1946 Farmers Home Administration Act provides that: "Any conveyance of real estate by the Government or any Government agency under this chapter shall include the mineral rights." Thus the Farmers Home Administration, successor to the old Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration, now follows the policy of divesting the Government's ownership in the minerals as well as the surface rights whenever farm lands acquired under certain agricultural programs are resold to farmers. Recently the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, in disposing of mineral interests reserved by it in the course of its farm-finance operations, has been following essentially the same policy as is incorporated in the bill now before us.

The pending legislation, Mr. President, seeks only to grant relief to those farmers who, under the agricultural programs I have just mentioned, purchased lands prior to 1946 from the Department of Agriculture and from the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. H. R. 4800 will enable these farmers to obtain ownership of all minerals under their lands, and thereby will put them in the same status as farmers who acquired lands after passage of the 1943 act. This bill does not give the mineral rights to the present landowners; it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell these rights to the landowners, upon receipt of their written applications. In areas where the Secretary of Agriculture determines that there is no active mineral development or leasing, the bill establishes a nominal sale price of $1 per application; in areas where there is active mineral development and leasing, the mineral interests shall be sold at "the fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary or appropriate." The bill further provides that in determining whether or not there is active mineral development in an area, the Secretary shall consult with the Department of the Interior and competent local authorities.

In this measure, Mr. President, the burden is placed on the present landowner to make application to the Secretary of Agriculture for conveyance of the mineral interests. Only private persons who, at the time of the application, are owners of the surface of the land may apply, and the landowner must establish title to the surface ownership at his own expense.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in reporting this legislation favorably, has recommended that the bill be amended to provide that if any mineral interests covered by this measure have not been disposed of by the Secretary of Agriculture within 7 years from the effective date of the legislation, or within 7 years from the date of acquisition of the mineral interests by the United States, whichever date is the later, title to such mineral interests shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for administration under the applicable Federal mineral statutes. This amendment was recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, but with a 5-year time limitation; however, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recommended the 7-year period in the bill now before the Senate.

All proceeds of mineral interests sales authorized under this bill are to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. An exception is made in the case of proceeds from sales of mineral interests which were a part of or derived from the assets transferred pursuant to the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations. These receipts shall be credited to the appropriate corporation account. Likewise, proceeds from sales of mineral interests by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation are to remain in the Corporation. I might state that the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation is wholly owned by the United States Government.

Section 8 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act. The Secretary of Agriculture estimates that approximately $65,000 will be required to administer the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, H. R. 4800 was approved by the House of Representatives on June 20, 1949. A Senate Agriculture and Forestry Subcommittee, of which I served as chairman, held open hearings on the bill last March. Representatives of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Justice presented the views of their respective departments. The distinguished Senator from Indiana, Mr. CAPEHART, and a number of Congressmen also testified. All of the testimony received by the subcommittee was favorable to the enactment of the bill. The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the measure's adoption. In a letter dated October 14, 1949, and addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with respect to a similar bill (S. 2104), the Secretary of Agriculture states as follows:

"The disposal of existing mineral interests under the administration of the Farmers Home Administration and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to the best advantage of the United States is of major concern and it is urgent that this Department be given directions by the Congress for the disposal of the mineral interests. S. 2104 contains a consistent, uniform policy for the disposal of the mineral interests and would resolve the problems involved in the existing mineral interests held by these agencies. For these reasons, we recommend its immediate enactment provided the suggested amendment for transferring unsold minerals to the Department of the Interior is included."

I submit, Mr. President, that this is a worthy bill, one that is deserving of early and favorable action by the Senate. I hope that it can be approved today by unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana I am inclined to think I shall agree to the bill at a later date.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator consent to let the bill go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would not be able to obtain the information which I am seeking in time for that. The reason I objected to the bill at this time is that I have been given to understand that the Government acquired these mineral rights on the farm lands which it purchased, and that in selling the farm lands to the farmers again it withheld the mineral rights prior to 1946.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But it has been called to my attention that certain mineral rights in oil-producing areas which they did acquire have been sold privately, and I want to follow through those sales

to know how they were handled. In other words, while the Government sold the land to the farmers, a portion of the mineral rights have since been sold privately.

Mr. ELLENDER. By the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By the Government to certain interests. I want to check that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the Senator is misinformed. The bill does not apply to that land at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to carry it over at this time to obtain information about that matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will go over.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 10 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

The bill (S. 3105) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This is a matter, Mr. President, in which I have no personal interest whatever. The Federal Reserve Board faces the necessity of building more new branches and improving some existing banking installations. We were informed that it was of very urgent necessity to increase the Board's building fund, because the Board had had no building program since before the war. The committee decided to reduce, by the substitute amendments or additional amendments reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, which I ask to have called up, the authorization from $25,000,000 to $20,000,000, and the committee places the following restrictions:

That such construction shall be of simple design, shall be deferred unless urgently needed for the efficient and economical operation of the branch, and, in determining the time of construction, consideration shall be given to the matter of relieving local unemployment.

The amendment reducing the amount from $25,000,000 to $20,000,000 and the amendment respecting restrictions, I ask to be considered. I ask the Senate's attention to the fact that the board proposes to spend its own money in this construction program. Certainly the Federal Reserve bank is doing a very wonderful job, and if it does not have banking facilities it sems to me we should authorize an amount sufficient to provide them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if what the Senator from Virginia states is all that is in the additional amendments reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency then I certainly would have no objection to the bill. I will say I have not read it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assumed my colleague would not have any objection when he heard the statement. I can assure him that is everything that is in the bill. The amendments were proposed by our great economy advocate, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is on the floor, and who can give the Senator double assurance that that is all that is in the amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is not necessary. The assurance of the Senator from Virginia is sufficient for me.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the amendments referred to by the Senator from Virginia permit the expenditure of the money according to the needs of the Federal Reserve rather than according to the needs of the community for labor?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The purpose of the substitute amendments is to change the original committee amendment, which only permitted the Board to build in order to relieve unemployment. As now amended, if the construction is absolutely needed, the Board can proceed with it, but these additional matters must be borne in mind.

Mr. BRICKER. There is now before the Senate the substitute offered by the Senator from Virginia for the measure as reported by the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The substitute was adopted by the committee. It is a committee substitute, and I accepted it.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3105) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, in line 7, after the figures "$25,000,000", to insert a semicolon and the following: "and by adding at the end of said paragraph the following: *'And provided further*, That such construction shall be of simple design, shall be deferred unless urgently needed for the efficient and economical operation of the branch, and shall be undertaken only when it will assist in relieving local unemployment' ", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso contained in the ninth paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 522), is hereby further amended by striking out "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000,000"; and by adding at the end of said paragraph the following: *"And provided further*, That such construction shall be of simple design, shall be deferred unless urgently needed for the efficient and economical operation of the branch, and shall be undertaken only when it will assist in relieving local unemployment."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first additional amendment of the committee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 7 it is proposed to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000,000."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second of the additional amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment beginning with the semicolon in line 7, it is proposed to insert the following: "; and by adding at the end of said paragraph the following: *'And provided further*, That such construction shall be of simple design, shall be deferred unless urgently needed for the efficient and economical operation of the branch, and, in determining the time of construction, consideration shall be given to the matter of relieving local unemployment'."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 3105) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2943) to liberalize the lending policies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of the Federal Reserve Banking System in favor of independent small-business enterprises; to adjust the registration provisions of the Securities Exchange Act, as amended, in order to enable independent small-business concerns to issue securities at a reasonable cost; to develop the productive facilities of the national economy; to further the interest of independent small-business enterprises; to provide for the appointment of a Small Business Coordinator; and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LEASE OF LANDS BY JOE GRAHAM POST, NO. 119, AMERICAN LEGION

The bill (H. R. 33) to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the land conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE TO GOODYEAR AIRCRAFT CORP. OF AN EASEMENT IN ARIZONA

The bill (S. 3122) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, an easement for sewer purposes in, over, and across certain Government-owned lands situated in Maricopa County, Ariz., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., at such locations and under such terms and conditions as he may consider appropriate, a perpetual easement for sewage purposes in, over, and across a parcel of land constituting a portion of the naval air facility, Litchfield Park, Ariz., being located in Maricopa County, Ariz., acquired by the United States by deed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting by and through War Assets Administration, dated December 31, 1948, recorded in the land records of Maricopa

County, Ariz., in Docket No. 323 on pages 456 to 461, inclusive, which deed is on file in the Navy Department.

TRANSFER OF SURPLUS LAND IN FORT LEWIS MILITARY RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 5101) to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Washington, I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon would agree to have the bill placed at the foot of the calendar, until we can send word to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill goes to the foot of the calendar.

ARMY INSTITUTE OF PATHOLOGY BUILDING

The bill (H. R. 6539) to amend Public Law 626, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Army Institute of Pathology Building was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTION OF RURAL POST-OFFICE CARRIERS FOR LONGEVITY OF SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 6553), to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural-delivery service in recognition of longevity of service was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation, particularly as to the amounts involved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is here, and is a member of that committee. I assume that he can explain the bill.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, this bill is, designed to afford protection against an adverse ruling of the Comptroller General regarding longevity benefits to certain postal employees under Public Law 428, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

It satisfies the Comptroller General's objections. It has the unconditional approval of the Post Office Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Service Commission.

The measure, if enacted, would add only $165,000 to the estimated cost of the longevity provisions of the present law which have been invalidated by the Comptroller General's ruling.

The bill, which was unanimously approved by the committee, would preclude a fourth-class postmaster from receiving greater longevity pay than is now received by postmasters in first-, second- and third-class offices.

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

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the able Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not a fact that the bill merely is a validation act?

Mr. NEELY. That is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) in the case of postmasters and employees in the postal field service (except employees, other than charmen and charwomen, paid on an hourly basis and substitute and temporary rural carriers) for whom single salary or annual automatic salary grades are provided in the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), there are hereby established longevity grades A, B, and C. The rate of basic compensation of each such postmaster and employee (except postmasters at post offices of the fourth class, and charmen and charwomen paid on an hourly basis) shall be increased by $100 per annum for each promotion to a longevity grade. The rate of basic compensation of each such postmaster at a post office of the fourth class shall be increased by 5 percent per annum for each promotion to a longevity grade. The rate of basic compensation of each such charman and charwoman shall be increased by 5 cents per hour for each promotion to a longevity grade.

(b) Each such postmaster or employee who is serving in a regular position on the date of enactment of this act or who is appointed to such a position at any time thereafter, shall be assigned to longevity grade A at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 13 years of service, to longevity grade B at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 18 years of service, and to longevity grade C at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 25 years of service.

(c) All time on the rolls of the custodial service of the Post Office Department on and after October 1, 1933, and all time on the rolls of the mail equipment shops before or after July 1, 1945, shall be considered as postal field service. In determining longevity credit for the purposes of subsection (b), there shall be credited all time on the rolls (except time on the rolls as a substitute rural carrier) in the postal field service or in the Post Office Department before or after July 1, 1945; all time on the rolls in the custodial service of the Treasury Department continuous to the date of the transfer of the employee to the custodial service of the Post Office Department in accordance with Executive Order No. 6166, dated June 10, 1933; all time on the rolls as a special delivery messenger at a first-class post office before or after July 1, 1945; all time on the rolls as a clerk in a third-class post office before or after July 1, 1945, for which payment is made from authorized allowances. In the case of an officer or employee who was separated or is hereafter separated from the postal field service or from the departmental service of the Post Office Department for military duty, or to comply with a war transfer as defined by the Civil Service Commission, all time engaged in military service or service on war transfer shall be credited, and pro rata credit shall be given for the time engaged in military service and service on war transfer for each year of such service. Service specified in this subsection shall be credited on the basis of one-twelfth of a year for each whole calendar month the employee has been on the rolls. All such service shall be credited, whether continuous or intermittent, except that credit shall not be allowed for time on the rolls under a temporary appointment unless such time on the rolls is continuous for 1 year or more, or unless continuous to the date of appointment as a classified substitute or regular employee.

SEC. 2. Employees on the rolls on the date of enactment of this act, who are in the highest automatic grade of their position or who are in additional grades, shall retain promotion credit under the provisions of section 2 (e) of the act of October 28, 1949 (Public Law 428, 81st Cong.), and under those provisions of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), which are repealed by section 4 of this act to the same extent as though such provisions had remained in effect, and thereafter shall be promoted to longevity grades A, B, and C at the beginning of the quarter following the completion of 3, 5, and 7 years of service, respectively, in the next lower grade, except that if prior thereto any such employee becomes eligible for promotion under subsection (b) of section 1 of this act, such employee shall be promoted in accordance with the provisions of such subsection.

SEC. 3. The amount of any increase under the provisions of this act in the compensation of any supervisory employee shall not be considered as part of the base salary of such employee for the purposes of the first and second provisions in section 3 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.).

SEC. 4. (a) The act of July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), is amended in the following respects:

(1) By striking out the first proviso in section 12 (a).

(2) By striking out the proviso in section 13 (b).

(3) By striking out the proviso in section 14 (b).

(4) By striking out the proviso in section 14 (c).

(5) By striking out the proviso in section 14 (d).

(6) By striking out the proviso in section 14 (e).

(7) By striking out the proviso in section 14 (f).

(8) By striking out the proviso in section 15 (d).

(9) By striking out the proviso in section 15 (e).

(10) By amending so much of section 16 (c) as precedes the proviso to read as follows:

"(c) Railway post-office lines shall be divided into two classes, class A and class B. Clerks assigned to class A lines shall be promoted successively to grade 9, and clerks assigned to class B lines shall be promoted successively to grade 11. Clerks in charge of class A lines shall be of grade 14. Clerks in charge of class B lines shall be of grade 16:".

(11) By amending the first sentence in section 16 (d) to read as follows: "Clerks assigned to terminal railway post offices and air mail field railway post offices shall be promoted successively to grade 9."

(12) By amending the first sentence in section 16 (e) to read as follows: "Clerks assigned to transfer offices shall be promoted successively to grade 11."

(13) By amending the first sentence in section 16 (g) to read as follows: "Clerks assigned to offices of division superintendents, regional superintendents Air Mail Service, and in Chief Clerks' offices shall be promoted successively to grade 9."

(14) By amending the proviso in section 16 (j) to read as follows: "*Provided*, That such operators shall be promoted successively to grade 9".

(15) By striking out the second sentence in section 16 (s).

(16) By striking out the proviso in section 17 (a).

(17) By striking out the proviso in section 18 (b).

(18) By striking out the matter relating to grades 10 and 11 in the table in section 19 (a), and by amending that part of section 19 (a) which follows such table to read as follows: "and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the ninth grade."

(b) Sections 1 and 2 (e) of the act approved October 28, 1949 (Public Law 428, 81st Cong.), are hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. None of the provisions of this act shall be so construed as to reduce the grade or compensation of any employee on the rolls on the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect as of November 1, 1949, except that retroactive payments for longevity promotions shall not be made to employees no longer on the rolls of the postal field service on the date of enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide uniform longevity promotional grades for the postal field service."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2595) to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Human Rights in the government of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let the bill go over.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is unavoidably detained, I ask that the bill go over.

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

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO EMMA PHELPS GLENN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5610) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 3, after the word "less", to strike out the following proviso: *"Provided,* That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Tribe, or any Indian who is a member of said tribe, shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase"; and on page 2, after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the superintendent of the Crow agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the superintendent of the Crow agency.

(b) A certificate of the superintendent of the Crow agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CHARLES M. PHELPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5611), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 8, line 8, after the word "acres," to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Tribe, or any Indian who is a member of said tribe, shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase"; and after line 13, to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the superintendent of the Crow agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the superintendent of the Crow agency.

(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAUL HIGH HORSE AND ANNA HIGH HORSE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2919), authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments on page 1, line 10, after the word "acres", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of Indians of the Rosebud Reservation of South Dakota, or any Indian who is a member of said tribe, shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase"; and on page 2, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of Indians of the Rosebud Reservation of South Dakota or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the said Rosebud Sioux Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency.

(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the register of deeds of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

B. M. (BUD) PHELPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5609), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "acres", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Tribe, or any Indian who is a member of said tribe, shall have 90

days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase"; and after line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Crow Agency.

(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF LAND OF FRANK PHELPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5860), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "authorized", to insert "and directed"; in the same line, after the word "sell", to strike out "to a Crow Indian, or to the Crow Tribe"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "acres", to strike out the comma and "the status of such land with respect to taxability to remain unchanged", and after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Crow Agency.

(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAYMENT FROM FUNDS TO THE CREDIT OF INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 1354) to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of Indians in California, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. May we have an explanation of this measure from the distinguished Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this is a bill to authorize distribution of certain tribal money which is due Indians of California. It amounts to about $150 per capita, and everyone has agreed that the payment should be made. There was no objection filed to the bill before the committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I ask the distinguished Senator, what happens to the balance of the fund that remains over, above the $150 per capita distribution?

Mr. McFARLAND. Some provision will have to be made in regard to that, after the roll is finally made up, which will have to be by another act of Congress. But it was thought necessary to go this far, as some of these Indians need the money, and they need it more now than they will later on. Until the roll is finally determined, it will not be known just how much can be distributed per capita.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It is the intention, however, is it not, to handle the remaining amounts by some appropriate legislation within the near future, without letting it drag on for years?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1354) to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 8, after the words "alive on", to strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act"; in line 14, after the word "on", to strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act"; in line 18, after the word "and", to strike out "alive on June 30, 1948" and insert "living on the date of the approval of this act"; in line 23, after the word "dying", to strike out "before June 30, 1948" and insert "prior to the date of the approval of this act"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "on", to strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "the date of the approval of this act"; in line 4, after the word "and", to strike out "before June 30, 1948" and insert "prior to the date of the approval of this act"; on page 4, line 11, after the word "on", to strike out "June 30, 1948," and insert "the date of the approval of this act", and on page 5, line 4, after the word "this", to strike out "section" and insert "act."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4703), relating to the internal security of the United States, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I object.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard. Does the Senator from New Jersey wish to be heard further?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CREDIT UNIONS ACT OF 1932

The bill (H. R. 2554), to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act of 1932, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize an increase in the amount of any unsecured loan, which a credit union in the District of Columbia may make, from fifty dollars—the present limit—to three hundred dollars. The measure, if enacted, would harmonize the District of Columbia's Credit Unions Act with the Federal Credit Unions Act of 1946. The bill was unanimously passed by the House and unanimously approved by the District Commissioners and the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

The bill (H. R. 4229), to amend section 17 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3176), to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas withhold his objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I withhold it for the moment.

Mr. LEAHY. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that if the District of Columbia is to have daylight saving under the bill, immediate action must be taken, because there remain only about 10 days more before it would go into effect. This bill does not establish daylight saving in the District of Columbia. It simply permits the Commissioners of the District to make it effective if they so desire. It is the purpose, I understand, of the District Commissioners to hold a public hearing before making it effective. If we are to have daylight saving in accordance with the law and the ordinance of the District of Columbia as we have enjoyed it for several years, immediate action must be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the bill's going to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to make a statement. As I understand, the purpose of daylight saving in the District of Columbia is primarily to give Government employees more recreational time in the afternoon, more time in which to play golf, more time in which to play tennis, more time to do whatever they want to do in the afternoon. The penalty for that is that all Virginia and Maryland farmers who bring produce into the Capital, and who rise before daylight, as it is, will have to get up another hour before daylight, in order to get the produce here.

Another penalty is that those in Maryland and Virginia who have business in the District will find that the airplanes and railroads run on one time, and other engagements are made on another time, and they never know for sure which is which.

The fact remains that some Government agencies now begin work at 8:15 in the morning and quit at 4:15, in order that the employees may have recreational opportunity. There is nothing at all to prevent any department from starting as early in the morning as it may want to start, in order to let employees out earlier in the afternoon. It seems to me that, considering the hardship it is going to work in surrounding areas, which do not have daylight saving, we are paying a considerable price for action that departments could take without any congressional action, and frankly I am glad the distinguished Senator from Arkansas objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the bill going to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I object.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia if there was any attempt when such a bill came before the committee, to establish a uniform time throughout the United States? Not only does the problem arise which the distinguished Senator has explained, that is, that there are two different standards of time within the District, transportation time and daylight-saving time, but there are throughout the United States areas that do not adopt daylight-saving time, and for them it would further complicate schedules in trying to arrange transportation, times of appearance, and so forth.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I may say to my distinguished colleague, I think it very desirable to have some universal and understood time, and not to have one standard of time here and another standard of time there.

Mr. MALONE. I agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection was originally made to the present consideration of the bill; which objection was withheld. Request was then made that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, to which objection was made. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I object.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to address my remarks briefly to the bill to which objection has just been made, with respect to what my good friend from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has said. I do not object to the Senator defending the farmers of his State; I think he has a right to do so, and he did it very well.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I may say my friend from Illinois defends the farmers of his State as much as I defend those of my State.

Mr. LUCAS. The farmers of Virginia probably do not like daylight-saving time in the District; but I want to challenge the statement made by my distinguished friend that this is solely for the benefit of Government employees in connection with their recreational facilities in the afternoon. I do not think that squares with the facts at all. I believe it will be found that this proposal comes primarily from the business and professional people of Washington who desire daylight-saving time in the District.

I merely could not allow to pass unquestioned the statement of my friend that daylight-saving time in the District was being suggested for a particular class of Government employees, because I know of no Government employees who testified before the committee about this matter. As I recall, a similar law has been in effect year after year, and it has been passed primarily in the interest of the business and professional men of Washington, D. C.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the interest of accuracy, I will accept the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois and change my remarks to say that I understood it was proposed primarily for Government employees, but I still contend that, whether they are Government employees or private employees, most of them can go to work as early in the day as they choose.

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly agree with that.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nevada for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. While it becomes rather hopeless to object to this proposal, for, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois says, it has been adopted year by year; yet on April 6, 1948, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 4098, the junior Senator from Nevada submitted a petition from the Department of the Interior employees, signed by between 400 and 600 persons, objecting to daylight saving time, which shows that they are not all in accord with this great innovation, establishing at least three different standards of time throughout the United States which one must coordinate when he wants to go somewhere.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wanted to address a question to the Senator on this particular measure. Is it not true that the Senate of the United States has, in the present Congress, passed by an overwhelming vote a home rule bill for the District of Columbia, that this measure, if passed, would, simply in a limited way, give the right to the representatives of the District of Columbia for themselves, and pursuant to the decision of the people as it is brought to their attention, to claim the advantages of daylight saving?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. I think they are really entitled to make this decision themselves. If the people of the District of Columbia want daylight saving time, it seems to me they ought to have it, and simply because I come from Illinois, or because someone else comes from Virginia, and I am being affected slightly in Illinois because of what is happening here in the District, is no reason why the people of the District should not have it. I may say it is possible to find many discriminations of that kind. It seems to me it is solely a question for the people of the District, and they ought to have an opportunity to decide whether or not they want daylight saving time, and we should as a matter of tolerance and fair play, give them the opportunity of making the

decision, rather than taking it upon ourselves to tell the people what is good and what is bad for them, with respect to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired. Under objection, the bill will be passed over.

ASSESSMENT OF BUILDINGS WITHIN THE LIMITS OF FORT MONROE MILITARY RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 4316) to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

The bill (S. 3255), to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 415 of the Career Compensation Act be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 415. Any member who, on October 1, 1949, was a hospital patient and who, prior to January 1, 1951, is retired as a result of a physical disability growing out of the injury or disease for which he was hospitalized, may elect to receive retirement benefits computed under the laws in effect on September 30, 1949."

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN OATHS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6171) to authorize commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to administer certain oaths, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill seeks to accomplish three minor improvements in administrative procedure applicable to the armed forces. Inasmuch as the three sections of the bill are somewhat independent of one another, I have indicated clearly on pages 2 and 3 of the committee report, in italics, precisely what each section of the bill proposes.

Section 1 addresses itself to the administering of the oath required of persons who enlist, or who are appointed, in the armed services. We are all aware of the fact that a great deal of effort is being directed toward joint utilization of recruiting facilities. Such joint utilization has been hampered by the fact that existing law prohibits any Army recruiting officer from administering the oath of naval personnel and vice versa. The same is true with respect to Air Force recruiting officers. Similarly, an Air Force sergeant attached to a naval mission at some overseas location could not be given his reenlistment oath by a naval officer. Such restrictive practices are obviously not in the interest of either efficiency and economy. Section 1 of the bill, therefore, proposes to authorize that the oath of enlistment or appointment be given by any commissioned officer, regardless of his component or service, and regardless of whether he is on extended or active duty. I would point out that this section addresses itself only to the oath of enlistment or appointment, and is not a general relaxation of present notarial authority.

Section 2 of the bill applies only to the Navy and deals with the renewal of the basic oath of office prescribed in section 1757 of the revised statutes. Under existing regulations which govern the naval service, an officer appointed to a higher grade is required to renew the basic oath of office which he originally took upon his first appointment. With regard to the Army and Air Force, however, officers have not been required to renew their basic oath upon promotion to a higher grade since 1942. This, of course, assumes that the individual's service has been continuous; otherwise he would be required to take the oath the same as he would upon original appointment. This section of the bill proposes to place the Navy and the Marine Corps on the same basis as the Army and Air Force by giving them language which is substantially identical with that contained in the act of October 14, 1942, dealing with the Army.

It should be specifically noted, however, as the committee report points out at the bottom of page 2, that—

It is not intended, however, that this section shall in any way relieve an individual naval officer from the necessity of taking the prescribed oath of office when assigned or reassigned to a specific position, such as chief of a department, bureau, or service, which the officer may occupy in addition to his actual filling of a designated naval rank.

Section 3 of the bill also deals with the Navy and the Marine Corps, and proposes to give to these services an authority comparable with what the Army and Air Force now have. The wartime authority whereby temporary promotions in the naval service were considered to be effective as of the date announced by the President was erroneously repealed by section 426 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Section 3 of the bill would reestablish this wartime authority, and place the naval service on the same basis as the Army and Air Force in this respect.

This bill is recommended by the Secretary of Defense with the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget. The committee concurs in their recommendations. The amendment to section 1, recommended by the committee, is a purely technical clarification of wording.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Would the enactment of this bill prevent such a dispute as occurred in the Denfeld matter?

Mr. MORSE. It has no bearing on the Denfeld case.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No, but would it prevent a dispute as to whether the oath was administered? There was such a dispute in the Denfeld case.

Mr. MORSE. I invite the Senator's attention to the committee report, page 2, in which it is stated:

It is not intended, however, that this section shall in any way relieve an individual naval officer from the necessity of taking the prescribed oath of office when assigned or reassigned to a specific position.

So it would not have relieved an officer, in that particular case, of the duty of taking the oath which is called for by the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is precisely what I wanted to ascertain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The amendment was on page 1, line 3, after the word "component", to strike out "of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, and Marine Corps (including the Reserve components thereof), or any component of the Air Force of the United States" and insert "(including the Reserve component) of any of the armed forces of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MAKING APPLICATION FOR TERMINAL-LEAVE PAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3205) to provide an extension of the time for making application for terminal-leave pay.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate an opportunity to explain House bill 3205.

This bill proposes to extend until June 30, 1951, the time allowed personnel who were separated from the military service prior to September 1, 1946, to make application for terminal-leave pay.

The original version of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946, provided that personnel who had been separated from the service as of the date of enactment could receive their terminal-leave pay in the form of a 5-year bond. Under the terms of the act the individual was required to file a claim for these terminal-leave bonds, and was given until September 1, 1947, to submit this claim.

The following year the Armed Forces Leave Act was amended so as to authorize the immediate payment in cash of these 5-year bonds. Furthermore, the time for filing applications was extended 1 year to September 1, 1948.

Subsequent to this new expiration date of September 1, 1948, approximately 16,303 claims were filed, but were rejected because of the late filing. As is shown in the detailed discussion contained in the report, departmental witnesses estimate that there are an additional 5,000 persons who are eligible for payment but who failed to institute the necessary claim. In effect, therefore, the Department of Defense estimates that there are approximately 25,000 individuals, separated from the service prior to September 1, 1946, who will make claim for terminal-leave payment if this legislation is enacted.

The committee feels that perhaps most of these 25,000 cases have only them-

selves to blame for their failure to file the necessary claim. Notwithstanding this fact, however, there is a very substantial number among these veterans who, through no fault of their own, were unable to meet the deadline. The Senate report discusses this in some detail on page 2. Also, the committee examined a proposal whereby any individual who submits a further claim shall be required to show why his claim should be considered at this late date. Obviously this would be an expensive and time-consuming operation and would require a sort of adjudication of each claim.

In the face of all of these circumstances therefore, the committee concurred that it would be appropriate to provide one final opportunity to file for terminal-leave payments accrued prior to September 1, 1946. We feel that this should be the last time any extension to the cut-off date is granted.

We are informed by the departmental witnesses that funds for the payment of the actual claim are available. However, an administrative cost of approximately $69,000 will be incurred for which no funds are currently available. The Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget interpose no objection to this legislation. The Armed Services Committee concurs with the House action on the bill, and recommends its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

REVISIONS IN TITLES I AND III, OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2335) to make certain revisions in titles I and III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby further amended by—

(a) Deleting in the proviso to subsection (b) of section 114 the comma after the word "thirty-two" and substituting therefor a period and deleting the remainder of the said proviso.

(b) Deleting in subsection (r) of section 304 the words "four" and "thirty-four" and substituting therefor the words "five" and "thirty-five," respectively, and deleting the period at the end of the said subsection and substituting therefor a colon and adding the following proviso: *"Provided,* That those rear admirals of the line not restricted in the performance of duty who attained such status prior to the date of enactment of this amendatory act shall be continued on the active list only upon the recommendation of the first such board convened thereafter."

(c) Amending paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 307 to read as follows:

"(1) Rear admirals not restricted in the performance of duty who attain a status of having completed 5 years of service in grade and 35 years of total commissioned service as defined in subsection 102 (d) of this act shall be eligible for consideration for recommendation for continuation on the active list by a selection board convened in the fiscal year in which they first attain such status: *Provided,* That those rear admirals not restricted in the performance of duty who attained such status prior to the date of enactment of this amendatory act shall be eligible for such recommendation by the first such board convened thereafter: *Provided further,* That a rear admiral not restricted in the performance of duty who will attain the age of 62 years in the fiscal year in which he would otherwise be eligible for consideration for continuation on the active list shall not be eligible for such consideration: *Provided further,* That a rear admiral who shall have lost numbers or precedence at any time shall be eligible for such consideration in the fiscal year in which the most senior rear admiral junior to him who has not lost numbers or precedence is eligible therefor."

(d) Amending paragraph (8) of subsection (a) of section 308 to read as follows:

"(8) The number to be furnished the board in respect to rear admirals not restricted in the performance of duty to be continued on the active list shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board. Such number shall be based upon a consideration of the number of vacancies existing among rear admirals not restricted in the performance of duty, plus the number of vacancies estimated to occur during each of the ensuing 5 years in order to best assure to captains a flow of promotion to the grade of rear admiral and to best assure to rear admirals in succeeding years equality of opportunity for continuation on the active list. The number to be so furnished the board shall be not less than 50 percent nor greater than 75 percent of the number of rear admirals eligible for consideration by the board for continuation on the active list."

(e) Deleting in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 309 the words "equal to" and substituting therefore the words "not exceeding."

(f) Amending subsection (a) of section 313 by inserting after the words "Rear Admirals" the words "of the line not restricted in the performance of duty" and deleting the words "two successive selection boards" and substituting therefor the words "a selection board."

(g) Amending subsection (b) of section 313 to read as follows:

"(b) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, each rear admiral designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, and specialty duty, and each rear admiral in the Medical Corps, Supply Corps, Chaplain Corps, Civil Engineer Corps, and Dental Corps, who is not retired or separated from the active list at an earlier date under other provisions of law, shall be placed on the retired list on June 30 of the fiscal year in which he completes 7 years' service in the grade of rear admiral or 35 years' total commissioned service as defined in subsections 102 (d) and 202 (d) of this act, whichever is later: *Provided,* That any such officer shall, if recommended in the report of a board of not less than three naval officers convened for that purpose and approved by the Secretary of the Navy, be retained on the active list and if not retired under other provisions of law, shall be placed on the retired list on June 30 of any succeeding fiscal year in which he is not again so recommended for retention on the active list by such a board or in which no such board is convened: *And provided further,* That for the purposes of this subsection, service in grade for an officer promoted to the grade of rear admiral prior to August 7, 1947, and for an officer whose lineal position is adjusted in the grade of rear admiral or who is assigned a new running mate in that grade, in accordance with the provisions of this act, shall be computed from the date of temporay rank in the grade of rear admiral; and for each other officer promoted to the grade of rear admiral on or after August 7, 1947, from the date of the occurrence of the vacancy to which the officer is promoted to fill.

"(2) The board to consider rear admirals for retention on the active list pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection may be convened annually in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy and shall be convened in any year when the Secretary of the Navy determines that one or more officers who would otherwise be subject to retirement under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection should be retained on the active list. The number of such officers who may be recommended for such retention on the active list shall not exceed the number furnished the board by the Secretary of the Navy, which shall be the number of determined necessary by the Secretary of the Navy to meet the needs of the naval service.

"(3) Each officer, when retired pursuant to this subsection, shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of his active-duty pay in the grade in which serving at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which he is entitled to credit in the computation of pay on the active list, but retired pay so computed shall not exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay."

(h) Repealing subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of section 313 and redesignating subsection (1) of section 313 as subsection (c).

(i) Repealing subsection (k) of section 313, effective July 1, 1950, except as it applies to officers retired under its provisions prior to that date.

(j) Amending subsection (l) of section 314 to read as follows:

"(l) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, major generals who are not retired or separated from the active list at an earlier date under other provisions of law shall be placed on the retired list on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 5 years' service in the grade of major general or 35 years' total commissioned service as defined in subsection 102 (d) of this act, whichever is later: *Provided,* That any such officer shall, if recommended in the report of a board of not less than three naval officers convened for that purpose and approved by the Secretary of the Navy, be retained on the active list and, if not retired under other provisions of law, shall be placed on the retired list on June 30 of any succeeding fiscal year in which he is not again so recommended for retention on the active list by such a board or in which no such board is convened: *Provided further,* That an officer serving as Commandant of the Marine Corps shall not, while so serving, be subject to retirement under the provisions of this subsection: *And provided further,* That for the purposes of this subsection, service in grade shall be computed from the date of appointment in the grade of major general for officers appointed in that grade prior to August 7, 1947, and from the date of the occurrence of the vacancy in the grade of major general to which the officer is promoted to fill for officers promoted to that grade on or after August 7, 1947.

"(2) Each officer, when retired pursuant to this subsection, shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of his active-duty pay in the grade in which serving at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which he is entitled to credit in the computation of pay on the active list, but retired pay so computed shall not exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay."

(k) Amending subsection (m) of section 314 to read as follows:

"(m) The board to consider major generals for retention on the active list may be convened annually in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy and shall be convened in any year when three or more such officers would otherwise be subject to retirement under the provisions of subsection (1) of this section. The number of officers which may

be recommended for retention by each such board shall not exceed the number furnished it by the Secretary of the Navy. The number so furnished shall be that which the Secretary of the Navy shall determine to be necessary to meet the requirements of the Marine Corps and, in any year when the number of officers otherwise subject to retirement under the provisions of subsection (1) of this section is three or more, the number so furnished shall not be less than the number of such officers in excess of two."

(l) Amending subsection (q) of section 314 to read as follows:

"(q) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, brigadier generals designated for supply duty who are not retired or separated from the active list at an earlier date under other provisions of law shall be placed on the retired list on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 5 years' service in grade or 35 years' total commissioned service as defined in subsection 102 (d) of this act, whichever is later: *Provided,* That any such officer shall, if recommended in the report of a board of not less than three officers serving in ranks above that of brigadier general convened for that purpose and approved by the Secretary of the Navy, be retained on the active list and if not retired under other provisions of law, shall be placed on the retired list on June 30 of any succeeding fiscal year in which he is not again so recommended for retention on the active list by such a board or in which no such board is convened: *Provided further,* That an officer serving as Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps shall not, while so serving, be subject to retirement under the provisions of this subsection: *And provided further,* That for the purposes of this subsection, service in grade shall be computed from date of appointment in the grade of brigadier general for officers appointed in that grade prior to August 7, 1947, and from the date of the occurrence of the vacancy in the grade of brigadier general to which the officer is promoted to fill for officers promoted to that grade on or after August 7, 1947.

"(2) Each officer, when retired pursuant to this subsection, shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of his active-duty pay in the grade in which serving at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which he is entitled to credit in the computation of pay on the active list but retired pay so computed shall not exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay."

(m) Amending subsection (r) of section 314 to read as follows:

"(r) The board to consider brigadier generals designated for supply duty for retention on the active list may be convened annually in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy and shall be convened in any year when two or more such officers would otherwise be subject to retirement under the provisions of subsection (q) of this section. The number of officers which may be recommended for retention by each such board shall not exceed the number furnished it by the Secretary of the Navy. The number so furnished shall be that which the Secretary of the Navy shall determine to be necessary to meet the requirements of the Marine Corps and, in any year when the number of officers otherwise subject to retirement under the provisions of subsection (q) of this section is two or more, the number so furnished shall not be less than the number of such officers in excess of one."

(n) Repealing subsection (s) of section 314.

(o) Repealing subsections (t) and (y) of section 314, effective July 1, 1950, and repealing subsection (v) of section 314, effective July 1, 1950, except as it applies to officers heretofore retired under its provisions.

(p) Redesignating subsection (u) of section 314 as subsection (s); redesignating subsection (w) of section 314 as subsection (t) and deleting in the said subsection the words "equal to" and substituting therefor the words "not exceeding"; and redesignating subsection (x) of section 314 as subsection (u).

SEC. 2. The Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, is further amended by deleting in subsections 114 (h) and 314 (h) the word "four" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "three."

SEC. 3. Section 305 (a) (2) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The officers composing the board for the recommendation of rear admirals for continuation on the active list shall be officers on the active or retired list of the Navy. The officers composing other boards shall be officers on the active list of the Navy. No officer may be a member of two successive boards for the consideration of officers for promotion to the same grade."

SEC. 4. No officer shall be retired pursuant to this amendatory act prior to the first day of the sixth month following the month of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

OSAGE INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA

The bill (S. 1719) to amend section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 28, 1906, relating to the Osage Indians of Oklahoma, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. 539, 543), is amended by striking out "President of the United States" and substituting in lieu thereof "Osage Tribal Council, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior."

DESIGNATION OF RESERVOIR AS LAKE MOHAVE

The bill (S. 2117) to provide for the designation of the reservoir to be formed by the Davis Dam on the Colorado River as Lake Mohave, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the reservoir to be formed by the impounding of the waters of the Colorado River by the Davis Dam now under construction shall be known and designated on the public records as Lake Mohave.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO ALPENA, MICH.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2783) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land with improvements to the city of Alpena, Mich.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have discussed this bill with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and he has no objection to the amendment which I shall now offer. It is an amendment in line with the policy I have tried consistently to follow, and which I think I have followed wherever I have found a bill which seeks to convey Federal property to some State or municipality without fair compensation therefor.

Therefore I offer an amendment, on line 4 of page 1 of the bill, to strike out the words "without consideration therefor", and insert in lieu thereof the words "*Provided,* The city of Alpena, Mich., in Alpena County, Mich., pays 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, does the distinguished Senator from Oregon know what the value of the land is?

Mr. MORSE. It is the opinion of the Senator from Oregon that it will run to the value of several hundred dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS TO LANDS IN ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 4289) to require settlers on public lands in Alaska to record notice of their settlement claims in the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JIM WHITE AND THE CARLSBAD CAVERNS

The bill (S. 1959) to commemorate Jim White and his contribution to the early history of Carlsbad Caverns, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of commemorating the contribution of Jim White to the early history and public knowledge of Carlsbad Caverns, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to erect a plaque or marker with an appropriate inscription thereon within Carlsbad Caverns National Park. Such plaque or marker shall be erected near the elevator in the elevator building in the park.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act not to exceed $200.

EL MORRO NATIONAL MONUMENT, N. MEX.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2274) to provide for the addition of certain lands to El Morro National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have some information as to what the cost of the bill will be?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there are approximately 1,038 acres of very much second-grade land involved, the total appraised value of which is $8,167, an average of about $6 or $7 an acre. The amount involved is rather small. The original act providing for the creation of the El Morro Monument was framed in such a fashion that there is not a satisfactory approach to it, and we have been trying for a long time to get an agreement which would permit a small addition to the monument.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what is proposed is that there be added to an

already existing national monument additional Federal land, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to procure, for the protection and preservation of El Morro National Monument, the following-described land and interests in land:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 9 north, range 14 west:

Section 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4; south half northeast quarter; south half northwest quarter; southwest quarter; and southeast quarter, containing six hundred forty and eighty one-hundredths acres;

Section 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4; north half northeast quarter; northeast quarter northwest quarter; south half southeast quarter and southeast quarter southwest quarter, containing three hundred ninety-seven and ninety-two one-hundredths acres.

Comprising in all an addition of one thousand thirty-eight and seventy-two one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. All property acquired pursuant to this act shall become a part of the national monument upon the issuance of an appropriate order, or orders, by the Secretary of the Interior setting forth the revised boundaries of the monument, such order or orders to be effective upon publication in the Federal Register. Lands so added to the monument shall thereafter be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the monument.

ELECTION FEES AND CHARGES IN ALASKA

The Senate proceed to consider the bill (H. R. 2387) authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "governor of Alaska" and insert "Alaska Territorial Legislature"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "governor" and insert "legislature"; in line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "governor" and insert "legislature", and in line 15, after the word "the", to strike out "governor" and insert "legislature."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2311) to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. On behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I object.

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

DEMURRAGE CHARGES ON UNDELIVERED COLLECT-ON-DELIVERY PARCELS

The bill (S. 3117) 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), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act 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), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, any collect-on-delivery parcel which the addressee fails to remove from the post office within 15 days from the first attempt to deliver or the first notice of arrival at the office of address may be returned to the sender charged with the return postage, whether or not such parcel bears any specified time limit for delivery; and a demurrage charge of not exceeding 5 cents per day may be collected when delivery has not been made to either the addressee or the sender until after the expiration of the prescribed period. No demurrage shall be charged on collect-on-delivery parcels exchanged between post offices in the continental United States and post offices in the Territories and island possessions of the United States."

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General may direct the immediate return to the sender, charged with return postage, of any collect-on-delivery parcel which is found to be undeliverable.

CLAIMS FOR PAYMENT OF CERTAIN POSTAL NOTES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill H. R. 6475.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, this bill which was passed by the House on the 6th of March 1950 is remedial in nature. It would permit the Postmaster General to honor postal notes more than a year old, provided the original note is presented and no duplicate has been issued. It would enable the Comptroller General to dispose of files of paid postal notes that are more than a year old, and allow the redemption of postal notes that have been issued more than a year, in cases in which the original is presented for payment. No cost is involved. The bill has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the Postmaster General, and the Comptroller General.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

SINGLE SUPPLY CATALOG SYSTEM

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 97) to provide for a single supply catalog system.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in connection with this concurrent resolution, I have no intention of objecting, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report which accompanies the concurrent resolution, because of the fact that so many requests have been made for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report (No. 1361) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 97) to provide for a single supply catalog system for all agencies of the Government, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the concurrent resolution do pass.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this resolution is to place the Congress on record as approving the development and establishment of a single supply catalog system for all agencies of the Government at the earliest possible date.

BACKGROUND

A subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee held extensive hearings on a similar measure (H. R. 321) during the Eightieth Congress, and at the conclusion of such hearings it was agreed to introduce House Concurrent Resolution 97 to place Congress on record as favoring the establishment of a single supply catalog system that is usable by all agencies of the Government.

Section 206 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorizes the Administrator of General Services to establish and maintain a uniform Federal supply catalog system for the purpose of identifying and classifying personal property under the control of each agency. To augment that authority, and to remove any ambiguity regarding its application, the committee believes that a single supply catalog system that is readily usable by both the military and civilian agencies of the Government should be established and has, therefore, approved the subject resolution.

During the recent war there were almost as many catalog systems as there were procurement agencies throughout the Government, and as a result considerable waste and delay was entailed in the procurement, warehousing, and delivery of supplies and materials at home and abroad. It is difficult to determine the monetary loss which has been incurred because of the lack of a uniform system. Competent authorities have estimated that the losses ran into billions of dollars during the war period.

Classification of Government supplies, materials, and equipment for the purpose of establishing a uniform supply catalog system has been under way by the Munitions Board and the Bureau of Federal Supply—now Federal Supply Services of GSA—since June 3, 1948. Considerable progress has been made by the 168 employees engaged in this activity for the Munitions Board and about 1,400 employees of the military departments, with but a small number of civilians participating for the General Services Administration. It is now estimated that the military analysis will be completed by June 30, 1952, at an estimated cost of $28,000,000. No funds have been appropriated for GSA's portion of this project. The Administration has, however, requested an appropriation of $441,932 for fiscal year 1951 to cover the GSA's program of classifying and cataloging those items which are interchangeable between military and civilian agencies, as well as those which are solely used by civilian departments.

Rather than await the completion of a single catalog, the interested Government agencies are placing into use various phases of the project as they become completed. This minimizes conversion and will bring about complete use without disrupting the Government's supply system. The end result will be that by the time the new catalog is complete the change-over to the new usage will be practically complete.

It is difficult to visualize the savings which may be accomplished by central catalog procurement. Admiral Ring, Director of Military Supply, Munitions Board, has stated that he estimates the savings will be very substantial and that considerable increase in efficiency will result. Other anticipated benefits are that in time of peace it will result in a massive reduction of storage and purchase requirements, and in time of war it will provide a positive system of identification for the procurement of parts at a time when time will be of the essence. That value cannot be measured in dollars. An additional benefit will accrue in the disposal of surplus property. At the close of the war the War Assets Administration was confronted with the task of disposing of hundreds of millions of dollars in personal property, much of which property had either improper or no identification.

It is apparent that the next logical step in this process is to establish a central inventory system. However, this committee recognizes the magnitude of completing the first task and is of the opinion that no additional legislative action on this program should be taken until a uniform catalog system is complete and installed throughout the Government.

There is complete agreement among all interested agencies upon the value and need for a uniform cataloging system and the Munitions Board, through its representatives, has urged the adoption of this concurrent resolution as an action which will strengthen and endorse the efforts which are already being made in behalf of the program.

The resolution will neither add nor detract from the authority contained in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152). Nor will it change in any way the existing authority of the Department of Defense to carry on its work of analyzing and classifying every item of supply which it procures. However, it is believed that this legislation may encourage and develop closer working relationship between the military and civilian agencies and make possible considerable savings in the supply programs of the Federal Government.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS

The Hoover Commission stated that—

"There is no uniform system of cataloging which permits identification and classification of the materials used by all of the agencies. There have been 17 unrelated systems of property identification in use at one time. This situation has resulted in the development of costly duplicating inventories throughout the Government. Since the recent war, the National Military Establishment has made some progress toward a coordinated system of property identification, and the Bureau of Federal Supply (now GSA) is now cooperating in this endeavor. Nevertheless, a declaration of congressional policy insisting upon a Federal commodity catalog is necessary to insure conformity of some of the old-line civilian agencies and to insure continued military-civilian cooperation."

The task-force report of the Commission further stated:

"It is believed that the important function of development, adoption, use, and maintenance of the Federal Commodity Catalog will not be satisfactorily solved until the Congress issues a policy statement to that effect and implements such policy by providing statutory authority and the necessary funds."

This resolution is in accord with these recommendations.

The following communications were addressed to the chairman of this committee by Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, and by Representative JACK ANDERSON, sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 97, in behalf of its approval by the Senate:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1950.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: House Concurrent Resolution 97, relating to a single supply catalog system for the procurement agencies of the Government, recently was passed by the House. I am advised that your committee has jurisdiction over this matter in the Senate.

While it may appear that a concurrent resolution is not entitled to the same consideration as the usual type of legislative proposal, I feel certain that this particular resolution is not subject to such a characterization.

At the present time, and for many months in the past, all of the interested Government agencies, military as well as civilian, have been endeavoring to establish a single supply catalog system, and I have no doubt that it will become a reality at some date in the future. My interest in the concurrent resolution is predicated upon my belief that an expression of this type by the Congress will accelerate the present efforts and remove the lethargy which is usually attendant upon such an undertaking.

I am convinced of the desirability of having a single supply catalog system, and will appreciate your early consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 97.

Sincerely,

CARL VINSON, *Chairman.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1950.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I am enclosing herewith a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 97 and the House Armed Services Committee report thereon. This resolution was approved unanimously by the committee and passed by the House recently on the Consent Calendar.

I have just recently conferred with members of your committee staff and I am hopeful that it will be possible for you to set a hearing on the resolution either before your full committee or a subcommittee thereof at an early date.

Rather extensive hearings on the measure were conducted by a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, and we feel that the passage of the resolution is imperative in order to spur the efforts of the Department of Defense and the civilian agencies of the Government to establish a single supply catalog system.

You will note that complete agreement has been reached between the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Services Administration.

I am sure that hearings before your committee would not be lengthy and that probably it would only be necessary to have Admiral Ring, Jess Larson, and myself as witnesses.

Anything that you may do to expedite consideration of the resolution above referred to will be deeply appreciated.

Assuring you of my hearty cooperation and with every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

JACK ANDERSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

WITHHOLDING OF COMPENSATION DUE GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 2357), to amend the act of May 26, 1936, authorizing the withholding of compensation due Government personnel, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, with amendments, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a statement by me in connection with the bill, together with a letter from the General Accounting Office under date of April 14, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HENDRICKSON WITH RESPECT TO S. 2357, A BILL TO AMEND THE ACT OF MAY 26, 1936, AUTHORIZING THE WITHHOLDING OF COMPENSATION DUE GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

The Senate committee report accompanying this bill points out that, without statutory authority, current salary payments to Federal employees may not be withheld in order to liquidate indebtedness to the United States.

The act of May 26, 1936, authorized a disbursing officer of the Government to withhold compensation of a Federal employee whenever General Accounting Office shall have disallowed a credit to a disbursing officer based upon a payment to such person. There is no provision in the law for similar withholding in cases where General Accounting Office raises a charge against a certifying officer for improper payment. This bill remedies that situation.

As amended, this bill would provide for withholding of salaries of Federal employees, in whole or in part, until the entire indebtedness is liquidated, in cases where there has been either a disallowance of credit or a charge raised, to a disbursing officer or a certifying officer of the Government.

After a careful study of the bill, S. 2357, it was believed desirable to obtain a clarification of the meaning of terms used, particularly of the phrase, "charge raised," as it appears on page 1, line 9, of the bill. Accordingly, request was made for comment by the Comptroller General. In response to that request, a memorandum, dated April 14, 1950, has been made available. It was prepared for the Comptroller General's use by the general counsel of the General Accounting Office, with the understanding that it could be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as bearing upon the legislative history of the bill. The memorandum is as follows:

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, April 14, 1950.

Mr. CHARLES E. JOHNSON,
Office of the Comptroller General:

Consideration has been given to the construction of the words "or a charge raised" in the bill S. 2357, Eighty-first Congress, as reported by the Senate Expenditures Committee.

The said bill would amend the act of May 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1374), so that whenever upon the statement of the account of any disbursing or certifying officer of the United States in the General Accounting Office credit shall have been disallowed or a charge raised for any payment to any person in the executive branch of the Government, otherwise

entitled to compensation from the United States, such compensation of the payee shall be withheld in part or in whole, until full reimbursement has been accomplished under such regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the agency under which such payee is entitled to receive compensation.

The terms "settlement of account" and "disallowance," as used in the act of May 26, 1936, and as applied to disbursing officers, have well-defined and long-established meanings. The "settlement of account" represents a settlement of an officer's money account for a specific period, showing a list of items for which credit has not been allowed in the account, and the term "disallowance" constituting a formalization of exceptions taken to questionable payments in said accounts which have not been removed or cleared by proper explanation or refund. However, unlike disbursing officers, a certifying officer has no public funds in his possession and hence renders no "money account" against which "disallowances" might be issued. For this reason the phrase contained in the present bill "or a charge raised" was deemed required to provide a basis for applying the provisions of the bill to certifying officers and was intended for application only in connection with certifying officers as distinguished from disbursing officers. Also it may be stated that such phrase, as used in the bill, contemplates a staement of exceptions outstanding against a certifying officer and not cleared by satisfactory reply or payment of the same degree of formality and finality represented by the "statement of account" or "disallowance" as those terms relate to disbursing officers.

It is, therefore, to be understood that the proposed enactment contemplates withholding of compensation only where the certifying or disbursing officer involved, after reasonable opportunity to explain or clear an exception challenging the propriety of payment, has not been able to do so, or has not done so, and credit has been disallowed or a charge raised for the amount by the issuance by the General Accounting Office of a certificate of settlement of the responsibilities of the accountable officer. Also, the bill contemplates that compensation will be withheld only where the officer certifying such compensation for payment or the officer making the payment has actual knowledge, or has been advised, that credit has been disallowed or a charge raised in the settlement of an accountable officers' responsibilities for an apparently improper payment. The bill is intended as an added safeguard to the United States and to certifying and disbursing officers generally, and there is no intention that charges be raised against accountable officers for failure to withhold compensation unless it plainly appears that at the time of making such payment or certification they had actual knowledge of the improper payment to the payee and that this Office in settlement of the responsibility of the accountable officer concerned had raised a charge or disallowed credit therefor.

E. L. FISHER,
General Counsel.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the heads of the departments and agencies to withhold compensation due and payable to officers and employees who have received improper payments of Government funds for which a certifying officer is held responsible; that is, where they have been overpaid, or have received funds for which a certifying officer may be held responsible to the Federal Government, any moneys then due the recipients of such funds may be withheld until an adjustment is made.

Mr. MORSE. Suppose in many of these individual cases there are disputes as to whether or not moneys were wrongfully paid.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This bill would give the right to withhold the funds until such time as the dispute could be adjusted.

Mr. MORSE. I have not had time to read the bill or the report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me read briefly from the report:

The act of May 26, 1936, authorized the withholding of compensation to any person in the executive branch of the Government whenever upon the statement of account of a disbursing officer in the General Accounting Office credit shall have been disallowed for any payment to such person. The statute makes no provision for cases in which the General Accounting Office raises a charge against a certifying officer for improper payment.

In other words, the disbursing officer can make a charge on the general accounting officer, and this bill gives the general accounting officer authority to withhold payment. I read further:

This amendment provides a remedy for this situation and will authorize the head of the agency to withhold compensation due Government personnel when they are indebted to the United States by reason of overpayment or from some other transaction under which the employee received an overpayment or improper receipt of public funds. Under decisions of the courts, statutory authority is necessary for the withholding of current salary payments to officers and employees of the Government to liquidate indebtedness to the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me discuss this procedure with the Senator on a hypothetical case, and see if I understand the bill.

A Government employee, we will assume, puts in an expense account, and the account is paid. Then subsequently it is claimed by the General Accounting officer that he was paid, let us say, $200 in excess of what he should have been paid. Weeks and months elapse, correspondence takes place, and finally $200 is withheld from the employee's pay check on the claim that he owes that amount to the Federal Government. This bill would authorize the withholding of that $200, would it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would, if the payment were a final payment, and was so found to be by the Comptroller General.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, we put the Federal employee in a somewhat different position from the private employee, we will say an employee of a corporation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe the bill also provides that the payments may be in installments, so as not to work undue hardship.

Mr. MORSE. What recourse does the employee have if he feels he has not been overpaid on his expense account?

Mr. McCLELLAN. He has the same recourse that he had before he was paid.

Mr. MORSE. Why does not the Government wait until it pursues its ordinary course? I think in individual cases some serious injustice could develop.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is merely a question of whether when it has been developed by the agents of the Government, constituted such by the Congress, that an error has been made, or an illegal payment has, unfortunately, been made, the salary of the employee may be withheld until the account is adjusted, or withheld in installments until repayment is made. If we do not want to do that, if we do not want to protect the innocent Government employee——

Mr. MORSE. I do not think it is a question of protecting the innocent Government employee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the able Senator that the disbursing agents already have the authority, and this relates only to a case where the matter has gotten by a disbursing agent and gotten to the Comptroller General.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

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

DRAINAGE CHARGES ON UINTAH INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

The bill (H. R. 4070) to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949

The bill (H. R. 5951) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICERS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2969) to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to remove suspensions and disallowances issued against vouchers approved by authorized certifying officers during the war. The certifying officers covered by this bill were employed by the Foreign Economic Administration, Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, Civilian Production Administration, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and the Office of Economic Stabilization, during the period these agencies were in existence. After the war they were abolished and the records, property, and facilities were transferred to the Department of Commerce for liquidation. This legislation will not require the appropriation of additional funds, nor will it relieve any payee who has received payment of Government funds to which he is not entitled, and does not contemplate the relief of any certifying officer where his fraudulent conduct contributed to or caused the erroneous payment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit, in the accounts of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in process of liquidation by the Department of Commerce at the time of the enactment of this act, for the amounts of suspensions and disallowances, which have been, or may be, raised by the General Accounting Office on account of payments made in accordance with vouchers certified by such certifying officers: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce or his authorized representative shall certify that in his opinion there is no evidence of fraud or collusion on the part of the certifying officers in connection with the payments: *Provided further*, That nothing under this act shall operate to relieve from liability to the United States, any payee who has received any payment of Government funds to which he is not entitled.

RELIEF OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICERS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3226) to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The purpose of the bill is the same as that of the previous bill, except that it applies to the Department of the Interior. The preceding bill applied to the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies, in process of liquidation by the Department of the Interior at the time of the enactment of this act, for the amounts of suspensions and disallowances, which have been, or may be, raised by the General Accounting Office on account of payments made in accordance with vouchers certified by such certifying officers: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representatives shall certify that in his opinion there is no evidence of fraud or collusion on the part of the certifying officers in connection with the payments.

SEC. 2. The expression "terminated war agencies," as used in this act, means the Solid Fuels Administration for War, the Petroleum Administration for War, the War Relocation Authority, the Coal Mines Administration, the Office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, and that part of the functions of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions authorized under the head of "Emergency fund, Territories and island possessions (national defense)" by the joint resolution of December 23, 1941 (55 Stat. 855, 856).

INVESTIGATION OF GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 202) to investigate gambling and racketeering activities was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I consider it exceedingly important that action on this resolution be had at an early date. I earnestly hope that such early consideration shall be had. I favor the resolution, with certain amendments, which I think would be proper to have incorporated therein.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that at page 5285 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on April 17, 1950, the Senate was advised by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] that he would offer a substitute to the resolution which, among other things, would establish a special committee, to be composed of five members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is my intention to oppose the substitute to which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee alludes. In my opinion, the subject matter which will be involved in the discussion of the substitute and the arguments in favor of the resolution, cannot be adequately discussed under the 5-minute limitation applicable to each speech under the consent calendar. Therefore, Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the resolution will be passed over.

NUMBER OF MIDSHIPMEN AT UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY ALLOWED THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2209) to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill would increase the number of midshipmen to be appointed from the District of Columbia from 5, as at present, to 15. At the present time, the District of Columbia has much lower representation in appointments than some States. For example, Vermont, with a population of 364,000, is presently entitled to 15 appointments, and Delaware, with a population of 293,000, is allowed the same number. Under the general law, each Senator and each Representative is allowed five appointments to the Naval Academy. The purpose of the pending bill, which was approved by the Committee on Armed Services, is to give fair representation to the District of Columbia by increasing the number from 5 to 15, which is in proportion to the population of the District of Columbia as compared with States having equal representation.

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

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Representations have been made to the senior Senator from Kansas with reference to the measure to the effect that many apopintments from the District of Columbia are now arranged for by reason of the fact that so many eligible individuals who live in the District of Columbia come from all over the United States, and have the benefit of obtaining some degree of consideration for appointment from those States, and that probably there should not be this larger number granted. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Virginia make a statement as to that.

Mr. BYRD. As I said, five midshipmen are allotted to each Senator and Representative in Congress, including the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. In addition to that, five are allotted at the present time from the District of Columbia, and fifteen are appointed each year at large. One hundred are appointed annually from among the enlisted men of the Navy. I assume the category which the Senator from Kansas mentions relates to the 15 appointed at large each year. But they would not necessarily come from the District of Columbia. Probably very few of them would come from the District. They are frequently taken, as I understand, from the sons of naval officers. They would not necessarily live here.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Who would have the appointing authority for the District?

Mr. BYRD. The District Commissioners.

Mr. THYE. The District Commissioners have the same appointing authority as a Representative or a Senator?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Under the bill the number from the District would be fifteen, which would give the District fair representation on the basis of population. The committee thought that would be proper, but felt that five was totally inadequate for the District of Columbia.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2209) to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments in line 11, after the word "years", to strike out "1949" and insert "1951", and in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "1950" and insert "1952", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy", approved December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the words "and five for the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and fifteen for the District of Columbia".

SEC. 2. The increase in appointments provided in this act shall be accomplished by the appointment of not more than five during each of the years 1951 and 1952.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

INCREASE OF THE NUMBER OF CADETS AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The bill (S. 2210) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength," approved June

3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306), was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this bill makes the same adjustment for appointments to the Military Academy from the District as was provided with respect to the midshipmen at the Naval Academy in the preceding bill.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2210) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306), be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking the word "six" preceding the words "District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twelve."

CONVEYANCE TO TOWN OF NAHANT, MASS., OF THE FORT RUCKMAN MILITARY RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 7477) providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, this bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It provides for the execution of a quitclaim deed to the town of Nahant, Mass., of certain lands for use by the municipality. There are involved approximately 50 acres, 45 of which were acquired some 40 years ago, and during which time the town, at considerable expense to itself, provided facilities which, of course, represented quite a loss to the community, and, in addition, suffered other losses, such as to the roads and other facilities, as a result of the use of this fort for military purposes.

It was the feeling of the committee, I may say to the Senator from Oregon, that the reservation now is surplus, is not in use. Therefore, it represents an expense to the Government.

The terms of the deed will provide that return of the property to the Federal Government will be required and will be made necessary in the event of any emergency. So we feel every purpose will be served to the Federal Government by having the land available for this very useful public purpose and, at the same time, without additional expense to the Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the bill go over, so I can study it, because it represents a type of bill which is very difficult to reconcile with a principle which I believe to be rather important, namely, that Federal property should not be given away.

I am very much impressed by the argument of the Senator from Maryland—and I have read the committee report—that over the years this little town in Massachusetts has expended a considerable sum of money on this particular property. On the other hand, we have had a great many other instances in which that argument has also been used in respect to Federal property, only to find that the location of the Federal activity in the particular community has been a great asset to the community, too, over the years.

It is just this simple with me as to the position which should be taken on this kind of legislation: Here is Federal property. It is owned by all the people of the United States. There are undoubtedly some equities in this property in behalf of the people of this particular Massachusetts town. But, as a matter of policy, I think it is a mistake to start giving away Federal property without at least some compensation to all the taxpayers of the country. So until I can have the time—and I have not had the time—to study the bill and the committee report, and to discuss it with the Senators from Massachusetts and the Senator from Maryland, I must object, because I am afraid I might find myself in a position of violating a principle and a policy which I am not consciously going to violate.

As the bill presently stands, I think this Federal property, which belongs to all the people of the United States, must be worth at least a dollar, and if it is worth a dollar, I think we ought to receive 50 cents for it.

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts may I say that the committee is in agreement with the general principles laid down by the Senator from Oregon, which we think are very important and very well considered. However, we believe the Senator, upon study of this particular situation, will come to the conclusion that it is better for the Federal Government, for the State, and for the local governments, to have the property used as it is proposed that it will be used, rather than to have it remain out of service, under expense to the Federal Government, particularly when there are offsetting considerations which entitle the small town of 3,000 population to the use of the land. The town has really paid for it in a measure.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am in substantial agreement with the philosophy of the Senator from Oregon that we should not give away Federal property. I have just received a telegram, I will say to the Senator, signed by the chairman of the board of selectmen of the town of Nahant, telling me that last night they had a meeting and unanimously voted to raise $23,000. That small town has voted to raise $23,000 for the purchase, which will be 50 percent, or half, the cost of purchasing Fort Ruckman.

I have in my hand a letter from Jess Larson, Administrator of General Services Administration, in which he says that the fair value of the property is $45,866. The town is on record as having voted to raise $23,000.

Mr. President, I had prepared an amendment in the event the action which the town took were to take place. I did not know until just a little while ago whether it took place or not. However, I had the amendment prepared in case such action were taken. It would amend the bill to require that upon payment to the United States of the sum of $23,000 the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, and so forth and so forth. I ask the Senator from Oregon, whether, if the amendment were agreed to, he would withdraw his objection to the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I always withdraw my objection if the Government can get 50 percent of the fair market value of the property, and if the property is to be devoted to the public use, as I understand this property is. So that no one may misunderstand me on the matter, my position is that all the people of the country have a 50-percent interest in the value of the property when it is turned over to local governmental agencies for a public use; but I do not think the local people should pay 100 percent for the property.

Mr. President, I am not at all surprised at the statesmanlike attitude of the Senator from Massachusetts in respect to this matter. It characterizes his attitude in regard to all matters. I am perfectly willing to accept his amendment, with the understanding that the twenty-three thousand and some dollars represent 50 percent of the fair value of the property.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, upon payment to the United States of the sum of $23,000 the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the town of Nahant, Mass., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all lands constituting the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation, situated within the town of Nahant, together with the buildings and other importments thereon, *Provided, however,* That the instrument of conveyance shall reserve to the United States, for so long as it is necessary for governmental purposes, that certain 15-foot easement for the maintenance, repair, and replacement of a cable and its appurtenances, and at such time as it shall be no longer required for governmental use, said easement may be abandoned and upon such abandonment will automatically terminate, and that certain temporary easement, terminating June 30, 1954, covering one and one-tenths acres of land used in connection with the Turf drainage investigation program, with right of access thereto, both easements being more particularly described in WAA Form 1005, dated June 22, 1948, Reporting Agency No. WD 1299, as amended by WAA Form 1005, December 15, 1948, Reporting Agency Form WD-1229-B, which are filed in the office of the General Services Administration.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Jess Larson, Administrator, General Services Administration, addressed to me, dated November 29, 1949, which shows that the value of the property is $45,866, together with a telegram which I received from the town of Nahant, expressing their agreement.

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

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
November 2, 1949.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: This is in further reference to your letter of October 7, 1949, regarding Fort Ruckman, Nahant, Mass., and to reply of this office of November 8, 1949, on this subject.

A further field investigation and review of the appraisal by Sidney L. Simonds, forwarded with your letter of Octotber 7, have been made by our New York regional office. In order to reconcile the wide variance of opinions as to the fair value of this property as expressed by the estimate furnished by Mr. Simonds, and the estimates obtained from the independent appraiser and our own appraiser, a study was made of recent land transactions in the immediate area. This study also included the assessed valuations of lands bordering this property, and the recent sales of reasonably comparable buildings at locations possessing somewhat similar characteristics and environment.

Consideration was given by the reviewing appraiser to the information relating to recent transfers of property which Mr. Simonds furnished in his report, and which apparently were given considerable weight in arriving at his conclusion of the fair value of the property.

From the report submitted by our New York office, it appears that a thorough review of both the appraisals furnished to the town of Nahant and War Assets has been made, based upon a reinspection of the property and consideration of all available valuation data by the reviewing appraiser.

The result of this review and study is to reduce the fair value of the land and those buildings which are considered to have a value for use in place from $52,200, as stated in my letter dated November 8, to $45,866. The remaining buildings, which are appraised separately for off-site use, are estimated to have a fair value of $6,884. Based on the information furnished by the regional office, it is our belief that the fair value of $45,866 is a fair and reasonable valuation.

I will be glad to furnish any additional information in connection with this case which you may require.

Sincerely yours,

JESS LARSON,
Administrator.

NAHANT, MASS., *April 18, 1950.*

Sen. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.:

Town of Nahant unanimously voted to raise $23,000 for purchase of Fort Ruckman at annual meeting.

WILLIAM F. ENGLISH,
Chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill (H. R. 7477) was read the third time and passed.

PAYMENT FOR THE TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 2860) to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, with particular regard to the category of personnel affected?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it has been the normal practice for all the military services, when ordering retired or Reserve personnel to extended active duty, to authorize and pay for the transportation of a limited weight of household effects from home of record to the duty station. Similarly, upon relief from active duty household effects are transported at Government expense from last duty station to home of record, or to any other point equally or less distant. Also, if to a greater distance, credit is allowed in an amount equal to the cost of shipment to home of record.

In the instances covered in this bill, retired or Reserve naval personnel when called to duty did not move their household effects to their duty station, nor did the Government move their household effects during their active-duty period. However, upon relief from active duty these individuals requested that their household effects be transported at Government expense to some point other than their home of record based upon the same restrictions as would be effective had the Government previously moved their household effects to their last duty station. The Judge Advocate General of the Navy, based on naval regulations then in effect, ruled that in such instances transportation of household effects could be authorized at Government expense. As a result of this ruling, the Navy Department authorized and paid approximately $63,000 to 233 such individuals for the transportation of their household effects.

On June 13, 1947, the Comptroller General ruled that shipments of household effects from homes of record to places selected by naval personnel upon release from active duty was unauthorized and disallowed the payments already made by the Navy Department for such transportation. As a result of this ruling the Navy Department has attempted to secure reimbursement for the unauthorized shipments of household effects and has succeeded in collecting approximately $6,200.

This bill would legalize the shipments of household effects which the Navy Department authorized and paid for prior to the decision of the Comptroller General on June 13, 1947, and which were disapproved as a result of that ruling. It would further authorize the Navy Department to pay out of current appropriations for those shipments of household effects which were authorized by the Navy prior to June 13, 1947, the date of the Comptroller General's ruling, and which were not paid as a result of that ruling. If this bill is enacted into law the Navy Department will take no further steps to collect the balance of the $63,000 and will return the $6,200 already collected. The Navy Department estimates that there will be less than 100 claims for reimbursement for shipments of household effects which were authorized prior to June 13, 1947, the cost of which will not exceed $30,000. Therefore, the total additional cost of this bill might involve approximately $36,200.

The committee considered all aspects of this problem, including the views of the Comptroller General, and concluded that in view of the small number of claims involved and that shipments were made in good faith, it is in the best interest of all concerned to recommend the favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceded to consider the bill (S. 2860) to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "been", to strike out "effected" and insert "authorized", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That payment of the cost of transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking) of household effects of members of the naval forces, upon release from active duty, from their homes of record to places selected by such members is hereby authorized to be made from current appropriations as may be available for such services and any payments representing the cost of such transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking) heretofore made, are ratified and approved: *Provided,* That such transportation shall have been authorized prior to June 13, 1947, pursuant to duly promulgated regulations of the Navy Department: *Provided further,* That the transportation costs authorized to be paid hereunder are limited to the constructive costs of transportation from the last duty stations to the homes of record.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This bill is the unfinished business, and it goes over automatically.

The bill (H. R. 6567) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the bill go over.

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

The bill (H. R. 7797) to provide foreign economic assistance was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LAWRENCE B. WILLIAMS AND VIVA CRAIG WILLIAMS

The bill (H. R. 6696) for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDGAR F. RUSSELL AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 6695) for the relief of Edgar F. Russell; Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward, was considered ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HUGO GEIGER

The bill (S. 356) for the relief of Hugo Geiger was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at port of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (e)), which excludes from admission into the United States persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, shall not hereafter be held to apply to Hugo Geiger, the son of Otto and Karoline Geiger, who are American citizens, on account of the offense alleged to have been committed by him in connection with a theft of food in Germany. If he is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to the said Hugo Geiger under this act upon application hereafter filed.

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 nonpreference category of the quota for nationals of Germany during the current year.

CLEMENTE SABIN DOPICO

The bill (S. 118) for the relief of Clemente Sabin Dopico was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Clemente Sabin Dopico, also known as Clementi Sabin Dopico, of Tampa, Fla. (file No. A-6279638), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment by him of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued with respect to the said Clemente Sabin Dopico.

SEC. 3. Upon 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 of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Spain.

MARIA FRANZIA

The bill (S. 290) for the relief of Maria Franzia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 801 (e)) (relating to loss of nationality through voting in a political election in a foreign state), shall not apply in the case of the participation of Maria Franzia, of the Province of Ligure, Italy, in the elections in Italy in 1946.

DOROTHEA SINGER

The bill (S. 395) for the relief of Dorothea Singer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dorothea Singer (No. A-6524463 E & RAU), temporarily residing in New York, N. Y., shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence, as of the date of her last actual entry into the United States, upon payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond issue in the case of Dorothea Singer. From and after the date of enactment of this act the said Dorothea Singer shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued.

SEC. 3. Upon 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 of the first available quota for nationals of Hungary.

EMMA L. JACKSON

The bill (S. 404) for the relief of Emma L. Jackson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Emma L. Jackson, of Indianapolis, Ind., in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Everett L. Jackson, who died as a result of injuries sustained while fighting a fire at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., May 31, 1945: *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 his 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.

VIT KOMAREK

The bill (S. 1143) for the relief of Vit Komarek was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, Vit Komarek, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of 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 appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MRS. MARIE GULBENKIAN

The bill (S. 1214) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Gulbenkian was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 3771, Calendar 1442, is an identical House bill. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill, instead of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3771) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Gulbenkian was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1214 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in that connection let me say that I understood that the Senate bill was reported with an amendment. Does the Senate bill with the amendment correspond to the House bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. That matter is taken care of in the House bill.

WILHEMUS JOHANNES MARIE VAN DER KOOY

The bill (S. 1419) for the relief of Wilhemus Johannes Marie Van Der Kooy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, Wilhemus Johannes Marie Van Der Kooy, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 6, 1948, the date on which he was admitted as a visitor, upon payment of 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 appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANTON BOS

The bill (S. 1561) for the relief of Anton Bos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Anton Bos, of Oakland, Calif., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of the Netherlands.

KARIN MARGARETA HELLEN AND OLOF CHRISTER HELLEN

The bill (S. 1693) for the relief of Karin Margareta Hellen and Olof Christer Hellen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Karin Margareta Hellen and her minor son, Olof Christer Hellen, of Portland, Oreg.,

who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of October 24, 1948, upon the payment of the required visa fees and head taxes.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Finland.

ZORA KRIZAN

The bill (S. 1753) for the relief of Zora Krizan, also known as Zorardo Krizanova, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Zora Krizan, also known as Zorardo Krizanova, of Perrysville, Pa., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 16, 1948, the date on which she entered the United States on a temporary visa, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Czechoslovakia.

MARINA GEORGE PAPADOPOULOS

The bill (S. 2265) for the relief of Marina George Papadopoulos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, Marina George Papadopoulos, Las Vegas, Nev., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date she last entered the United States, upon payment of the 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 appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MRS. OSA J. PETTY

The bill (S. 3012) for the relief of Mrs. Osa J. Petty was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Osa J. Petty, of New Matamoras, Ohio, the sum of $78.37, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for performing the duties of lamplighter for the Wells Island Light in the Ohio River during the period from January 18, 1949, to May 28, 1949: *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.

LT. (JG) CHARLES W. IRELAND, ETC.

The bill (S. 3090) for the relief of Lt. (jg) Charles W. Ireland, Supply Corps, United States Navy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the payments made by Lt. (jg) Charles W. Ireland, Supply Corps, United States Navy, symbol No. 573180, to certain civilians employed by the Navy Department in the maintenance and operation of the Aiken Relay Calculator, for the cost of their travel and that of their dependents and for the cost of transportation of their household effects incident to the transfer of such personnel from Cambridge, Mass., to Dahlgren, Va., are hereby ratified and the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of the said Lt. (jg) Charles W. Ireland in the amounts of such payments.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert W. Rose the sum of $143.56, which sum represents reimbursement for expenses incurred by him in the transportation of his household effects to Dahlgren, Va.

SALOMON HENRI LAIFER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 304) for the relief of Salomon Henri Laifer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "the", to strike out "nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of France" and insert "appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Salomon Henri Laifer, of Bridgeport, Conn. (file No. A-6965201), who entered the United States as a visitor on July 19, 1948, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of July 19, 1948, upon payment by him of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. Upon 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 appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

LOW WAY HONG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 331) for the relief of Low Way Hong, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That, for the purposes of immigration and naturalization laws, Low Way Hong, the minor child of Low Wen Been, a citizen of the United States, shall be considered as eligible for admission to the United States under the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JURISDICTION IN CLAIMS OF ESTATE OF ARCHANGELO STRANERI—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 583) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Archangelo Straneri was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, if the sponsors of the bill will accept a substitute conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims, I shall withhold objection and shall favor the bill. However, I think the bill as it now stands, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, violates a rather fixed principle which we have in respect to claims of this sort.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment, if the Senator wishes to offer it, to have jurisdiction conferred upon the Court of Claims.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May the bill go to the foot of the calendar, Mr. President, until the amendment can be drafted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

JURISDICTION IN CLAIM OF FOREST LUMBER CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 764) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co. which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 21, after the word "act.", to strike out "Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.", and insert "Upon the rendition of final judgments, the court shall certify the same to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall thereupon direct the payment of said judgments out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 25, sec. 81) and notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims with respect to claims upon any contract implied in law, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such court to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co. against either the United States in a fiduciary capacity or the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians in connection with the contract construed by such court in its decision dated January 12, 1938, in the case of Forest Lumber Co., a corporation, against the United States (86 C. Cls. 188).

SEC. 2. The amount of any judgment awarded by the Court of Claims upon such claim shall not exceed the amount of the judgment heretofore awarded by such court in the case of Forest Lumber Co., a corporation, against the United States (86 C. Cls. 188, 225). Such judgment may be awarded against the United States in a

fiduciary capacity or as guardian, or against the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, or in part against the United States in a fiduciary capacity or as guardian and in part against such tribe, as the facts and law require, except that as to timber cut from allotted lands any judgment may be against the United States as guardian of the allottees.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted by or on behalf of the Forest Lumber Co. at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Upon the rendition of final judgments, the court shall certify the same to the Secretary of Interior, who shall thereupon direct the payment of said judgments out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JURISDICTION IN CLAIM OF ALGOMA LUMBER CO. AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 765) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 3, line 4, after the word "act.", to strike out "Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.", and insert "Upon the rendition of final judgments, the court shall certify the same to the Secretary of Interior, who shall thereupon direct the payment of said judgments out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 25, sec. 81) and notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims with respect to claims upon any contract implied in law, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such court to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. (including the claim of George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust, successors by transfer, conveyance, and assignment thereof) against either the United States in a fiduciary capacity or the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians in connection with the contract construed by such court in its decision dated January 12, 1933, in the case of Algoma Lumber Co., a corporation, against the United States (86 C. Cls. 226).

SEC. 2. The amount of any judgment awarded by the Court of Claims upon such claim shall not exceed the amount of the judgment heretofore awarded by such court in the case of Algoma Lumber Co., a corporation, against the United States (86 C. Cls. 226, 271). Such judgment may be awarded against the United States in a fiduciary capacity or as guardian, or against the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, or in part against the United States in a fiduciary capacity or as guardian and in part against such tribe, as the facts and law require, except that as to timber cut from allotted lands any judgment may be against the United States as guardian of the allottees.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted by or on behalf of the Algoma Lumber Co. as by the said trustees as successors in interest thereto at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Upon the rendition of final judgments, the court shall certify the same to the Secretary of Interior, who shall thereupon direct the payment of said judgments out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JURISDICTION IN CLAIM OF LAMM LUMBER CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 766) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 20, after the word "Act", to strike out "Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code as amended.", and insert "Upon the rendition of final judgments, the court shall certify the same to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall thereupon direct the payment of said judgments out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 25, sec. 81) and notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims with respect to claims upon any contract implied in law, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such court, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co. against either the United States in a fiduciary capacity or the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians in connection with the contract construed by such court in its decision dated January 12, 1938, in the case of Lamm Lumber Co. against the United States (86 C. Cls. 171).

SEC. 2. The amount of any judgment awarded by the Court of Claims upon such claim shall not exceed the amount of the judgment heretofore awarded by such court in the case of Lamm Lumber Co. against the United States (86 C. Cls. 171, 188). Such judgment may be awarded against the United States in a fiduciary capacity or as guardian, or against the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, or in part against the United States in a fiduciary capacity or as guardian and in part against such tribe, as the facts and law require, except that as to timber cut from allotted lands any judgment may be against the United States as guardian of the allottees.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted by or on behalf of the Lamm Lumber Co. at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

Upon the rendition of final judgments, the court shall certify the same to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall thereupon direct the payment of said judgments out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CHEN-KYA HAHN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 861) for the relief of Chen-Kya Hahn, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 11, after the word "available", to strike out "immigration quota for China" and insert "Chinese racial immigration quota", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Chen-Kya Hahn, of San Francisco, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 21, 1947, upon payment by him of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Chinese racial immigration quota.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 891) for the relief of Ronald Clive Jack was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Over.

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

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, reverting to Calendar 1405, Senate bill 891, did I correctly understand there was objection to its present consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection was made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Alabama care to state his objection?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I desire to look over the report a little more carefully than I have had time to do thus far, and I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

DR. JUAN A. QUERALT BALLESTE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1452) for the relief of Dr. Juan A. Queralt Balleste, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "August 19, 1948", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Juan A. Queralt Balleste shall

be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. Upon 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 of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Spain.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

RUDOLF MEINHARD AND IRENE HALLINGER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1491) for the relief of Rudolf Meinhard and Irene Hallinger, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Rudolf Meinhard and Irene Hallinger shall be considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Gustav Stattner, United States citizens.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ANDRE LAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1506) for the relief of Andre Lan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That, in the administration of the laws relating to immigration and naturalization the alien, Andre Lan, a lawful resident of the United States, shall be held and considered to have resided in the United States for 5 years prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JOSE AUGUSTO PEREIRA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1551) for the relief of Jose Augusto Perira, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond which may have been issued in the case of Jose Augusto Pereira, of Fall River, Mass. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Jose Augusto Pereira shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Jose Augusto Pereira, who last entered the United States on October 31, 1939, shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry, upon payment by him of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 3. 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 of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Portugal.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ANASTACIA ROSHANI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1573) for the relief of Anastacia Roshani, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 10, after the word "entry", to insert "upon payment of the required visa fee 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 appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Anastacia Roshani, a national of Iran, temporarily residing at 1203 Sheffield Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., who entered the United States on May 15, 1948, at New York, N. Y., for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of such entry, upon payment of the required visa fee 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 appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

EFRONSINI ABAD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1672) for the relief of Efronsini Abad, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "son" and insert "daughter", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Efrosini Abad, of Istanbul, Turkey, who is the daughter of a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be a child under 21 years of age.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ANASTASIOS KOLLIAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1802) for the relief of Anastasios Kollias, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "November 1, 1948,", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Anastasios Kollias shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date on which he entered the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Greece.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SISTERS MARIA RITA ROSSI, MARIA DOMENICA PAONE, RACHELE ORLANDO, ASSUNTA ROSELLI, ROSA INNOCENTI, AND MARIA MANCINELLI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1856) for the relief of Sisters Maria Rita Rossi, Maria Domenica Paone, Rachele Orlando, Assunta Roselli, Rosa Innocenti, and Maria Mancinelli, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, at the top of page 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to deduct six numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of Italy.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Sisters Maria Rita Rossi, Maria Domenica Paone, Rachele Orlando, Assunta Roselli, Rosa Innocenti, and Maria Mancinelli, who were admitted to the United States on temporary visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the dates of their last entries, on payment of the required visa fees and head taxes.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to deduct six numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of Italy.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MARCANTONIO DORIA D'ANGRI AND WIFE, SONIA STAMPA DORIA D'ANGRI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1869) for the relief of Marcantonio Doria d'Angri and his wife, Sonia Stampa Doria d'Angri, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Marcantonio Doria d'Angri and his wife, Sonia Stampa Doria d'Angri, citizens of Italy, who last entered the United States at the port of New York, on May 29, 1948, as visitors, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entry, upon payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of Italy.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ITALO VESPA DE CHELLIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2108) for the relief of Italo Vespa de Chellis, which had been reported from

the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, beginning with line 3, strike out to and through line 1, on page 2, as follows:

That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause an immigration visa to be issued to Italo Vespa de Chellis, temporarily residing in Windsor, Ontario, Canada, permitting his immediate entry into the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than those relating to quotas. Upon issuance of such visa, the Secretary shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of China.

And insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Italo Vespa de Chellis shall be held and considered to be the minor child of his mother, Mrs. Ninetta Vespa de Chellis, lawfully admitted legal resident of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

THOMAS PFEIFFER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2714) for the relief of Thomas Pfeiffer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Thomas Pfeiffer, who is presently residing in Montreal, Canada, and who is to be adopted by Mr. and Mrs. Ely Beaumont, of Burbank, Calif., shall be deemed to be the alien child of said Mr. and Mrs. Ely Beaumont, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

LT. (SG) GIACONIA FALCO

The bill (H. R. 1487) for the relief of Lt. (sg) Giaconia Falco, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the files of the Judiciary Committee contain a summary of the files of the Immigration and Naturalization Service with regard to this alien. Ordinarily, the granting of preexamination is not an indication of an exceptionally meritorious case. Under some circumstances, it may be such an indication; and this is a case in which it is.

The situation is this: This man came to the United States in February 1947, under a visitor's visa. In July of 1947, he applied for an extension of his temporary stay. During the investigation of that application for an extension, he expressed the desire to apply for preexamination so that he could proceed to Canada and obtain a visa for permanent residence. As soon as he had made that expression, the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization took it that he desired to remain in the United States indefinitely, and therefore denied his application for an extension of stay. That meant that when his temporary visa expired, on August 5, 1947, he was immediately in the status of an alien illegally in the United States.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service then proceeded to consider this man's application for preexamination. Ordinarily, the regulations require a period of residence longer than this man had been in the country. There is, however, a provision of law which states that in a case of exceptional merit, preexamination may be granted without compliance with the residence requirement. Senators will find that provision in section 142.1 (c), title 8, Code of Federal Regulations.

This alien submitted to the Immigration and Naturalization Service a certificate signed by Capt. Michael P. Russillo, of the United States Navy, who was commander of Submarine Division 72, certifying to the service rendered by this alien from February 11, 1945, to October 1, 1945, aboard the Royal Italian submarine *Dandolo*, cooperating with United States naval units operating in North American waters under the operational control of the United States Navy. The alien also submitted a letter dated September 30, 1947, from Captain Russillo, in which it was stated that the alien "showed great qualities of cooperation and enthusiasm in our war effort." The alien also submitted to the Immigration and Naturalization Service copies of a letter, which is printed in the committee's report on this bill, from Admiral Nimitz, praising the work of the officers and men of the Italian submarines of which the *Dandolo* was one.

In consideration of all the circumstances, and after examining the evidence submitted by the alien, and questioning the alien himself, the Immigration and Naturalization Service granted preexamination on the ground that this was an exceptionally meritorious case.

The alien thereafter applied for his visa at the American consulate in Montreal, but was advised that a visa could not be granted, because he had entered the United States subsequent to September 10, 1946. That was the date on which a new regulation became effective, providing that an alien who is in the United States illegally may not file a registration form at an American consular office. Remember, this man came to the United States legally, on a temporary visa, and applied, in good time, for an extension of that visa; but at the time of his examination on that application, he told the Immigration and Naturalization Service that he wanted to stay in the United States permanently, if he could; and therefore, the extension of temporary stay was denied. That meant that the alien was, technically, illegally in the United States.

Let me simplify the picture. In order to apply for preexamination, this man had to state his desire to remain in the United States for permanent residence. When he stated that desire, he could not get a further extension of his temporary stay; and even though the Immigration and Naturalization Service granted preexamination, on the grounds that this was an exceptionally meritorious case, the procedure took so long that by the time the alien could apply to a consulate in Canada for registration, his temporary permit had expired and he had become, technically, an alien illegally in the United States, and therefore ineligible to register.

This may sound funny to Senators, but it is a very serious matter for this man whose case the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization has found to be exceptionally meritorious, but who must nevertheless be deported unless special legislation in his behalf is enacted.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1487) for the relief of Lt. (sg) Giaconia Falco was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GIOVANNA PARISI ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 2591) for the relief of Giovanna Parisi, Michelina Valletta, Yolanda Altieri, Generosa Tamburi, Carolina Picciano, and Giovanna Turtur, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALTER E. PARKS

The bill (H. R. 3010) for the relief of Walter E. Parks, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALTER J. O'TOOLE

The bill (H. R. 3462) for the relief of Walter J. O'Toole, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. T. F. HARRISON

The bill (H. R. 3924) for the relief of Dr. T. F. Harrison, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. R. HOLDEN AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4342) for the relief of J. R. Holden, R. C. Biggadike, and John Hoffman, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH W. GREER

The bill (H. R. 5341) for the relief of Joseph W. Greer, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANIS SHIMADA

The bill (H. R. 5704) for the relief of Janis Shimada was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BEULAH L. WHITE, WIDOW OF JOHN E. WHITE

The bill (H. R. 6003) for the relief of Beulah L. White, widow of John E. White, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill, especially with reference to the possible

application of the statute of limitations? I think the statute of limitations is involved in the measure, and I should like to have the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee discuss that feature.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the beneficiary of this bill is the widow of a former White House chauffeur. The amount involved is $7,009, and represents compensation to which this woman's late husband would have been entitled, for night work and for Sunday and holiday overtime.

The late husband of this claimant worked at all times as a White House chauffeur, until he was retired for age in 1945. He served 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year, except for one 2-week vacation each year. During the period from August 1935 to August 1940, he was on the Post Office Department pay roll, having been transferred in order to make a place on the White House pay roll for the late President Roosevelt's personal chauffeur. This man was not advised that he was entitled to be paid extra for his overtime and night work, until just before he retired. He was not a well-educated man, and was not familiar with paper work, and he tried ineffectually for more than 4 years to secure the extra pay which was due him; but he got something of a run around, and it was not until the year before his death that anyone told him he should file his claim with the General Accounting Office instead of with the Post Office Department. When he did file his claim with the General Accounting Office, the statute had run against him, and all but about $350 of his claim was denied for that reason. It was the view of the committee that in justice and equity, the widow of this faithful servant should be paid the amount to which he was justly entitled, but which he failed to receive not because of his own fault, but because of the callousness or negligence of officials superior to him.

The amount of the claim has been reduced in accordance with the recommendation of the Comptroller General.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Then the Senator feels that, owing to the extraordinary circumstances, the matter is taken out of a situation which might establish a dangerous precedent; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That was the view of the committee, after very careful consideration.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6003), for the relief of Beulah L. White, widow of John E. White, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MASAMI HIROYA AND AIKO HIRAYA

The bill (H. R. 6093) for the relief of Masami Hiroya and Aiko Hiraya was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EIVOR ANNE-BRITT JEDLUND

The bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of Mrs. Eivor Anne-Britt Jedlund was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHNY NIELSEN

The bill (H. R. 6283) for the relief of Johny Nielsen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. RAYMOND SCHAFFER, JR.

The bill (H. R. 6345) for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF SUSIE LEE SPENCER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1026), for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

AILEEN L. SHERWOOD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2351), for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 6, page 1, to strike out "$1,087.50" and to insert in lieu thereof "$58.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

WADE H. NOLAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2854), for the relief of Wade H. Noland, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$145.50" and insert "$228.25."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished sponsor of this measure a question, if I may. Is it not true that this bill is for the relief of a United States commissioner who is really in laches?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I certainly object to a bill which would waive the statute of limitations for a United States commissioner who should know his rights.

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

STELLA AVNER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4720) for the relief of Stella Avner, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 2, after the word "on", to strike out "October 16, 1946" and insert "October 13, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CLAIM OF J. T. MELSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 597), to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson, against the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the word "liability", to insert "if any,", and in line 7, after the word "recovery", to insert "if any,".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. WALTER K. MIYAMOTO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1862) for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, line 1, after the word "be", to strike out "immediately issued an immigration visa upon application hereafter filed" and insert "granted the status of a nonquota immigrant", and after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Upon the issuance of the visa, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of Japan.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5511) to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act of 1930 relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities was announced as next in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, has not that bill already been passed?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a corresponding Senate bill on the calendar, prior to the point where the call of the calendar was begun today.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then it must have been objected to at some previous time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MRS. LYDIA L. SMITH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2079) for the relief of Mrs. Lydia L. Smith which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 6, page 1, to strike out "$2,640" and to insert "$2,384.33."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Lydia L. Smith, of Aiken, S. C., the sum of $2,384.33, representing the amount of pension she

would have received for the period beginning on July 7, 1944, and ending on March 9, 1948, had her claim for a widow's pension been filed within 1 year after July 7, 1944, the date fixed by the War Department as the presumptive date of death of Capt. Lloyd B. Smith, who was reported missing in action on July 6, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

FISHER CONTRACTING CO.

The bill (H. R. 4959) to reimburse the Fisher Contracting Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of this measure?

Mr. HAYDEN. This bill is identical with a bill favorably reported to the Senate heretofore. The only question which was raised at that time was whether the claim should be considered by the Court of Claims in Washington or by a United States district court in the area. The House having passed the bill, providing that the jurisdiction be in the United States district court in the area, it seemed to me that the Senate might well concur and pass the bill. That was the only issue involved.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that this bill is the same as Calendar 1257, Senate bill 1950?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of the fact that the bill has been previously objected to——

Mr. HAYDEN. I have explained to the Senate why objection was made at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was the Senator from Kansas the only Senator who objected to it?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. As I understand, the bill was passed over for further consideration. It was not objected to.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. In fairness, I desire to make an explanation, since the question has arisen. I merely requested that the bill go over for further study and determination, and that is the reason I asked for an explanation. I have satisfied myself at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of the fact that the Senator from Kansas is satisfied, I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 4959 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1950 will be indefinitely postponed.

RETROCESSION TO MASSACHUSETTS OF CERTAIN LAND IN SHIRLEY, MASS.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4433) to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over certain land in Shirley, Mass., which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 2, line 2, after the word "Deeds", to strike out "of 1947," and in line 3, after the numerals "1600", to insert "of 1947."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO TWO ROCK UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT, IN CALIFORNIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4732) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union School District, a political subdivision of the State of California in Sonoma County, Calif., and to furnish said school district water free of charge which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment on page 4, line 10, after the word "rate", to strike out "not to exceed" and insert "equivalent to."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSFER OF PART OF CAMP JOSEPH T. ROBINSON TO THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3783), authorizing the transfer of part of Camp Joseph T. Robinson to the State of Arkansas, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I rise to make a statement.

This bill was introduced by Congressman BROOKS HAYS of Arkansas. It passed the House on April 3. The Department of the Army concurs in the legislation and the Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection. The letter setting forth the Department of the Army's views appear in the House report. The bill was amended in the House to meet the suggestions contained in the Army's letter.

The purpose of the bill is to convey approximately 33,467 acres of land located on Camp Joseph T. Robinson to the State of Arkansas for National Guard purposes.

Camp Robinson is located about 5 miles north of Little Rock. It originally was known as Camp Pike, during World War I, but during World War II was greatly expanded and was renamed.

The property is now surplus to the Department of the Army. Of the original acreage of 48,700, 15,000 has already been disposed of. Of the buildings which were on the reservation during the war, 8,800 have been declared surplus and removed. The remaining 33,000 acres, buildings and utilities which are under consideration in this bill, are now under a 5-year lease to the State of Arkansas, and are being used by the Arkansas National Guard as a training area. The facilities are adequate to take care of about 6,500 men. The State desires to continue the property as a permanent National Guard installation because of its size and its favorable location within the State. However, it is reluctant to make any expenditure of State funds on the property until it has acquired title. The Department of the Army interposes no objection to transferring the property for National Guard uses provided a suitable right of recapture is retained. That is the amendment which has been added to the bill. The Army's position is that this provides a good way of keeping this property on a stand-by, or "mothball," status until it is needed again.

Special legislation is necessary to accomplish this purpose because of the fact that the general legislation which would permit this has been permitted to lapse. Public Law 829 of the Eightieth Congress authorized the transfers to States of surplus property suitable for, and needed by, the civilian components. Public Law 829 was an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, which lapsed when the new Surplus Property Act, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, became effective.

The bill consists of three sections.

Section 1 authorizes the transfer to the State of Arkansas of the property in question, reserving to the United States all mineral rights.

Section 2 provides that the property must be used primarily for the training of the National Guard for military purposes and provides for a reversion to the United States should the State fail to use the property for the purpose intended. Such reversion would also include any improvements made by the State.

Section 3 gives to the United States the right of recapture in case of national emergency without any obligation to make payment of any kind.

Favorable consideration of this legislation is urged because of the fact that general legislation to meet the situation has lapsed. The Army concurs in the desirability of the transfer, as does the Bureau of the Budget. The legislation as drafted, therefore, seems to fulfill the requirements of all interested parties.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will ask that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCLELLAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I am advised that what is attempted to be done by this bill has been done under the general law to which I referred, which has expired, in five different instances heretofore. One was in connection with Camp Swift, Tex.; one at San Antonio, Tex., Arsenal; at Fort Huachuca, Ariz.; at the Naval Separation Center, Nashville, Tenn., and at the Ridgewood Forge Plant, Ohio.

I merely mention this because it seems that the purpose is to afford an advantage to national defense, an advantage to the national Government, in order that the areas concerned, which have

been used for camp sites, be not completely abandoned, but be used for military purposes by the National Guard, and placed on a standby basis, so that they would be available in all instances in case of a national emergency.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that is exactly what was done in the case of Fort Huachuca, Ariz. Part of it used for military purposes was reserved for the National Guard. The part that was up in the mountains has been reserved for use of the Arizona Fish and Wildlife Service. It is all there available for use to the Nation at any time when there may be a threat of war.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is all the bill seeks to accomplish. Of course, there has been a request that it go over, and that is all right, but there is nothing in the bill to provide any advantage for Arkansas, any more than it will actually be in the interest of the general welfare and in the interest of the national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard, and the bill has gone over.

SISTER STEFANIA CUPRYS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 587) for the relief of Sister Stefania Cuprys, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Sister Stefania Cuprys shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JAMES GREENWOOD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 615) for the relief of James Greenwood, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws James Greenwood shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment 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 amendment was agreed to.

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

JACQUES YEDID AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 977) for the relief of Jacques Yedid and others, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the name "Henriette Yedid", to strike out "Richard Emanuel Yedid,", and on page 2, line 2, after the name "Lebanon", to strike out "Palestine", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Jacques Yedid, Henriette Yedid, and Ethel Danielle Yedid shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of their last entries into the United States, on payment of the required visa fees and head taxes.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Lebanon, Poland, and Egypt.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jacques Yedid, Henriette Yedid, and Ethel Danielle Yedid."

JOHN SPLINGAERD AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1051) for the relief of John Splingaerd, his wife, and two children, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "laws", to strike out "John" and insert "Paul Joseph", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Paul Joseph Splingaerd, his wife, Helen Colette, and his two children, Renee and Christine, of Twenty-nine Palms, Calif., who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by them of the required head taxes and visa fees.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota or quotas.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Paul Joseph Splingaerd, his wife, and two children."

STEVEN ETIENNE LASZLO AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1572) for the relief of Steven Laszlo, and others, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mary Laszlo and her son, Ervin Laszlo, of New York, N. Y., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of their last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such numbers are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mary Laszlo and her son, Ervin Laszlo."

VICTOR ALEXANDROVITCH MARTINUK

The bill (S. 2013) for the relief of Victor Alexandrovitch Martinuk, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any exclusion proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order of exclusion or warrant of deportation issued in the case of Victor Alexandrovitch Martinuk. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Victor Alexandrovitch Martinuk shall not again be subject to exclusion or deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such exclusion proceedings were commenced or such orders of exclusion or deportation issued.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the immigration laws, the said Victor Alexandrovitch Martinuk shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last actual entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota.

ADELE DE PAULI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2040) for the relief of Adele De Pauli, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after "Adele De", to strike out "Pauli" and insert "Paoli", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Adele De Paoli, of Denver, Colo, who was admitted into the United States on a diplomatic visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Italy.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Adele DePaoli."

MRS. JAMES A. VAUGHN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2053) for the relief of Mrs. James A. Vaughn, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary

with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Vivienne Joy Wilson, the Japanese fiancée of James A. Vaughn, a citizen of the United States and former civilian employee of the armed forces of the United States, and that Vivienne Joy Wilson may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Vivienne Joy Wilson is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said James A. Vaughn, 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 Vivienne Joy Wilson, 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 wthin 3 months after entry of said Vivienne Joy Wilson, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Vivienne Joy Wilson as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment by her of the required fees and head taxes.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, Mary Ann Vaughn, the minor child of the said Vivienne Joy Wilson shall, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of James A. Vaughn, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Vivienne Joy Wilson and minor daughter Mary Ann Vaughn."

EIVIND HOGNESTAD

The bill (S. 2175) for the relief of Eivind Hognestad, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Eivind Hognestad, of Chicago, Ill., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota.

DR. BEI TSE CHAO AND HIS WIFE, MAY CHAO

The bill (S. 2176) for the relief of Dr. Bei Tse Chao and his wife, May Chao, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Bei Tse Chao and his wife, May Chao, of Chicago, Ill., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of October 18, 1948, the date of their last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head taxes and visa fees.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota.

PETER HEYDEN

The bill (S. 2232) for the relief of Peter Heyden, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Peter Heyden, of Oneida, Wis., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of the Netherlands.

TEVFIK KAMIL KUTAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2243) for the relief of Tevfik Kamil Kutay, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "entry", to strike out "and shall not be debarred from becoming naturalized as a citizen of the United States," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the first proviso of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and sections 13 (c) and 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the alien Tevfik Kamil Kutay, of Los Angeles, Calif., a national of Turkey who entered the United States at New York, N. Y., on September 19, 1939, for a temporary stay as a student, and whose wife and minor daughter are residents and citizens of the United States, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of such date of entry. 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 Turkey for the first year such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

HYMAN WINTERMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2257), for the relief of Hyman Winterman, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Hyman Winterman shall be deemed to be a native of Great Britain.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. APOSTOLOS A. KARTSONIS

The bill (S. 2258) for the relief of Dr. Apostolos A. Kartsonis, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Dr. Apostolos A. Kartsonis, of Ann Arbor, Mich., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Greece.

MARIANNE BRUCHNER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2629) for the relief of Marianne Bruchner, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

The the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause a nonimmigrant temporary visa to be issued to Marianne Bruchner, German fiancée of World War II veteran Daniel Reule, of Edmunds, N. Dak., who was prevented, because of delay in processing her case, from entering the United States prior to the expiration of Public Law 51, Eighty-first Congress.

And in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Marianne Bruchner, the fiancée of Daniel Reule, a United States citizen veteran of World War II, may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Marianne Bruchner, the fiancée of Daniel Reule, a United States citizen veteran of World War II, may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Marianne Bruchner is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Daniel Reule. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Marianne Bruchner, 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 that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Marianne Bruchner, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Marianne Bruchner as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

GEORGES GREGORY ALPIAR

The bill (S. 2107), for the relief of Georges Gregory Alpiar, was considered,

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Georges Gregory Alpiar, of Cashmere, Wash., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Turkey.

DR. JOHN R. PORTARIA

The bill (S. 2511), for the relief of Dr. John R. Portaria, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. John R. Portaria, of Portsmouth, Va., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of China (white).

MRS. BILLY J. KNIGHT AND DOROTHEA KNIGHT

The bill (S. 2556), for the relief of Mrs. Billy J. Knight and Dorothea Knight, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed immediately prior to the consideration of Senate bill 2556, Calendar No. 1466, a statement relating to that bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS ON S. 2556

This is a matter of greatest importance to a 19-month-old baby girl in Munich, Germany, and to its grandparents in the small west Texas town of Littlefield. It concerns the child of an American boy who served in the army of occupation in Germany.

The boy, Pfc Billy J. Knight, went overseas 4 years ago, and some time later he wrote his parents in west Texas that he was married to a German girl. A baby, Dorothea, named in this bill, was born to Billy and Ellinor Knight in September 1948.

Billy returned to the United States on furlough last year and never again saw his wife and child. He was drowned in a lake near Amarillo.

His parents' first thought naturally was of their granddaughter. They contacted the child's mother, learned she was unable to support the baby and that the child was ill. Ellinor Knight was also unable to present documentary evidence of her marriage so that this American soldier's daughter might be deemed to be a United States citizen by birth and join her grandparents without further delay.

It was finally determined the baby could not enter the United States except under the immigration quota for Germany, which, as you no doubt know, would require several years delay.

Mr. and Mrs. Knight sold their home in Littlefield and moved to a less desirable place in order to have greater resources with which to assist their grandchild. They send money, food, and clothes to the mother, but still the mother is in destitute circumstances. The Knights are, naturally, afraid they will soon lose all trace of the baby unless something is done as soon as possible. Their whole hope lies in this bill.

This bill would confer United States citizenship upon the daughter of Pvt. Billy Knight. It would also entitle his wife to a nonquota immigration status.

The Department of Justice has satisfied itself as to the facts in the case, and has offered no objection to the passage of this bill.

The Judiciary Committee reported the bill favorably and unanimously. The committee's report summed up the purpose of the bill in pure and simple terms as to "preserve for the daughter of an American soldier her right to grow up in the country for which her father fought."

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

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

ARTICAIRE REFRIGERATION CO.

The bill (S. 2646) for the relief of Articaire Refrigeration Co. was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Articaire Refrigeration Co., of Kansas City, Mo., the sum of $1,500, representing the unpaid purchase price of air-conditioning equipment installed by the said company in an Army recruiting station in Kansas City, Mo., under unnumbered contract, purchase order No. 821, dated July 16, 1947, payment of such sum by the Department of the Army having been held to be unauthorized: *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.

ADMISSION OF FOREIGN LABORERS TO PERFORM AGRICULTURAL WORK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 272) to facilitate the admission of certain foreign workers desiring to perform agricultural work in the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "Secretary of Agriculture" and insert "Administrator of the Federal Security Agency"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "such", to insert "temporary"; in line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "Secretary of Agriculture" and insert "Administrator"; in line 4, after the word "certification", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That the admission of such residents pursuant to this act shall be for a period not to exceed 6 months, subject to a renewal period not to exceed an additional 6 months"; in line 11, after the word "to", to strike out "contract laborers,"; after line 18, to insert "Determination of the admissibility of workers under this act who are contract laborers within the meaning of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875; 8 U. S. C. 136), shall be made by the Attorney General as provided in said section 3, except that, in arriving at his decision, the Attorney General may base that decision upon the certification made by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency concerning the need for such labor in this country."; on page 3, line 9, after the word "in", to strike out "accordance with section 20" and insert "the same manner as provided for by sections 19 and 20"; after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Any workers admitted under this act must be admissible to the United States under all provisions of the immigration laws, except as otherwise specified in this act.

On page 3, after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall prescribe such regulations, not inconsistent with the terms of this act, as shall be deemed necessary for the enforcement of this act.

And on page 4, after line 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall terminate 2 years following the date of its enactment, except that those provisions relating to the deportation of aliens admitted under the act shall remain in effect against any alien so admitted.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency determines that the supply of domestic workers willing and able to perform agricultural work is inadequate, he shall so certify to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and such Commissioner shall, with the approval of the Attorney General, prescribe regulations permitting the admission of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto into the United States to meet such shortage in such numbers and for such temporary periods as the Administrator specifies in his certification: *Provided,* That the admission of such residents pursuant to this act shall be for a period not to exceed 6 months, subject to a renewal period not to exceed an additional 6 months. Workers so admitted shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such act which relate to the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign governments, or others. Each such resident shall be provided with an identification card (with his photograph and fingerprints) to be prescribed under the said regulations, which shall be in lieu of all other doumentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Determination of the admissibility of

workers under this act who are contract laborers within the meaning of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875; 8 U. S. C. 136), shall be made by the Attorney General as provided in said section 3, except that, in arriving at his decision, the Attorney General may base that decision upon the certification made by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency concerning the need for such labor in this country. Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in the same manner as provided for by sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. Sections 5 and 6 of such act shall not apply to the importation of aliens under this act.

When used in this act, the term "agricultural work" includes any services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

SEC. 2. Any worker admitted under this act must be admissible to the United States under all provisions of the immigration laws, except as otherwise specified in this act.

SEC. 3. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall prescribe such regulations, not inconsistent with the terms of this act, as shall be deemed necessary for the enforcement of this act.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall terminate 2 years following the date of its enactment, except that those provisions relating to the deportation of aliens admitted under the act shall remain in effect against any alien so admitted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who indicated that he would object to consideration of the bill because he wanted to give it further consideration, I intend to ask that the bill go over. There is an obvious error in the bill, and the amendment of the committee should be amended accordingly. I do not intend to ask that the bill be considered at the present time. I intend to ask that it go over. However, I wish to point out that at the time the bill was introduced, the text of the bill provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should determine whether workers were needed in this country. The committee amended the bill to provide that the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency should make the determination.

That was done because at the time the matter was under consideration the United States Employment Service was in the Federal Security Agency. In the meantime, by the adoption of an Executive order, that Service was transferred to the Department of Labor. What I wish to do is to perfect the bill. Perhaps the way to do it would be to disagree to the first committee amendment, strike out "Secretary of Agriculture," and substitute therefor "Secretary of Labor."

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to accept such an amendment.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona what would be accomplished by the acceptance of his amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. It would provide that, instead of the Secretary of Agriculture or the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency passing on the question of whether or not foreign labor is needed, the Secretary of Labor would determine the question, because the United States Employment Service, by Executive order, has been transferred from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor. Therefore, the proper agency to make the decision is the Department of Labor. I do not say that we should take up the bill for final passage at this time. I believe the amendment which I propose would have to be made in three places in the bill.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is it the Senator's thought that the bill as amended should be passed at this time?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it should be passed over, because there are other considerations. I should like to perfect the bill so far as it can be perfected at this time, so that when it is taken up again its provisions will be understood.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I definitely concur with the distinguished Senator from Arizona with reference to that.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the first committee amendment, on page 1, line 4, should be rejected so as to strike out "Secretary of Agriculture" and also "Administrator of the Federal Security Agency" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Labor."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, all that we should like to do is to put the bill in proper shape so that when it is considered all of us may have a complete understanding of its provisions. I am very happy to hear that the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. McCARRAN] is willing to accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona. If we accept the amendmen, all of us will understand just what the bill provides for. The Senator from Arizona will not ask to have it acted upon finally at this time. We are perfectly willing to have it go over, in order to give Senators an opportunity to consider the proposed change in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator restate his motion?

Mr. HAYDEN. My motion is to disagree to the committee amendment and to insert "Secretary of Labor." That is the first motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation, as the Parliamentarian states it to the Chair, is that the substance of the Senator's motion is to amend a committee amendment. Does the Senator so move?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I am willing to do it in any way it can be done. I desire to strike out the words "Secretary of Agriculture" wherever they appear in the bill and substitute in lieu thereof "Secretary of Labor."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, would the Senator from Arizona be willing to submit his amendments en bloc?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. On page 2, line 3, strike out "Secretary of Agriculture" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Labor."

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on page 3, lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out "Administrator of the Federal Security Agency," and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Labor."

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Arizona. The bill has been delayed for a considerable length of time in its passage through the Committee on the Judiciary. I think it is quite essential that it should receive reasonably prompt consideration by this body and that it should be passed, because the time is fast approaching, if it has not already arrived, when the labor which we are seeking to bring into the country will be needed. The bill should be favorably considered, if not today, at least as promptly as possible.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I fully agree with the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in what he has just said. The bill has been reported and we hope to see it brought up for action as early as possible. We appreciate very much what the Committee on the Judiciary has done.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, at the request of the American Federation of Labor, I join in the objection which has been made to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been amended. Objection is heard to its final passage, and it will go over.

MANUEL URIBE

The bill (H. R. 715) for the relief of Manuel Uribe, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUSTAV SCHILBRED

The bill (H. R. 1600) for the relief of Gustav Schilbred, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HILDE FLINT

The bill (H. R. 1871) for the relief of Hilde Flint, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JULIA (IOLL) M. STEFANI LENCIONI

The bill (H. R. 5276) for the relief of Mrs. Julia (Ioll) M. Stefani Lencioni, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH AND LAWRENCE WONG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1861) for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong, which had been reported from the Committee on

the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Elizabeth Wong and Lawrence Wong, stepchildren of Kwai Lun Wong, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor children of Kwai Lun Wong, a citizen of the United States, and shall be deemed to be nonquota immigrants within the purview of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and pased.

MRS. KATSUKO NAAHARA HUNTLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4857) for the relief of Mrs. Katsuko Naahara Huntley, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "be", to strike out "granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed" and insert "granted the status of a nonquota immigrant."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. TSUNEKO SHIMOKAWA GUENTHER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5580) for the relief of Mrs. Tsuneko Shimokawa Guenther, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "shall", to strike out "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 immigration laws" and insert "be, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, deemed to be a nonquota immigrant."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ALCIDE RAYMOND

The bill (H. R. 6051) for the relief of Alcide Raymond was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is the case of the widow of a retired Army sergeant, now deceased. The dead soldier was discharged in 1935, lacking only 65 days of active duty to complete 30 years of service, which was the period then required for retirement, but he did not know he lacked any days of service, because he had actually been in the Army for 30 years and 14 days on the day he retired. The catch was that under Army regulations, the Army deducted from his service a period of 2 months and 19 days, during which the sergeant had been in confinement awaiting trial by general court martial. The court martial was in 1918, and the sergeant's record was perfectly clean from 1918 until the time of his retirement in 1935, a period of more than 17 years. The sentence of the court martial was to reduce him to the grade of private, and require him to forfeit two-thirds of his pay per month for a period of 6 months. That sentence was executed, but by merit he worked his way back up to the grade of sergeant, which he held at the time of his last discharge, which was an honorable discharge.

The Secretary of the Army has stated that his Department is sympathetic to this case, and the committee has been informed that the board for the correction of military records would correct the record in this case if that was permissible under the law, but that the only way to grant relief is by the enactment of special legislation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada if this is not a case of such a nature that it would be taken out of the precedent establishing category?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not establish a precedent.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6051) for the relief of Alcide Raymond, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That 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, Army serial No. R-203028, formerly sergeant, Battery A, Thirteenth Coast Artillery, which amount is equivalent to 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond."

AMY LOUISA SHIER

The bill (S. 2990) for the relief of Amy Louisa Shier, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Amy Louisa Shier, of Clifton, Bristol, England, the sum of $3,360, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, pain and suffering, and loss of earnings sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by her as the result of an accident, involving a United States Army truck, which occurred on Highway Numbered 217 between Volksen and Steinkrug, Germany, on May 19, 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 agents, or attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, 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.

MRS. HONORA REDMAN

The bill (S. 3163) for the relief of Mrs. Honora Redman, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Honora Redman, of London, England, the sum of $1,566.04, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. Honora Redman and her infant daughter, Veronica Redman, and medical, hospital, and incidental expenses incurred, as the result of an accident occurring in Bremen, Germany, on April 30, 1947, and involving a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, or attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, 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.

MRS. VICTOR V. GREG

The bill (H. R. 633) for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JULIUS ZAFFARENI

The bill (H. R. 1481) for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM KRAUS

The bill (H. R. 1699) for the relief of the estate of William Kraus was considered, order to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTONIO ROJAS VÉLEZ

The bill (H. R. 3306) for the relief of Antonio Rojas Vélez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF OVIDIO VÁZQUEZ

The bill (H. R. 3309) for the relief of the estate of Ovidio Vázquez was con-

sidered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALEJO PADILLA

The bill (H. R. 3315) for the relief of Alejo Padilla was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JUANA PAGÁN

The bill (H. R. 3319) for the relief of Juana Pagán was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGNES EMMA HAY

The bill (H. R. 4380) for the relief of Agnes Emma Hay was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEAN CLARK

The bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of Jean Clark was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIE HENRIETTE DE BRUYN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1637) for the relief of Marie Henriette de Bruyn, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws the alien, Marie Henriette de Bruyn, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of head tax and visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

OSCAR (OSZKAR) NEMENYI, MARIANNA NEMENYI (WIFE), AND THOMAS JOHN NEMENYI (SON)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2309) for the relief of Oscar (Oszkar) Nemenyi, Marianna Nemenyi (wife), and Thomas John Nemenyi (son), which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Oscar (Oszkar) Nemenyi, Marianna Nemenyi (wife), and Thomas John Nemenyi (son), as having entered the United States on May 5, 1948, for permanent residence. The said Oscar (Oszkar) Nemenyi, Marianna Nemenyi (wife), and Thomas John Nemenyi (son), shall not be subject to deportation by reason of such entry.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following sentence:

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF I. D. COSSON, A MINOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2719) for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$15,000", and in line 4, after the word "sustained", to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That such payment to such guardian shall not be made unless such guardian has been authorized by a court of competent jurisdiction to enter into a final settlement, and give a final release in full, of all claims of said minor against the United States by reason of such accident:.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement relating to House bill 2719, Calendar No. 1490.

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

Mr. President, this is the case of a Florida boy who, at the age of 12, was so severely injured by bombs dropped in the yard of his home, and nearby, from a United States Army plane, that he was expected to die. On the theory that he would die in a very short time, the Congress enacted a bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress, providing for the payment of $6,000.

Since then, it has become apparent that the boy may live to a ripe old age; but he is permanently paralyzed from the waist down, and has lost his right leg at the thigh.

Under the circumstances, it is obvious that the award already made to this boy is completely inadequate to compensate him for the injury, since he faces a whole lifetime in which he must have special care. The bill was introduced to provide for an additional award of $10,000, and the Department of the Army has approved this award as fair and reasonable under the circumstances.

In the Committee on the Judiciary, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] moved to amend the bill by increasing the amount from $10,000 to $15,000, on the theory that the award of $10,000 would not be adequate. The committee adopted this amendment, and the bill comes before the Senate with the committee's recommendation that the amount be so increased.

ELMER PIPPIN AND MRS. PANSY PIPPIN AND THE LEGAL GUARDIAN OF NORMAN OTIS PIPPIN, A MINOR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4164) for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 10, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,183" and insert "$15,183", and on page 2, line 4, after the word "accident", to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That such payment to such guardian shall not be made unless such guardian has been authorized by a court of competent jurisdiction to enter into a final settlement, and give a final release in full, of all claims of said minor against the United States by reason of such accident:

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a bill which came to the Senate from the House providing for the payment of $5,183, but which the Committee on the Judiciary recommends be increased to provide for the payment of $15,183.

It is an injury claim, the injured person being a boy then only 3 years old, and now ten, who lost his left arm in an accident involving a United States Army truck. The Department of the Army has reported that the accident resulted from the negligence of the driver of the Army truck, and that no contributory negligence can be attributed to the boy; and the Department approved the award of $5,000 for injuries to the child. In committee, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] argued that $5,000 was wholly inadequate compensation in the case of a child of such tender years who must go through an entire lifetime under the handicap of the loss of an arm; and the Senator from Missouri moved to amend the bill by increasing the amount to $15,183. The committee adopted the amendment.

In fairness to the Senator from Missouri, I believe it should be pointed out that neither the claimant here, nor the claimant under the next previous bill on the calendar, where the Senator from Missouri also offered an amendment to increase the amount of the award, is a constituent of the Senator from Missouri. In the former case, the claimant is a resident of Florida. In this case, the claimant is a resident of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to House bill 4164, Calendar No. 1491, for the purpose of having a typographical error corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada asks that the votes ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, whereby the bill was passed be reconsidered so he may correct a typographical error. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill, as printed, contains a typographical error which should be corrected by amendment. The typographical error appears in line 10, on page 1, the first word in the line now being the word

"with", which should be changed to the word "the". I move amendment of the bill accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938 RELATING TO UNLAWFUL USE OF EXAMINATION PAPERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 451) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for certain penalties for unlawful use of examination papers, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment on page 1, after line 6, to strike out:

"902. (h) Any person who, without authorization from the Administrator, copies, reproduces, sells, or distributes any examination paper used by the Administrator in connection with the issuance of any certificate authorized to be issued by him under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or to imprisonment of not exceeding 3 years, or to both such fine and imprisonment."

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"902. (h) Any person who, without authorization from the Administrator, copies or reproduces, any portion of any examination paper used by the Administrator in connection with the issuance of any certificate or rating authorized to be issued by him under this act, or who sells or distributes any portion of any such examination paper or copy thereof, or who makes, copies, reproduces, sells, or distributes any key to the answers to any portion of any examination of the Administrator in connection with the issuance of any certificate or rating authorized to be issued by him under this act, and any person who uses any article or thing referred to in this subsection for the purpose of passing any such examination shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or to imprisonment of not exceeding 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 902 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new subsection as follows:

"UNLAWFUL USE OF EXAMINATION PAPERS

"902. (h) Any person who, without authorization from the Administrator, copies or reproduces, any portion of any examination paper used by the Administrator in connection with the issuance of any certificate or rating authorized to be issued by him under this act, or who sells or distributes any portion of any such examination paper or copy thereof, or who makes, copies, reproduces, sells, or distributes any key to the answers to any portion of any examination of the Administrator in connection with the issuance of any certificate or rating authorized to be issued by him under this act, and any person who uses any article or thing referred to in this subsection for the purpose of passing any such examination shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or to imprisonment of not exceeding 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938 TO MAKE ILLEGAL THE FALSE MARKING OF AIRCRAFT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3377) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 902 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any person who knowingly and willfully forges, counterfeits, alters, or falsely makes any certificate authorized to be issued under this Act, or knowingly uses or attempts to use any such fraudulent certificate, and any person who knowingly and willfully displays or causes to be displayed on any aircraft, any marks that are false or misleading as to the nationality or registration of the aircraft, shall be subject to a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or to imprisonment not exceeding 3 years, or to both such fine and imprisonment."

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill please?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the bill would make it unlawful to change the markings or the numbers upon registered airplanes. An airplane may be grounded, and, if the number on it is changed, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has no way of checking up and knowing that that is the airplane which has been grounded. The purpose of the bill is to assist the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the enforcement of its rules and regulations. The bill would prohibit the changing of markings on airplanes just as the same provision is now in effect with respect to automobiles.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3377), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The bill (S. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act the term "gambling device" means any machine or mechanical device, or parts thereof, designed or adapted for gambling or any use by which the user as a result of the application of any element of chance may become entitled to receive, directly or indirectly, any thing of value.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce any gambling device, or knowingly to take, receive, possess, or dispose of any gambling device transported in violation of this act: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to the course of unbroken interstate transportation of any gambling device into any State where the use of such device is legal, as certified by the governor of the State to the Attorney General of the United States and published by the Attorney General in the Federal Register. In the absence of such certification and publication, the use of gambling devices in any State shall, for the purposes of this act, be presumed to be illegal; and all persons and officials affected by the provisions of this act shall be entitled to act in reliance upon the presumption.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with or reduce the authority, or the existing interpretations of the authority, of the Federal Trade Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 41–58).

SEC. 3. Upon first engaging in business, and thereafter on or before the 1st day of July of each year, every manufacturer of and dealer in gambling devices shall register with the collector of internal revenue for each district in which such business is to be carried on, his name or trade name, the address of his principal place of business, and the addresses of his places of business in such district. On or before the last day of each month every manufacturer of and dealer in gambling devices shall file with the collector of internal revenue for each district in which he maintains a place or places of business an inventory and record of all sales and deliveries of gambling devices as of the close of the preceding calendar month for the place or places of business in the district. The monthly record of sales and deliveries of such gambling devices shall show the mark and number identifying each article together with the name and address of the buyer or consignee thereof and the name and address of the carrier. Duplicate bills or invoices, if complete in the foregoing respects, may be used in filing the record of sales and deliveries. For the purposes of this act, every manufacturer or dealer shall mark and number each gambling device so that it is individually identifiable. In cases of sale, delivery, or shipment of gambling devices in unassembled form, the manufacturer or dealer shall separately mark and number the components of each gambling device with a common mark and number as if it were an assembled gambling device. It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to sell, deliver, or ship any gambling device which is not marked and numbered for identification as herein provided; and it shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, deliver or ship any gambling device without having registered as required by this section, or without filing monthly the required inventories and records of sales and deliveries.

SEC. 4. All gambling devices, and all packages containing any such, when shipped or transported shall be plainly and clearly labeled or marked so that the name and address of the shipper and of the consignee, and the nature of the article or the contents of the package may be readily ascertained on an inspection of the outside of the article or package.

SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, transport, possess, or use any gambling device in the District of Columbia, the Territories and possessions of the United States, on any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof or within Indian country as defined in Eighteenth United States Code Eleven Hundred and Fifty-one.

SEC. 6. Whoever violates any of the provisions of section 2 or 5 of this act shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Whoever violates any of the provisions of section 3 or 4 of this act shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 7. Any gambling device transported, delivered, shipped, manufactured, reconditioned, repaired, sold, disposed of, received, possessed, or used in violation of the provisions of this act shall be seized and forfeited to the United States. All provisions of law relating to the seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of vessels, vehicles, merchandise, and baggage for violation of the customs laws; the disposition of such vessels, vehicles, merchandise, and baggage or the proceeds from the sale thereof; the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures; and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this act, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof: *Provided,* That such duties as are imposed upon the collector of customs or any other person with respect to the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, merchandise, and baggage under the customs laws shall be performed with respect to seizures and forfeitures of gambling devices under this act by such officers, agents, or other persons as may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Attorney General.

SEC. 8. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are declared to be severable.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE VIII OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7846) to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at the request and on behalf of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold objection for a moment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to withhold the objection. However, as I stated I was making the objection at the request of a Senator who cannot be present today and who asked that the bill go over until he can have an opportunity to make some inquiry about it and reach a decision upon it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement for the RECORD. Of course in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is not present and the senior Senator from Arkansas insists upon the objection, he has a perfect right to do so. The amendment is to the Military Housing Act, and merely attempts to secure housing on military installations through the private enterprise system. The amendments which have been adopted by the Committee on Banking and Currency are practically the ones that were written in the House. The House amendments were rewritten in order to take in one other feature, which is very minor. In the main, however, in order properly to administer the act, what is needed is for the military authorities on any installation to set up, through their own architects, the kind of plan they feel the contractor should bid on. The way it has been administered, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, is that different contractors have submitted all sorts of plans. There is considerable cost in drafting the plans, and in some cases as many as a score of contractors have submitted plans which differ in specifications, so there is a terrific expense. By the time they go through and try to select even 1, let alone 20 plans, it has resulted in a bottleneck in the administration of the act, and as a result the contractors have not been awarded the contract, and are not going forward with the installation.

This bill merely provides that in the case of a military installation or authority which has been declared permanent, there will be drawn up, under supervision of the architect, the plans and specifications; and then the contractors will be able to bid upon those plans and specifications.

There is one feature of the bill about which I myself would like to ask a question; but what I have stated is the purpose of the bill.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that there are many projects which simply are awaiting the relief proposed by this measure. I am satisfied that in the best interests of the country we should make it possible for such housing to be obtained. Unless there is serious objection, I would suggest to the Senator that he permit the bill to be passed.

I would associate myself with the Senator from Alabama in seeing to it that nothing be done in respect to a conference on the bill until the Senator from North Carolina returns; and when he returns, we would submit the bill to him. If it was not then satisfactory to him, we would move to have the vote by which the bill was passed reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 5-minute rule, the Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wonder whether I may speak on another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the Senator may proceed further. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate that courtesy, I say to the Chair.

So, Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Alabama will take up the amendment and will explain it further, and that the bill will be passed.

Again I say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that, if possible, it is most desirable that the bill be passed at this time; and then we can hold up the conference until the Senator from North Carolina returns.

If it is not then agreeable to the Senator from North Carolina, of course, a motion for the reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed can be made; certainly we would give him that right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I certainly wish to join in the suggestion which has been made by the distinguished minority leader. Of course, I realize the position in which the Senator from Arkansas finds himself, for he is making the suggestion at the request of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

However, if we have to wait on this measure until the calendar is called again, that may mean a delay of 30 days or more. Enactment of this bill is needed now. Certainly I would join in the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska that the bill be allowed to be passed, and then lie on the table; and if the Senator from North Carolina is not satisfied with the action thus taken, when he returns, I shall join him in a motion for reconsideration.

Mr. President, it has been nearly a year since the original law was passed. That law was sponsored by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. It is commonly known as the Wherry law. We have relied on it in order to obtain badly needed housing at many of the permanent military-defense posts throughout the country. However, to date only eight projects, with a total of 1,592 family units have been started. The delay has developed simply because it was found impractical to operate under the law, where the builder or bidder himself is required to submit plans for proposed houses. As a matter of fact, in one case 57 different plans for different types of housing were submitted. The Secretary of Defense soon found that he could not operate under that situation.

All that we propose in this bill is to require the Secretary of Defense to decide on the type of housing he wants, and then let the would-be builders bid competitively on that basis.

I think enactment of the bill is directly in line with the type of legislation which the committee, of which the able Senator from Arkansas is chairman, would advocate. I believe it is the kind of legislation which the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from North Carolina would like to have enacted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear. I am sure every Senator can understand that inasmuch as the able Senator from North Carolina had to be absent today, he requested of me that I ask that the bill be passed over.

Under circumstances, I would be strongly inclined to agree with the request which has been made on the floor, since the Senators who have spoken about this measure say they would be willing to have a motion to reconsider entertained.

However, inasmuch as I have agreed to object on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina, I now suggest that the bill be passed over at this time, and then brought up later.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I would be very happy if the Senator would permit the bill to be passed now, and a motion to reconsider entertained today. Then when the Senator from North Carolina returns, we could proceed with the motion to reconsider, if the Senator from North Carolina then wished to have that done. If he did not wish to have it done, the motion could then be withdrawn.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in that connection let me say that I do not want the Senator from Arkansas to do anything which in any way would be violative of the word he has given to our good friend the Senator from North Carolina. However, if the Senator from Arkansas would be willing to let the bill be passed now, I would join with him or with any other Senator in filing a motion immediately for reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is some question in my mind whether that would be keeping faith with the Senator from North Carolina, after I have assured him that request would be made to have the bill go over. If his objections are met, there is no reason why the bill could not be passed in 2 minutes after he returns.

So, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is one of the most important bills on the calendar. Last night, on the radio, I was fortunate enough to hear General Bradley talk about our defenses throughout the country. One of the places where he said we are weak at the present time, in the way of real military strength, is in Alaska. The basic reason why we are weak there is because of the lack of adequate housing for our soldiers. We simply cannot keep them there long, because of the severe weather.

Enactment of this measure is so important that I hope either the Senator from Nebraska or the Senator from Alabama will move, at the conclusion of the call of the calendar, to call up the bill, because in my opinion it is that important.

Because of the importance of this bill, I do not believe the bill should go over, with the result that it will not be acted upon today, and thus be put on the calendar for future consideration. To the contrary, I believe it should be considered today, because once it is placed on the calendar, there will be some delay before we can get to it again. Furthermore, if it is subject to a future call of the calendar, when the calendar is called the next time, if one objection is made, that will prevent consideration of the bill at that time.

I had hoped the Senator from Arkansas would agree to follow the course which has been suggested by other Senators.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I would be very happy to do so. If the bill is placed at the foot of the calendar, I shall find out in the meantime what I can do about it. Of course, I do not wish to break faith with the Senator with whom I have made the agreement to which I have referred.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not wish the Senator to break faith; but I do not think the Senator would be doing so if he permitted the bill to be passed and a motion to reconsider to be entered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall inquire as to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

RETROACTIVE ADVANCES IN GRADE, TIME, AND COMPENSATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

The bill (H. R. 4285) to amend the act of July 31, 1946, in order retroactively to advance in grade, time in grade, and compensation certain employees in the postal field service who are veterans of World War II, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey would appreciate it very much if we could have an explanation of the cost of the bill.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, this bill would amend what is known as the McCormack Act, Public Law 577, of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Under that measure, some postal field employees receive less compensation than they would have received if the law had not been enacted. Representative McCORMACK, in a praiseworthy effort to do justice to all concerned, introduced the bill, H. R. 4285, as an amendment to the law of which he was the author. The House unanimously passed, and the Senate committee has unanimously approved, this measure.

The sole purpose of the bill is to do justice to some war veterans, who are prejudiced by the law as it now stands. It is estimated that the total cost of this amendment to the act, if adopted, would be not less than $10,000 or more than $50,000. The benefits proposed will be enjoyed exclusively by World War veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN HARDIN AND JEFFERSON COUNTIES, KY.

The bill (S. 3396) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky., was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Over.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon will withhold his objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon withhold his objection?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to withhold it for the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is withheld, and the junior Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon will remember, because I think he was present when the committee considered the bill, that the State of Kentucky had an agreement with the United States Government under which the State of Kentucky agreed to pay all costs of the condemnation proceedings on this land. The State complied with its part of the agreement, and paid some $27,000, and constructed the roads leading to the reservation at Fort Knox. When the Federal Government attempted to comply with its part of the agreement, it found it could not do so because of the expiration of the Second War Powers Act.

The able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] presented this matter to the Armed Services Committee, which, in turn, called upon the Defense Department. I thought the Senator from Oregon was present. I remember that several questions were asked the representatives of the Defense Department, who assured the committee that they had entered into this agreement, that the State had paid all the money, the State had built the road, the State had complied with everything it had agreed to do, and that it was only fair that the Federal Government should comply with its part of the agreement.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon recalls the discussion of this case in committee. It is the case, I believe, in which the Defense officials testified that the State of Kentucky had already paid in more than 50 percent of the fair market value of the property, and I therefore withdraw my objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the State of Kentucky, by quit-claim deed, title to that land, comprising approximately 100 acres, acquired by the United States in the case entitled *"United States of America* v. *Certain Lands Situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky., the West Point Brick Co., et al.,"* Civil No. 362, in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky at Louisville.

COLLECTION OF POSTAGE DUE AT TIME OF DELIVERY

The bill (S. 3118) relating to the forwarding and return of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, the collection of postage due at the time of delivery, and for other purposes, was considered, or-

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, second-, third-, and fourth-class matter which is undeliverable as addressed may be forwarded to the addressee or returned to the sender and the postage for such service may be prepaid or collected on delivery of the matter in accordance with the instructions and pledge of the addressee or sender, as the case may be, to pay the forwarding or return postage, and such matter, including that of a perishable or urgent nature, for which payment of forwarding or return postage is not pledged, may be forwarded or returned under such conditions as the Postmaster General shall prescribe, but when the addressee or sender refuses to pay the required postage, the forwarding or return of further matter may be discontinued.

SEC. 2. (a) Under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, the addressee or sender of second-, third-, or fourth-class matter which is undeliverable as addressed may be so notified, and there shall be a charge for each such notice of not to exceed 5 cents.

(b) When copies of any publication of the second class mailed by a publisher or news agent at the pound rate or free-in-county of publication are undeliverable as addressed, such publisher or agent shall be notified of that fact in such manner and at such time as the Postmaster General may prescribe, for which service there shall be a charge of not to exceed 5 cents, and copies of the publication received subsequent to such notification shall be treated as provided by this act or as may otherwise be directed by the Postmaster General.

SEC. 3. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed. Such repeal shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following laws and parts of laws: (1) Revised Statutes, section 3885 (39 U. S. C., sec. 253); (2) section 4 of the act of June 13, 1898 (30 Stat. 444), as amended by section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1903 (32 Stat. 1176); and the act of November 19, 1919 (41 Stat. 360), relative to forwarding or return of certain mail matter (39 U. S. C. 276, 278); (3) the next to the last paragraph of the act of March 12, 1910 (36 Stat. 366), as amended by the act of July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 709), relating to second-class publications undeliverable at the address thereon (39 U. S. C. 277).

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to the legislative budget, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have filed minority views on the resolution, but it was so recent that I am quite sure most of the Senators have not had time to read them. For that reason I ask that the resolution go over at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 359, CHAPTER 287—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3050) to amend Public Law 359, chapter 287, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is necessarily absent, voted against this bill and stated that he would probably file a minority report in opposition to it. For the sole purpose of protecting the Senator's rights in this matter, I ask that action on the measure be postponed.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in that connection, I should like to call attention to something that I believe was never intended when the bill was originally introduced, or when it was reported by the committee. As I understand the history of the proposed legislation, it was designed to meet a situation in the Government Printing Office and in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. However, the way the bill is written, it applies to all Government agencies. In the Tennessee Valley Authority there has been in existence on the entire TVA a very fine apprenticeship program. This bill would completely upset that program of the TVA. I ask at this time to offer an amendment. I send to the desk an amendment that I desire to propose to the bill, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD I should like to have printed some brief comments on the effect of the bill on the TVA apprenticeship program.

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

COMMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE EFFECT ON TVA IF S. 3050, TO AMEND PUBLIC LAW 359, CHAPTER 287, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, WERE ADOPTED WITHOUT AMENDMENT

1. This bill, as we understand it, was designed to deal with a specific situation in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. We doubt that it was intended to abolish, in effect, the highly successful apprenticeship program which TVA has been carrying on.

2. The TVA apprenticeship program has been under way for 14 years. During this time 608 apprentices have been graduated in 16 crafts. These apprentices have been not only valuable sources of recruitment for the TVA construction and operating programs, but in addition have contributed to the supply of skilled labor available to industry in the region.

3. The TVA apprenticeship program has been praised as an unusually successful program, in which labor has cooperated fully. The Department of Labor's Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship has stated that "TVA is the outstanding Federal agency engaged in the formal training of apprentices in the skilled crafts."

4. Requirement that TVA apprentices be recruited through the machinery of the Civil Service Commission would put the recruitment of apprentices on an entirely different basis from the recruitment of all other types of personnel in TVA, whereas apprentice recruitment clearly must be closely integrated with total recruitment. There would be serious danger of destroying the program completely.

5. Requirement that only veterans be hired for apprentice positions, though presenting no serious problems immediately, would become increasingly inconsistent with the general theory of apprenticeship as the veteran group becomes older, since most apprenticeship programs are designed to appeal to, and are intended to train the younger men entering the labor market.

ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN LIVESTOCK LOANS

The bill (H. R. 5097) for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the committee report accompanying this bill fails to disclose or explain the purpose of the first amendment. I wish the sponsor of the bill would explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the word "settlements" it is proposed to strike out "at prevailing market prices" and insert "by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in cases where livestock is loaned to Indians this bill would permit them, instead of returning the loan in kind, to pay the value of the livestock. The amendment merely gives them a voice in determining what the fair value is. The purpose of the amendment is to give those to whom the loan of the stock was made, the privilege of having some part in determining the fair value.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I regret that I cannot reconcile the explanation with the amendment. The amendment, in lines 3 and 4, is to strike out "at prevailing market prices." I do not reconcile the explanation with the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. The amendment provides that, for arriving at the value of such livestock, the amendment contains the following proviso:

Provided, That hereafter the value of such livestock for the purposes of any cash settlement shall be based on prevailing market prices in the area and shall be ascertained by a committee composed of three members, one of whom shall be selected by the superintendent of the particular agency, one of whom shall be selected by the chairman of the tribal council, and one of whom shall be selected by the other two members.

In other words, it gives the tribal council a voice in selecting the members of the committee to determine the fair market price of the livestock.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I now understand the purpose of the amendment.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5097) for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "settlements", strike out "at prevailing market prices" and insert "by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

The amendment was agreed to.

In line 9, after the word "ratified", insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That hereafter the value of such livestock for the purposes of any such cash settlement shall be based on prevailing market prices in the area and shall be ascertained by a committee composed of three members, one of whom shall be selected by the superintendent of the particular agency, one of whom shall be selected by the chairman of the tribal council, and one of whom shall be selected by the other two members."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 332) providing for the establishment of a joint Senate and House recording facility, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the joint resolution will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF TITLES 18 AND 28, UNITED STATES CODE

The bill (S. 2874) to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Such rules shall not take effect until they have been reported to Congress by the Chief Justice at or after the beginning of a regular session thereof but not later than the first day of May, and until the expiration of 90 days after they have been thus reported. All laws in conflict with such rules shall be of no further force or effect after such rules have taken effect."

SEC. 2. The third paragraph of section 2072 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Such rules shall not take effect until they have been reported to Congress by the Chief Justice at or after the beginning of a regular session thereof but not later than the first day of May, and until the expiration of 90 days after they have been thus reported."

SEC. 3. The third paragraph of section 2073 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Such rules shall not take effect until they have been reported to Congress by the Chief Justice at or after the beginning of a regular session thereof but not later than the first day of May, and until the expiration of 90 days after they have been thus reported."

AMENDMENT OF HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

The bill (S. 3093) to amend section 82 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii and temporary vacancies therein was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 82 of the Hawaiian Organic Act (act approved Apr. 30, 1900, ch. 339, 31 Stat. 157; 48 U. S. C., sec. 632), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 82. Supreme court: That the supreme court shall consist of a chief justice and two associate justices, who shall be citizens of the Territory of Hawaii and shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and may be removed by the President: *Provided*, That any vacancy or vacancies occurring within the court, whether by reason of disqualification, disability, death, resignation, removal, absence from the Territory or inability to attend, or for any other reason, shall, for the hearing and determination of any cause, be temporarily filled as provided by the law of said Territory, and, if there be no such law, then by appointment from among the circuit judges of the Territory by the remaining justices or justice, and if there be no such justice, then by the Governor."

EXTENSION OF UNITED STATES LAWS TO OFFENSES ON THE HIGH SEAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5166) to extend the laws of the United States relating to civil acts or offenses consummated or committed on the high seas on board a vessel belonging to the United States, to the Midway Islands, Wake Island, Johnston Island, Sand Island, Kingman Reef, Kure Island, Baker Island, Howland Island, Jarvis Island, Canton Island, and Enderbury Island, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, to strike out lines 21 through 23, as follows:

The situs for the trial of such civil and criminal cases shall be the situs of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTIMATES OF PROBABLE COST OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) requiring committee reports to include estimates of the probable cost of proposed legislation, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to some minor amendments in this resolution, which I think should be made. I discussed the matter with the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the committee reporting the resolution.

On page 1, line 2, after the word "that" the words "on and after" should be inserted, so as to make it read, "That on and after January 3, 1951, section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding the following language," and so forth. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Michigan that it will first be necessary to act upon the committee amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is an amendment to a committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. The second amendment I have to offer will also involve a committee amendment, and I should like to explain it if I may have unanimous consent.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment which the Senator from Michigan has is to a committee amendment, concerning the date January 3, 1951. He has a right to propose such an amendment, which is to insert the words "on and after."

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan offers an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 1, line 2, after the word "that", to add the words "on and after." The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am going to ask that this resolution be passed over until I can make a further examination of it.

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

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to the next committee amendment, which is in lines 6 and 7, but that it will adopt an amendment inserting after the word "committee" on line 7, page 1, the words "other than the Appropriations Committee."

I wish to make a few remarks with reference to the amendment, Mr. President.

I feel that this resolution is one of great importance in establishing orderly procedures directed at economy in Government.

The purpose of the resolution is to require that all proposed legislation which involves future Government expenditure shall have attached to it a statement of anticipated costs on a 5-year basis, when reported to the Congress.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 made a great step forward, in the interests of orderly legislation, by requiring the submission of written reports recommended to Congress by its committees.

This resolution pursues that objective one step further. It will require that the reports include a statement of cost. This is in the interest of sound fiscal policy, which is essential to sound legislation. Too often the Congress has approved an otherwise attractive and justifiable piece of legislation and then discovered at a later date the cost factors which could well have influenced consideration of the legislation had it been available at the time the legislation was adopted.

In reporting Senate Concurrent Resolution 35, the Senate Rules Committee made some invaluable additions to the resolution as I had introduced it.

One such addition was a requirement that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses shall maintain and publish compilations of the cost estimates required by this resolution. This should be quarterly and not semiannually.

The Rules Committee also sought to make a worthwhile contribution to the operation of the resolution, having in mind that the statement of costs has no meaning as applied to appropriation bills. Therefore the committee, in its third amendment, sought to exclude appropriation bills from the operation of the resolution.

The Rules Committee sought to achieve this by stating that the resolution would apply only to "all bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations." The last two words constitute the third committee amendment.

This provision would automatically exclude appropriation bills, but it goes somewhat further. That phrasing would operate to exclude also those bills and resolutions which do not authorize appropriations but nevertheless are of such a nature as to require some future expenditure.

Examples of legislation which does not authorize appropriations but which requires expenditures are those bills that bestow some new responsibility upon a department. As that new responsibility gets under way we invariably find that it has necessitated an increase in the budget request for the department or agency.

Obviously, the present resolution should cover cases such as these if it is to be effective at all.

I think that the purposes of the Rules Committee can be satisfied and the objectives of the resolution preserved by the amendment I offer, which excludes the appropriations committees from the necessity of submitting cost data on bills it reports by making the resolution simply applicable to all legislative committees.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

SHORT TITLE TO ACT OF JULY 1, 1898

The bill (S. 2513) to give a short title to the act of July 1, 1898, commonly known as the Bankruptcy Act, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, is amended by inserting immediately after the enacting clause a new sentence as follows: "That this act may be cited as the 'Bankruptcy Act'."

DESIGNATION OF MAY 30, MEMORIAL DAY, AS A DAY FOR A NATION-WIDE PRAYER FOR PEACE

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating May 30, Memorial Day, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe each May 30, Memorial Day, by praying, each in accordance with his religious faith, for permanent peace; designating a period during such day in which all the people of the United States may unite in prayer for a permanent peace; calling upon all the people of the United States to unite in prayer at such time; and calling upon the newspapers, radio stations, and all other mediums of information to join in observing such day and period of prayer.

CONVEYANCE OF PERPETUAL EASEMENT TO THE CITY OF HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

The bill (H. R. 1726) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Hot Springs, Ark., a perpetual easement for the construction and operation of a water-main pipe line, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have examined the report on this bill and I find that the Federal Government will not only receive very definite benefits, but it also reserves the right to have this pipe line relocated if at any time it interferes with Federal operations.

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

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

TRANSFER OF BUILDING IN JUNEAU, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 3494) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau (Alaska) Camp was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this bill would transfer a small building at Juneau, Alaska, to the Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood of Juneau. The building was purchased some years ago for $300. It is of small value. The organizations referred to have thousands of members. The building is no longer being used by the Federal Government, and it was thought that if it could be made of service to the organizations mentioned it would be in the public interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am confident that there must be someone in Alaska, because of the good use to which this building is to be put, who would be willing to help to raise 50 percent of the fair market value of this property. Therefore I wish to offer my usual amendment that the property be transferred, in return for which 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property be paid.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC AIRPORT IN OR IN THE VICINITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, when Calendar 1278 was before the Senate this afternoon I objected. Since that time I have looked into this matter of the amendments which were offered, and I have also looked into the purpose of the bill. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate may revert to Calendar No. 1278, Senate bill 456, and that I may withdraw my objection to its consideration.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 456) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been agreed to.

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

CONSTRUCTION OF RENTAL HOUSING ADJACENT TO MILITARY AREAS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Order No. 1495.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7846) to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement. I objected to the consideration of this bill at the request of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. Because of the importance of the proposed legislation and the great interest in it, I have since gotten in touch with the administrative assistant of the senior Senator from North Carolina.

After conferring with him, it is agreeable that the bill may be passed, with the understanding that I shall move, immediately after it is passed, for reconsideration of the vote, so as to hold it until the Senator from North Carolina may return and be present in person. I understood that in that action I shall have the cooperation of the majority leaders and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"SEC. 809. Whenever the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or his duly designated representative, determines that it is desirable in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, the Secretary is authorized, without regard to the civil service and classition laws, to procure, by negotiation or otherwise, the services of architects and engineers, or organizations thereof, under such arrangements as he deems desirable, but at an expense not in excess of that permissible under the schedule of fees allowed from time to time by the Public Housing Administration in connection with projects assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended. Such services may include the development of plans, drawings, and specifications for rental housing under this title and other services in connection therewith: *Provided*, That such plans, drawings, and specifications may include the use on any project to be constructed under this title of alternate materials or alternate types of construction, including prefabrication, that provide substantially equal value and conform to standards established by the Federal Housing Administration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may designate certain sites or parts thereof for rental housing to be furnished from prefabricated houses or housing components. Such arrangements may include provision for advance or progress payments, for payment by third parties, for payment by the Government of any such compensation as is not paid for by third parties, and shall include provision for reimbursement by third parties to the Government of any compensation or other expenses paid by the Government pursuant to this section, and may include other provisions for compensation. The Secretary is further authorized to advance or pay to the Federal Housing Administration its 'Appraisal and Eligibility Statement' fees in connection with such rental housing. The Secretary is further authorized to procure options from private parties for the acquisition by third parties of off-installation sites intended for such rental housing. The Secretary is further authorized to enter into arrangements by contract or otherwise for eventual acquisition by the Government, without cost to the Government, of all right, title, and interest in sites on which housing is constructed pursuant to this title and improvements thereon. Any public-works appropriations now or hereafter available to the Departments of the Army, Navy, or Air Force may be obligated by the respective departments for these purposes. Reimbursements to the Government on account of payments made pursuant to this section shall be made to appropriations against which such payments were charged."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this afternoon when I was acting temporarily as the minority leader, I received a request to have this bill go over. I have since been trying to contact the Senator who objected, and I think we can get the objection withdrawn. I should like to have the bill held up temporarily until the Senator can be called to the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the Senator speaking of House bill 7846?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I myself have no objection, and I think we can get the request withdrawn in a few minutes, if another bill can be taken up temporarily.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator want it to go over?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I note that the Senator from Nebraska has now returned to the Chamber, and he can speak for himself.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for protecting my interests. There is no objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the able minority leader that I am withdrawing the objections which I interpose at the request of the senior Senator from North Carolina, with the understanding that when the bill passes I shall move to reconsider, and that I will have the cooperation of the able minority leader.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, one question. The amendment on page 4 provides:

That such plans, drawings, and specifications may include the use on any project to be constructed under this title of alternate materials or alternate types of construction, including prefabrication, that provide substantially equal value and conform to standards established by the Federal Housing Administration:

As I read the report on page 3, it states:

In this connection your committee considered, including provisions to require that some minimum fixed percentage of all housing under title VIII should be of this type. Your committee did not include such a provision in reliance upon a proper exercise of administrative discretion and assurance from officials of the Department of National Defense that full use would be made of prefabricated or factory manufactured houses, or housing components wherever feasible.

I ask the Senator from Alabama whether the bill as now written does not provide that the prefabricated houses might be used?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator mean the original language, or the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I mean the original language of the bill. If the amendment is purely discretionary, I have no objection to it, because I think the Administrator has already the authority sought to be granted. I certainly would not want the legislative history to show that it is mandatory in any way, that he will be required to use prefabricated houses. I have no objection if it is discretionary, and I understand it is.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. The principal difference between the language in the amendment and the language in the other bill was that we say here that the Secretary of Defense may designate certain sites for the use of prefabricated houses. So that when the plans are made for a site, or any part of a site, every bidder will know that the plans will provide for prefabricated housing for that particular area. If the Senator will read the amendment he will see that is the principal difference. There is nothing that makes it mandatory on the Secretary of Defense to build any particular number of prefabricated houses. When the representatives of the Department were before our committee we made it clear to them that we believed they should avail themselves of the use of prefabricated housing where it would fit the particular needs of the community.

Mr. WHERRY. Provided they could be used competitively with the other types.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, we would not be shutting out anyone who might come in, and on the other hand, anyone who could come in should come in, in order to get the competition necessary to meet the requirements of the Administrator. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, under the new amendment the Secretary of Defense will determine ahead of time the type of housing he will want for a particular area.

Mr. WHERRY. But it is not mandatory.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all; it is discretionary with him.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the distinguished Senator recall that there was any discussion about the fees? On page 3 of the amendment, line 18, going back to the comma, it reads:

Under such arrangements as he deems desirable, but at an expense not in excess of that permissible under the schedule of fees allowed from time to time by the Public Housing Administration in connection with projects assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

I do not disagree with that language, except that it is my understanding that the services of the architect here referred to would not be the services performed by the one provided for under the terms of the Housing Act. We want to get the housing as cheaply as possible for the enlisted personnel. Does the Senator know of any evidence introduced that would justify the particular fee specified for the architect in drawing the plans?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The bill as it came to us from the House contained no limitation whatsoever. Our committee was eager to put a ceiling on the fees. It so happens that in public housing we have set a standard. There are standards for different types of service, and it is my understanding that in no case shall the fees allowed for this type of housing exceed fees for similar work on other types.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the fee runs up as high as 5 percent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is for the over-all services. I think I can safely say that it is the intention of the committee that if in this type of housing all the services could be rendered by an architect, he would be entitled to those fees, but if only half the service were rendered, he would be entitled to only half the fee.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that statement, because while it is my feeling that the architect should be paid, certainly he should not be paid more than the services rendered warrant.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is our feeling.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

CONTINUANCE ON ROLLS OF CERTAIN LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 454) relating to the continuance on the pay rolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this joint resolution relates entirely to business of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Arizona, just contacted the junior Senator from Nebraska. As I understand, this joint resolution affects only the House, has not anything to do with the Senate, and we are merely passing it so that the House can run its own affairs to suit itself.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6406) providing procedure for claimants of mining claims in the United States obtaining credit for assessment work performed during the year ending July 1, 1949, under the provisions of Public Law 107, Eighty-first Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

The bill (H. R. 7302) to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation of the bill is requested, and the Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, previously there was authorized the purchase as a memorial of the birthplace of George Washington Carver, a distinguished Negro scientist, located near Diamond, Mo. There was authorized to be appropriated an amount of money not to exceed $30,000. In the negotiations which developed, it was impossible to purchase the property for that amount of money.. The property was condemned, and judgment was entered in the sum of $78,895. The bill would increase the authorization from $30,000 to $80,000.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment on page 1, after line 6, to strike out section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including an amount not to exceed $80,000 to be used in payment for land to be acquired pursuant to this act.

And insert a new section 4 as follows:

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums not to exceed $80,000 as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, with respect to Calendar Nos. 1513 through 1520, neither the bills nor the committee reports on them are before Members of the Senate. I have been unable to get copies of any of the bills or of the committee reports. I think it would be very bad legislative procedure to pass on any measure which none of us has had an opportunity to study. Therefore, Mr. President, I must object to consideration of the remaining bills on the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, of course, I do not wish to ask any Senator to approve any bill if he feels that it should not receive favorable consideration. I am thoroughly in agreement with that thought. However, I should like to make one brief statement with respect to Calendar No. 1513, Senate bill 2980.

The tobacco referred to in the bill is the wrapper leaf which goes on the outside of cigars. The tobacco can be produced in only two sections of the country, in Connecticut and Massachusetts, and in Florida and Georgia. The bill was introduced by the two Senators from Florida and both Senators from Georgia. Favoring testimony was received from the two Senators from Connecticut, as well as from several House Members from that State.

Growers of the small classification of tobacco involved in the bill have always asked that it be left out of the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The tobacco was left out of the act by request of the growers. They now ask that it come under the provisions of the act. That request is made for only one reason, namely, that during the war, at a time when importation of Indonesian tobacco, which is used for this purpose, was cut off, the acreage of this tobacco in those areas in our country was greatly increased. Now that Indonesian tobacco is again being imported, necessity exists for cutting down the acreage in those sections.

Of course, cutting down of acreage can be done only after two-thirds of the growers have joined in approving a program for a quota, and the only way acreage can be cut fairly is by having legal machinery available for that purpose. Therefore, they now reluctantly ask to come under the program.

I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that after hearings were held the bill was fully approved by all growers in the Florida and Georgia area, and all growers in the Connecticut Valley, with the exception of two growers, who admitted that their companies were owned by an Indonesian producer who had come into the country during the war. An almost unanimous case was made on the bill. The Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of Agriculture have approved it. I think it is a matter of right on the part of this one excluded group to come under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It should be remembered that they had been left out wholly because of their own insistence.

Mr. President, I close by saying that if any Senator feels he should like to make a closer study of the provisions of the bill, I am quite agreeable to having the bill go over. However, it seems to me that we are having calendar calls rather infrequently. Furthermore, no objection to the measure was voiced before the committee. The subcommittee which heard testimony on the bill was composed of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the junior Senator from Florida. As I say, there was no objection raised by any of the growers affected except those growers who belong to offshore producing groups.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should be very happy to withhold my objection, but there are other bills in the same category, and if we open the door to this bill, we should, in justice, open the door to the other bills. We should not make fish of one and fowl of another. Although I wish to help the distinguished Senator from Florida very much, I feel constrained to object to all bills on the remainder of the calendar.

INTERMENT IN ARLINGTON CEMETERY OF LAST SURVIVOR OF GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

Mr. LUCAS. I think the reports to which the Senator from New Jersey refers should be before Senators in advance of any action being taken on a bill. However, Mr. President, there is one measure to which I should like to invite the Senator's attention. It is Calendar No. 1520, Senate Concurrent Resolution 64. It concerns the burial in Arlington National Cemetery of the last surviving member of the Grand Army of the Republic, upon his own request. It seems

to me that we might pass the resolution without objection.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I could not very well object to that measure, Mr. President.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 64), which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 3, after "Republic", to insert "and with the consent of his nearest living next of kin"; and in line 5, after the word "arrangements", to insert "with his relatives", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That, upon the death of the last surviving member of the Grand Army of the Republic, and with the consent of his nearest living next of kin, the Secretary of the Army is requested to make arrangements with his relatives for his burial, with fitting and appropriate ceremonies, in Arlington National Cemetery.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

REQUEST THAT CALL OF CALENDAR STOP AT ORDER NO. 1512

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I suggest that, instead of objecting to consideration of further measures on the calendar, we simply stop consideration of the calendar after Calendar No. 1512, in order that the succeeding measures may be considered on the next call of the calendar. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the call of the calendar stop with No. 1512.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the reason for stopping with Calendar No. 1512?

Mr. LUCAS. Because no reports have been filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Alabama restate his request?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I request that the Senate stop the call of the calendar with No. 1512, subject to taking up measures that have been passed over which were carried to the foot of the calendar, rather than having the RECORD show that bills subsequent to order No. 1512 were objected to.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will not the Senator omit from his request Calendar 1515, House bill 6552? It is my hope that the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] will exclude this measure from his omnibus objection. It merely proposes to insert the word "or" in an ancient law from which that word was inadvertently omitted.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am in exactly the same position respecting that measure as I am in respect to the bill of the Senator from Florida. If I make an exception, then another exception, and still another exception will have to be made. I feel I must stand by the original objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 1339, House bill 5101, concerning which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] raised a question earlier this afternoon in my absence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certain measures were carried to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. CAIN. I believe this bill is one of them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire if it has not been the custom when bills were carried to the foot of the calendar, to consider them in the order in which they had previously been reached on the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the practice. Bills which went to the foot of the calendar will be called in the order in which they were reached on the call of the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether the bill to which the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] refers is No. 1 on that list.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, that I do not know. I shall ask that my bill be considered as it is reached in its turn on the list of bills which went to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first bill which went to the foot of the calendar will be stated.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2113) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to clarify the status of freight forwarders and their relationship with motor common carriers, was announced as first in order at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The next bill in order at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

TRANSFER TO PIERCE COUNTY, WASH., OF CERTAIN SURPLUS LAND

The bill (H. R. 5101) to provide for the transfer to Pierce County, Wash., of certain surplus land in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation was announced as the second bill in order at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this bill provides for the transfer of two small portions of the Fort Lewis Military Reservation back to the original donors of the land, Pierce County.

The Fort Lewis Military Reservation consists of some 71,000 acres and is located a few miles south of Tacoma, Wash. The land was deeded to the Federal Government, without any cost or consideration, by the people of Pierce County, Wash.

The deed of conveyance contains the normal reversionary clause which prescribes that in the event the property should not be maintained by the Federal Government as a military reservation, it will revert to Pierce County.

There are two small portions of this reservation which have become surplus, and of no further military use, and which are desired by the county. The two tracts are both located on the north boundary of the reservation and have lost their military usefulness because of the fact that they are small, triangular-shaped parcels which are now separated from the main reservation by a highway. The county desires the more northerly of these two parcels—approximately an acre—for road purposes. It desires the more southerly portion—approximately 63 acres—for school purposes. The Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget interpose no objection to releasing this property back to the original donors.

As a matter of fact, there is some legal question as to whether legislative authority is in fact necessary in this instance, because of the fact that the deed itself contains the reversionary provision. However, the Federal Government feels that there is some possibility that the title of the Federal Government to the remainder of the tract might be jeopardized if the reversionary clause of the deed were permitted to operate with respect to these two individual portions of the whole reservation. For that reason legislative authority is being requested, and section 2 of the bill specifically protects the title of the United States to the remainder of the reservation. The Committee on Armed Services felt that the wording in section 2 which made it mandatory that the State of Washington and Pierce County, Wash., should both be required to take certain action, is unduly restrictive. Neither the officials of the State of Washington nor of the Office of the Judge Advocate General are positive as to what action, if any, the State government would be required to take. For that reason the committee recommends amending the bill so as to substitute the words "in accordance with local law" for the words, "by the State of Washington and Pierce County, Wash."

This amendment is concurred in by the departmental witnesses and has been checked with the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate as to its legal sufficiency.

I wonder if, by that explanation, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has either had his very legitimate interest satisfied, or if he cares to ask me any further questions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Washington for his explanation of the bill. I shall study it very carefully between now and the next calendar day, and I shall ask to have the bill go over until then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The next bill in order at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT

The bill (S. 3176) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third read-

ing, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance the standard time applicable to the District 1 hour for a period of each year commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April and ending not later than the last Sunday of September. Any such time established by the Commissioners under the authority of this act shall, during the period of the year for which it is applicable, be the standard time for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER subsequently said: The Chair wishes to announce that the bill providing for daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia was objected to when it was reached on the call of the calendar, and was not carried to the foot of the calendar by unanimous consent. Therefore, the calling of that bill a moment ago was an error. The bill has not been passed. It was objected to on the call of the calendar and is still on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 583), conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Archangelo Straneri, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO THE TWO ROCK UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT OF SONOMA COUNTY, CALIF.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 4732), to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union School District, a political subdivision of the State of California in Sonoma County, Calif., and to furnish said school district water free of charge, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this bill was held over during my absence, when I was at the Naval Academy as a member of the Board of Visitors. I think the bill went to the foot of the calendar at the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The Two Rock Army Base consists of approximately 867 acres. It is a radio receiving station with a permanent garrison of 13 officers and 400 enlisted men. It is located approximately 10 miles east of Petaluma, Calif., and about 45 miles north of San Francisco.

The grammar-school facilities in the Two Rock School District are quite out of date. The present school building was built in 1885, and has no water or telephone. Its sanitary facilities are wholly inadequate. The California Commission on Redistricting of Rural Schools has recommended a consolidating of the three school districts in the area into one union district, so that one modern grammar school may be built to serve the whole area.

The consolidation has been effected, but the building program cannot get under way because of the lack of a suitable site for the new building.

H. R. 4732 proposes to give to the Two Rock Union School District a tract consisting of 5.36 acres located in the northeast portion of the Two Rock Army Base.

The value of this land is approximately $400. It contains no improvements. The Department of the Army interposes no objection to this transfer and the Bureau of the Budget concurs. The land is selected for two reasons: First, because of its accessability to the water supply of the Army base; second, this particular plot is centrally located in the union school district. Approximately half of the students in the Two Rock grammar-school are children of Army personnel.

The bill requires that water is to be supplied from the Army system, but paid for by the school district. The bill also requires that the school district relocate the security fence around the area. The bill provides a reversionary clause which will be effective should the land fail to be used for school purposes. The rights of the United States with respect to fissionable material are also reserved in the bill.

I recommend that the title of the bill be amended by striking out the words, "to furnish school district water free of charge," and substituting the words, "for other purposes."

The original bill contemplated that there should be no charge for the water. It was amended in the House to require payment but the title was erroneously let stand in its original form.

Mr. President, I believe the Federal Government would be amply compensated for the $400 worth of property because half the students will be students of the personnel on the Army base.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since asking to have the bill go to the foot of the calendar, I have taken the time to study it. I find that the Government not only will receive on this transfer a sum equal to half the fair market value of the property—its total value is $400—but probably will receive in excess of that amount by reason of the fact that the school district will transfer and relocate the military fence. I have checked the matter with staff members of the committee and find that this particular bill in no way violates the principle of the Federal Government receiving at least half of the fair market value of the property.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have been heretofore agreed. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4732) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock union school district, a political subdivision of the State of California, in Sonoma County, Calif., and for other purposes."

CATHERINE A. GLESENER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to Senate bill 469, Calendar 1258, a bill which has received the attention of the two Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CAIN] and the two Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and myself, in recent months and weeks. Consideration of the bill was objected to during the last call of the calendar until the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] could make further study as to the claims set forth in the bill.

I understand that the Senator from New Jersey and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. MCCARRAN] have agreed upon an amendment to the bill. In the absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the author of the bill, I have been asked to read the following statement:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is unable to be on the floor at this moment, has requested me to ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to Calendar No. 1258. This is a bill for the relief of C. A. Glesener.

Senators will note the bill was reported by the committee and appeared on the calendar just 1 day before last calendar call. The bill was not objected to, but a request was made that the bill go over for further study. I understand that the junior Senator from New Jersey, who asked that the bill go over for further study, on the last calendar call, has an amendment he wishes to offer.

His amendment has been agreed to by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], author of the bill, and by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

There should be no controversy over the bill, and in all fairness it should be considered at this time because of the circumstances I have already related.

Mr. President, I would only add that the woman involved in this particular bill has suffered great property damage, which has been admitted by the Government. For the past several years she has been working in an endeavor to iron out her difficulties with the Government. Now that the Government departments are in agreement with her, and, as I understand, now that the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Nevada are in agreement as to the final amount of the claim, I think in fairness to this poor woman we should dispose of this bill this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 469, Calendar 1258, a bill not included in the part of the calendar ordered for consideration by the Senate today. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The ECA bill, as I understand, is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the call of the calendar has been completed, and the ECA bill is the unfinished business.

Mr. TAFT. Then I take it that the Senator's request should be that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 469. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Of course, the transaction of any other business at this point, by unanimous consent, would not affect the status of the unfinished business, so far as resuming it is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object unless the request includes a request to have the unfinished business temporarily laid aside. What I object to is the practice, at the end of the calendar, of bringing up a number of bills as to which no notice has been given, other than the fact that they are on the first part of the calendar, and can be brought up, of course, after the Senate returns to the current order of business.

However, I do not think we should consider another bill while the ECA bill is before us pending the Senate, except by temporarily laying aside the ECA bill and proceeding to the consideration of another bill. So I object, but only as to the form in which the request is made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection, in order to do what I think anyone who would go into the record of this case would agree is merely plain justice to this woman, who, at long last, has gotten all the departments of Government concerned to agree as to the damage which has been done to her, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, the ECA bill, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 469, Calendar 1258.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and let me say I did not hear all the colloquy—I understand that the request of the junior Senator from Oregon has nothing to do with arrangements made in regard to the calendar prior to this time; but I understand that the Senator is now asking that the ECA bill be temporarily laid aside and that, by unanimous consent, the bill he has mentioned be brought up. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 469) for the relief of Catherine A. Glesener, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment, was on page 1, line 5, after the word "to", to strike out "Catherine" and insert "Cathryn."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments, which I offer and ask to have stated. One of them is to a committee amendment, and the other is to the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the amendments of the Senator from New Jersey do not relate to the first committee amendment, which has been stated.

The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment, was on page 1, in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$126,811" and insert "$84,792."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has offered an amendment to this committee amendment. His amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The amendment to the committee amendment was on page 1, in line 6, in lieu of the amount proposed by the committee, to insert "$36,441, with interest at 4½ percent from January 1, 1938, to the date of enactment of this act."

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to hear from the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as to whether that amendment to the committee amendment is agreeable to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I have not heard from him.

Mr. MORSE. My understanding is—and he has authorized me to so state—that it is agreeable to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I am reliably informed that these amendments are satisfactory to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] to the committee amendment on page 1, in line 6.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 6, after the word "said", to strike out the word "Catherine", and insert "Cathryn."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, beginning in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "inability of the said Cathryn A. Glesener to further carry on her business by reason of the refusal of the War Department to grant her a permit which would have enabled her to reconstruct such log wharf and boom" and insert "loss of business from 1935 to 1937, inclusive, while the Bonneville Dam was under construction."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 469) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cathryn A. Glesener, of Underwood, Wash., the sum of $36,441, with interest at 4½ percent from January 1, 1938, to the date of enactment of this act, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for (1) the destruction of a log wharf and boom on the north side of, and extending into, the Columbia River, near Underwood, Wash., by the United States engineers in 1937 in connection with the construction of the Bonneville Dam; (2) losses incurred by reason of the depreciation in value of shore property, improvements, and facilities as a result of the destruction of such log wharf and boom; and (3) loss of earnings as a result of the destruction of such log wharf and boom and the loss of business from 1935 to 1937, inclusive, while the Bonneville Dam was under 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.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener."

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, earlier in the day I gave notice that I would ask that Calendar No. 321, Senate bill 1086, a bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn., be taken up. I am not going to ask that it be taken up now, for the reason that, although two Senators who objected previously have told me that they no longer object, yet one of them is not on the floor at this time. So I merely give notice that I shall ask to have that bill taken up at a subsequent time, when more Senators are present. I shall do so at that time, rather than now, in order that no attempt will be made to take advantage in any way, manner, shape, or form, in regard to that bill.

TRANSFER OF FORT DES MOINES, IOWA, TO THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Oregon has asked for the consideration of a bill on the calendar prior to the point on the calendar at which the calling of calendar bills was ordered for today, and inasmuch as the Senator from Oregon is the only Senator who objects to House bill 4569, so far as I know, I am prepared to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily

laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4569, Calendar 1209, an act authorizing the transfer of Fort Des Moines, Iowa, to the State of Iowa.

Fort Des Moines was originally donated to the Government, but the Government has no longer any use for it; and the Government is spending tremendous sums of money there every day to maintain it. The State of Iowa is anxious to have that land for institutional purposes.

Under those circumstances, and inasmuch as there is no objection on the part of any Government agency, so far as I know, and no objection in either House of Congress, except by the Senator from Oregon, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4569, Calendar No. 1209.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4569) authorizing the transfer of Fort Des Moines, Iowa, to the State of Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa does not wish to have me wait for further study of the bill, and if he is willing to accept an amendment that the city of Des Moines shall pay 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property, whatever it may be, I would accept the bill, under those circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa wish the floor?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Iowa agree to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. I have no comment on the Senator's suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Is the request to pass the bill, or to consider it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for unanimous consent to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection to considering it.

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object, we are getting right back where we agreed we would not go. We took up one bill, and I presume since we have taken up one, we might as well start at the beginning of the calendar and call it all. That would suit the Senator from Tennessee, because he has two bills he wanted to call up, and other Senators have bills they desire to call up.

Mr. McKELLAR. The two bills are at the top of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield, I may say I would not have attempted to bring this bill up, except that a precedent was broken just a short time ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4569) authorizing the transfer of Fort Des Moines, Iowa, to the State of Iowa, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "meridian" to insert "subject to the continued use by the city of Des Moines, without payment to the State of Iowa of ground or other rental therefor, of the improvements and necessary land presently used for veterans' temporary housing projects Iowa–V–13140, V–13077, and VN–13115, for so long as they may be needed for veterans' temporary housing purposes pursuant to Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, and the contracts between the city of Des Moines and the United States, it being understood that the rights and obligations of the United States and the city of Des Moines under said contracts shall not be in any way affected by such transfer except that the projects shall not thereafter be subject to the removal requirements of section 313 of Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, or the contractual obligations of the city of Des Moines for their removal, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. At the proper place in the bill I ask to have inserted my usual amendment, that, in this case, the city of Des Moines shall pay 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert "the city of Des Moines shall pay 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property in question."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall have to object to the adoption of the amendment.

Fort Des Moines, as shown by the reports of both houses, was donated to the Federal Government by the State of Iowa and the local citizens, without cost to the Government. It is now useless to the Government as a military reservation. It has a housing project there, operated in the temporary buildings which were erected during the war. The State of Iowa has agreed that if it is transferred to the State, it will take over the Government's obligations and contracts for the operation and for the completion of the housing project in its operating phases. It will eventually be abandoned. There is no objection that I know of. In fact, the reports show that there is no objection from either the housing authorities or the Defense Department, which has abandoned it as a military reservation. It is costing the Government much money every day to maintain these buildings, which originally were built on the property. The State has arrangements to use it for humanitarian purposes, and I see no excuse whatever for a 50 percent payment on this property, when no one is demanding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I merely want to say that a pretty good test as to whether this property is worth anything to the American taxpayer would be to put it on the market tomorrow to see what would be offered for it. It does have value. It has considerable value. I think the equities the Senator from Iowa is now discussing could be worked out on somewhat the same basis as we worked out similar equities with the Senator from California last year in regard to the transfer of certain Federal military property in his State. I am sorry that the Senator from Iowa and I do not see eye to eye on this matter. But I am not going to permit the transfer, for nothing, of property which the taxpayers of the United States now own, and in regard to which in many instances I have discovered, as I have looked into other cases, there have been Federal improvements which have increased the value over the years.

The fact that the property was given to the Federal Government in the first place I do not think is a very weighty argument, because we find that the economic advantages to the community concerned increased many times over whatever the value of the property was in the first instance, because of certain Federal operations resulting from the transfer of the property to the Federal Government.

I realize that I find myself frequently in embarrassing positions, because of my insistence on a consistent, uniform application of this policy; but I am going to persist in it, and therefore I object.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that I make this statement. I am going to be constrained to object to any other unanimous-consent requests to return to any bill that is on the calendar previous to the order of business at which the call of the calendar began today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois wish the floor?

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President, but the Senator from Oregon objected to consideration of the bill. I understood the Senator from Oregon objected to the consideration of the bill. Am I correct? A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Oregon objected to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I understood that the Senator from Iowa objected to my amendment, and, without the acceptance of my amendment, I object to the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I thought.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent was given to consider the

bill, and the Chair understands it is like any other bill in that situation. It is the business before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. If the decision of the Chair stands, and there is no appeal, then the question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the ECA bill, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE VIII OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—MOTION TO RECONSIDER WITHDRAWN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to return to Calendar 1495, the bill (H. R. 7846).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7846) to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. I intended to make the request before there was a demand for the regular order. The bill is one in which the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators are interested. At the request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I withdraw the motion made by him to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Will the Senator restate his request?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Arkansas entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which House bill 7846 was passed. The Senator from Arkansas has requested me to withdraw the motion to reconsider, and let the bill pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none; the motion to reconsider is withdrawn, and the bill stands passed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on page 4, after line 19, insert:

A-5371149, Horngacker, Hedwig Magdalena, or Sister Mary Blanka Horngacker.

And on page 8, strike out lines 10 and 11.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator give us a brief explanation of the amendments?

Mr. McCARRAN. The House amended the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55) by striking out one name, which was withdrawn by the Attorney General, and by adding one name.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate concurs in the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution from the Senate (S. Con. Res. 58) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on page 2, strike out line 5.

On page 5, strike out lines 17, 18, and 19.

On page 5, after line 23, insert:

A-1364379, McLaughlin, Bridget.

On page 7, after line 20, insert:

A-6810463, Solan, Julius, or Julius Seidner.

On page 8, after line 6, insert:

A-6396120, Stefanini, Mario.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. The House amended Senate concurrent resolution 58 by striking out two names which were withdrawn by the Attorney General, and by adding three names, which we have screened carefully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate concurs in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution from the Senate (S. Con. Res. 62) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were on page 9, strike out line 5. On page 9, strike out line 6.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. May we have an explanation?

Mr. McCARRAN. The House amended the resolution by striking out two names which were withdrawn by the Attorney General.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

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

MRS. MERLE LEATHERBURY PYLE AND PATRICIA M. PYLE—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on February 22, 1950, House bill 1133, for the relief of Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

At a recent meeting the committee considered this bill, which would create a status so as to entitle a widow to an annuity provided under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

The bill involves a matter of policy and the committee determined that it is one which more properly comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which handled the general legislation.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I request that the committee be discharged from further consideration of House bill 1133, and that it be referred to the Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERAGENCY RECREATION COMMITTEE—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on October 18, 1949, Senate bill 2731, to create a Government Interagency Recreation Committee from the present voluntary committee to plan, organize, and maintain a recreation program among Federal employees, to establish a Federal recreation center in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Following consultation with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], author of the above-mentioned bill, the committee considered this measure at one of its meetings, and it was determined that the subject matter of the above-mentioned bill is one that more properly comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I request that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 2731 and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. While I have no objection to the consideration of this business, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] took the Senator from Iowa off the floor by asking for the regular order. Does a unanimous-consent request always have a condition in it that a Senator may ask for the regular order after unanimous consent has been granted, and does it provide that when the regular order is asked for, a Senator may lose the right to have considered the business which the Senate had started to consider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair observes, on advice of the Parliamentarian, that under the circumstances a few moments ago, with reference to the Senator from Iowa, the demand by a Senator for the regular order would automatically bring back for consideration the unfinished business.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot see the use of a unanimous-consent request if at any time a Senator can ask for the regular order. I cannot, for the life of me, understand what the unanimous-consent request means unless it is that the unfinished business be temporarily set aside, and the bill for which consideration is requested is to be concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the precedents are uniform on the point.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is my understanding that unless the unanimous-consent agreement comprises not only the request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and the other business be taken up, and also that it be carried to a conclusion, without question the regular order can be asked at any time, whereupon the unfinished business again will be subject to consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. I submit to the distinguished occupant of the chair that the request of the Senator from Iowa that the unfinished business, the ECA bill, be temporarily set aside, was made in exactly the same terms in which the Senator from Oregon made a prior request.

It seems to me that when unanimous consent is granted that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, it automatically carries with it that some conclusion of the new business shall be reached, just as if it were a motion to consider a bill. I submit to the distinguished occupant of the chair that when the Senator from Iowa was taken off his feet by a call for the regular order he was deprived of an opportunity of finishing the matter which was then the order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was very much surprised, on examining the precedents, to find the situation as it is.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska could have taken the Senator from Nevada off his feet by demanding the regular order, if he had wanted to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the rule would apply in the same manner.

Mr. WHERRY. Does it make any difference whether it is done by unanimous consent or by a motion to take up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Nebraska that a motion to take up a bill, if agreed to, makes that matter the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. The Chair misunderstood my query.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair finish.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry I interrupted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is a unanimous-consent request that a matter be taken up, the precedents of the Senate are that a call for the regular order automatically operates as a return to the pending question.

Mr. WHERRY. So the rules provide that when a Senator has asked unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business, it does not carry with it the right to proceed to a conclusion of the business if a request is made for a return to the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. But if some Senator makes a motion that the unfinished business be laid aside——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the proper approach is not to make a motion to lay aside the pending matter; the approach would be a motion to take up the second matter without any strings attached to it.

Mr. WHERRY. My question was, If a motion is made which requires that the pending measure be temporarily set aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a certain bill, does that mean that consideration has to continue until it is concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The precedents are that a motion to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business would not be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. So a motion would not be in order in that sort of a situation, but we are to understand that if there is a unanimous-consent agreement temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business and take up another matter, any Senator can ask for regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, if it is approached by a unanimous-consent request.

ANNUITANTS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider order of business 294, Senate bill 878, to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not like to object, but the majority leader, who was called out of the Chamber a moment ago, had already stated he would object to taking up any measure which would disturb the parliamentary situation, so I must object on behalf of the majority leader.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the majority leader himself has already agreed to go back on the old calendar for two other bills, and I assure the Senator this measure will not take over 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry, but the majority leader made the statement I have just repeated, and unless the Senator can get him to retract the statement, I shall be obliged to stand by what I have said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida objects.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement relative to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, Senate bill 878 has been on the calendar over a year. It proposes to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act by extending additional benefits to those retiring prior to April 1, 1948.

The bill has much merit. No one disputes that fact. However, there are certain sections which some of us feel should be amended, and we have repeatedly requested the majority party to make the bill the regular order of business in order that the Senate might vote upon all the amendments and the bill itself.

As evidence of the administration's objection, I wish to read, for the information of the Senate, a statement contained in the report of the Committee on Civil Service:

> As heretofore stated, the benefits provided by this bill are purely a gift from the Government costing approximately $157,000,000. In view of the cost involved the Commission is constrained to recommend adverse action.

That statement was contained in a letter signed by Mr. Harry B. Mitchell, president of the Civil Service Commission, and reflects the views of the administration.

The amendment which I shall offer is very simple. It merely provides that all employees be treated on a basis of equality regardless of when they left the Government service. I have yet to hear anyone object to that principle.

This bill has not been made the regular order of business because the administration is opposed to the passage of the bill, and have indicated their disapproval of the bill through the Civil Service Commission, a copy of whose adverse report is contained in the committee report.

Every Member of the Senate knows how hard it is to pass a measure to which the administration is opposed. However, the members of the majority party, instead of assuming their responsibility, are continuously writing these retired employees placing the blame for the nonpassage of this bill on the Republican Party, basing such claims solely upon the fact that some of us have indicated that we will offer an amendment to the bill when it is given consideration.

In order that the responsibility for any lack of consideration being given to this measure might be placed exactly where it belongs, at this time I am making an effort to have the bill made the regular order of business. I assure Senators that if they will make the bill the regular order of business I will confine my remarks not to exceed 10 minutes. I merely want an opportunity to offer an amendment to the bill and state my reasons why such an amendment is important. I am perfectly willing to abide by the decision of the Senate both on the amendment and the bill itself if the majority leader will cooperate and allow the Senate to render its decision.

I appeal to the majority leader to withdraw his objection to the consideration of this bill and allow the Senate to vote both on my amendment and the bill itself. It is time that the majority party stops playing cheap politics on a measure so vital to the retired employees of our Government.

PROPOSED UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is the opinion of the junior Senator of Nevada that a United States of Europe is the first step in the permanent solution of the European problem, including the problem of Germany.

A few days ago, our High Commissioner in Germany, John J. McCloy, was quoted as saying "no permanent solution of German problems seems possible without an effective European union."

A United States of Europe is not only the practical, but the ideal step. Because Europe has climbed upon our back and has looked to us to carry her, the

American Government is in position to take a leading part in bringing about European unification. As a condition of further assistance from us, we should insist upon the formation of a United States of Europe. However, our State Department seems dominated by British thinking, and Britain's anxiety regarding the position of the British pound is the chief obstacle to European unification.

In other words, any time the United States of Europe is formed, each one of the nations of Europe would take its place in the firmament, just as California and New York took their places in the United States of America, just as the small State of Nevada and the large State of California have equal rights in their voting power on the floor of the United States Senate.

Will it require another east-west crisis over Germany to clear away this obstacle? Would it not be better to let common sense direct us now than to wait for the Kremlin to do it?

To avoid chaos there must be a United States of Europe, of which Germany is one of the states. Only within the context of European unity is there the opportunity to direct the economic, political, and spiritual forces of Germany into healthy and peaceful channels. Prompt action is needed because, first, the west today has an opportunity to unite for defense; second, Germany is in a formative stage; third, the idea of unity has a strong hold on the mind of the people; and, lastly, the United States of America would give full assistance in the establishment of a United States of Europe, for it is to our advantage to do so.

They can then reach their maximum of development by trading with each other, instead of placing obstacles to trade between the nations, such as quotas and embargoes and specifications, and all the things which prevent trade, so that, as they think, we become the only market for their production.

When cartels are formed, and such things as the sterling bloc, they bring about trade wars. Some nations are surrounded by trade barriers, others are isolated, so that ultimately a war is the only logical result.

With a United States of Europe, Germany would no longer be the problem she is. We are now torn between two choices: Allowing Germany to become strong industrially, with the danger that she may join Russia, and through that union seek to dominate the world; or turning her into a harmless agrarian state, with our endless financial support, involving about a billion dollars a year, which some time we will have to stop, and with the always-present danger that a frustrated Germany would ultimately join Communist Russia anyway, since Russia is offering her industrial independence through purchase of her products, and furnishing manufactured and processed products to Communist China.

The present situation is not good. Despite the fact that we have pumped American taxpayers' money into Europe, almost without limit, no cure for Europe's economic ills has been effected. That was the effect of Mr. McCloy's statement. He understands that no cure has been effected. Our give-away program has been futile. America cannot continue to leech its resources forever, nor can we continue in a struggle wherein every gain by us is temporary and questionable, while every gain by the Russians is permanent.

Europe could become strong as one nation, no longer subject to rivalries, distrust, and suspicions.

In setting up a United States of Europe which would function, there would, of course, have to be provisions for the integrity of private investments and the free convertibility of foreign currencies. This would automatically end the manipulation of currencies for trade advantage, and end complaints of dollar trouble or dollar shortage, when the dollar shortage is caused by the overvaluing of the currencies. No one will give a dollar for what they say their currencies are worth.

In conclusion, there must be a consolidation into a federation of states of what is left of western Europe—the 16 ECA countries, formed into a structurally sound, free-economy unit, unburdened by monetary conspiracies, Marxist regulations, bilateral agreements, restricting licensing arrangements, or other barriers to manufacture and trade among themselves. It would be a United States of Europe in fact. Such a Europe could be as intimately linked with us as is Canada at the present time.

This step is necessary for the survival of the nations of Europe, and for the effectiveness of any help rendered by us. Let us condition any further assistance for a United States of Europe upon integrity of private investments, free converitibility of their currencies between the nations themselves and the dollar.

What is the object of point 4? It is to guarantee investments which are gone the moment they are made because of the socialization and nationalization plans of European countries.

There should be a United States of Europe, where all the nations would be equal in their representation, just as in the United States of America the States are equal. That would prevent any manipulation of currency for trade advantage purposes. Such manipulation is a form of piracy, however it is practiced or whatever nation practices it.

RECESS

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 20, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Dexter W. Adams, O1061599.
James J. Albertson, O1342356.
Don C. Ambrose, O2036527.
Richard C. Ames, O1560422.
Allen R. Anderson, O423186.
Kenneth S. Anderson, Jr., O1019830.
Lewis J. Ashley, O1342031.
Jack S. Bailey, O422048.
Doric W. J. Ball, O1081543.
Andrew M. Barr, O1341936.
George B. Barrett, O948288.
Marshall B. Bass, O1341208.
John P. Berres, O945844.
William R. Bierwirth, O945800.
Leslie M. Blake, O1056986.
Maurice H. Boutelle, O1284090.
Donn T. Boyd, O548159.
Robert K. Bradford, O445994.
Patrick J. Breen, O1574605.
Haldon D. Brown, O453806.
Jackson M. Bryant, O2032831.
Frank R. Burget, O423863.
Dalton O. Carpenter, Jr., O928592.
Kevin F. Carrigan, O2049499.
Michael J. Cerrone, Jr., O1308098.
Egbert B. Clark III, O1341947.
Richard W. Clark, O1322130.
Stanley P. Converse, O955774.
Robert F. Coveny, O2039556.
William H. Crane, O1599149.
Thomas H. Crowder, Jr., O1309525.
John D. Cunningham, O465285.
Wallace H. Currey, O1540856.
Vernon C. Devan, O1329334.
Jack L. Dinkel, O2019859.
Otis J. Doty, O954135.
James R. Duncan, O1311628.
Richard J. Eaton, O947243.
William W. Etchemendy, O529113.
David E. Etzold, O947389.
Harry E. Evans, O424864.
Ronald J. Fairfield, Jr., O1824002.
Rudolph A. Fallon, O1635858.
Donald P. Fink, O1800096.
Alvin E. Fort, O1041763.
Robert Francis, O1283574.
Robert M. Galloway, O1058011.
Orlando Garcia, O1553814.
Joseph M. Gay, Jr., O1341261.
Henry H. Gerecke, O1798784.
Freddie W. Gramling, O414332.
Benjamin L. Gunter, Jr., O1699966.
George M. Hamscher, O1060794.
Joseph S. Harrelson, Jr., O1283598.
Harry B. Harris, O2027761.
John L. Hart, O947609.
Carl W. Hartman, O1556437.
Elzie Hickerson, O1010505.
John H. Hoffman, O1053640.
John J. Hoffman, Jr., O1341008.
Robert P. Hotaling, O1319091.
Harmon Howard, O2001000.
James M. Hull, O1119070.
I. J. Irvin, Jr., O1081220.
Arthur Jackson, O1341976.
John E. Jessup, Jr., O959279.
Clayton E. Johnson, O955377.
Jasper R. Johnson, O1320995.
Paul E. Jones, O1186043.
Delbert A. Jurden, O954539.
Andrew J. Kapec, O1342336.
Kenneth F. Kast, Jr., O949843.
Daniel K. Kealalio, O1331741.
Bernard S. Kern, O2025145.
Howard W. Killam, O1647987.
William W. Kirchman, O1173676.
Eric Kobbe, O468707.
Kenneth W. Koch, O1019375.
Kendall W. Korems, O956501.
Constantine D. Kryzanowsky, O1326504.
George V. Labadie, Jr., O396041.
Wilfred G. Lalonde, O1338719.
Joe B. Lamb, O1314794.

James E. Lawson, O945705.
William F. Lawson, Jr., O1296395.
Robert H. Lehman, O1101913.
Bernard J. Leu, Jr., O2033085.
John W. Liddle, O2038789.
Leon H. Lockhart, O1576307.
John Lycas, O446927.
Paul D. MacGarvey, O1010491.
Robert T. Mailheau, O2027263.
Merritt P. Martin, O1583333.
Robert J. Martin, O2017423.
Billy M. M'Carver, O1541005.
Milton E. McCaig, O955486.
Leo C. McCarthy, O1291497.
Sam Meadow, O1578348.
Jack M. Meiss, O1081084.
Jack R. Metzdorf, O1030909.
Warren H. Metzner, O1326291.
Douglas A. Mollison, O1339556.
Keith L. Monroe, O1063042.
Fred S. Moore, O1109534.
William J. Morrisroe, O1062420.
Paul A. Morton, O425659.
Albert R. Moses, O1334610.
James J. Murnane, O1588194.
Francis J. Murphy, O1047696.
Irvin E. Nachman, O956241.
Marvin L. Nance, O1338116.
Orrin D. Neff, O1342344.
Louis J. North, O1329038.
Richard C. O'Connor, O1329152.
Wade H. Padgett, Jr., O449809.
David W. Passell, O2088676.
Arthur G. Pendleton, O451462.
Jack G. Penick, O2050601.
Edgar L. Petty, Jr., O955776.
Milton B. Phillips, O551528.
John J. Policastro, O1049307.
Gilbert Procter, Jr., O547892.
Nicholas G. Psaki, O413264.
George W. Pulliam, Jr., O552791.
George P. Ramsey, Jr., O959185.
James C. Ramsey, O956441.
Albert Redman, Jr., O1648811.
Daniel J. Renneisen, O1001217.
Oliver L. Robbins, O1296258.
Robert S. Robbins, O2006257.
John F. Rogan, O1282407.
Warren J. Rosengren, O2042889.
John P. Ruppert, O402057.
Gerald F. Ruschmeyer, O1165444.
Donald P. Rush, O1636575.
David C. Russell, O1341907.
Robert C. Russell, O1046633.
Hans G. Ruthe, O1117023.
Bernard B. Sapp, O1169721.
Edward W. Sargeant, O957444.
Louis T. Schaner, O1338134.
Wittmer I. Schleh, O1281336.
Edgar B. Sharpe, O1648490.
Charles J. Shoemaker, Jr., O1314964.
Paul L. Skogsberg, O407739.
Dillon Snell, O957411.
George Snipan, O949077.
Jack W. Stallings, Jr., O1341374.
James K. Stringer, O554215.
Leslie J. Swope, O926460.
Loren H. Sylvester, O953864.
Douglas B. Tucker, O1327588.
Joseph R. Ulatoski, O1340833.
William D. Van Buskirk, O885037.
Miles C. Vaughan, Jr., O1332443.
Homer L. Walker, O1341487.
Richard H. Ward, O1296303.
William B. Ware, O487923.
Milton D. Weeks, O455175.
Seymour T. Weisser, O1825656.
Thomas R. Westermann, O446550.
David D. Whiteside, O1000888.
Charles H. Whitledge, O1119594.
Kingston M. Winget, O1341060.
Sanford H. Winston, O442715.
Dean R. Woodward, O954294.
Robert D. Worthen, O1555932.
John D. Yarbrough, O948179.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father C. E. Farrelly, of Emmetsburg, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

O Almighty and Eternal Father, master of the universe, creator of heaven and earth, giver of life and all things pertaining to it, look down, we beseech Thee, in benediction upon Thy children gathered here this afternoon.

We beg Thy blessing, O Lord, upon our beloved America. From the depths of our hearts we beseech Thee to grant that she may always enjoy peace, security, and freedom from harm. May she always be protected by Thy mighty arm from her enemies, both within and without her borders.

We pray Thee, O God, that the light of Thy divine wisdom may direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government; so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of happiness, the increase of industry, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty. Amen.

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

PROTECTION OF CANVAS AND WATERPROOF RUBBER FOOTWEAR

Mr. GOODWIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, as further indication of the alarm felt in my district over the current threat to the rubber-footwear industry, I have received the following letter from the Massachusetts Federation of Labor:

MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Boston, Mass., April 18, 1950.

Representative ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOODWIN—

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF LABOR, APRIL 5, 1950

Whereas a bill is pending in Congress entitled "Bill to revise administrative procedures of the Bureau of Customs," which would eliminate what is known as the American selling-price principle, specifically as it applies to canvas and waterproof rubber footwear;

Whereas the State Department has under consideration negotiations which would result in reciprocal trade agreements lowering present tariffs on canvas and waterproof rubber footwear imported from foreign countries;

Whereas any further reduction in the tariff rates applying to imports of canvas and waterproof rubber footwear would constitute a serious threat to the major industry of our community and to other local business firms and would result in the loss of jobs, widespread distress, increase of relief rolls, and increase of the tax burden of our citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive council of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor at its monthly meeting, held Wednesday, April 5, 1950, does hereby memorialize and petition the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; and all Senators and Congressmen from the New England States, to take necessary action to prevent any reduction in the tariff on imports of canvas and waterproof footwear whether it be by legislative enactment abrogating the American selling-price principle, by negotiation under the general agreement on tariffs and trade, or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, and Senators and Congressmen from the New England States.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY J. BRIDES, *President.*
KENNETH J. KELLEY,
Secretary-Treasurer-Legislative Agent.

HIDDEN TAXES

Mr. RICH. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are now considering the omnibus appropriation bill. It is a big one. Big appropriations mean high taxes. To keep our country solvent, balance the budget, and reduce taxes we must cut appropriations to the bone. The following is a list of some of the hidden taxes which millions of Americans are paying every hour of the day:

Quart of milk, 13 cents; taxes, 8 cents.
Loaf of bread, 10 cents; taxes, 5 cents.
Pack of cigarettes, 8 cents; taxes, 11 cents.
Meat, 50 cents; taxes, 20 cents.
Cake of soap, 5 cents; taxes, 2 cents.
Can of baby powder, 29 cents; taxes, 18 cents.
Movies, 40 cents; taxes, 20 cents.
Telephone, $4; taxes, $2.
Television, $400; taxes, $70.
New house, $7,000; taxes, $3,000.
Rent, $40; taxes, $20.
Light, $3.25; taxes, $1.75.
Refrigerator, $150; taxes, $75.
Coal, $13; taxes, $7.
Clock, $2; taxes, $1.
Automobile, $1,400; taxes, $700.
Gasoline, 14 cents; taxes, 11 cents.
Tire, $15; taxes, $3.
Battery, $15.59; taxes, $2.36.
Lawn mower, $14; taxes, $7.
Railroad ticket, $12.75; taxes, $2.25.
Perfume, $9.75; taxes, $2.45.
Hosiery, $1; taxes, 50 cents.
Shoes, $6; taxes, $3.
Purse, $10; taxes, $5.
Camera, $11.23; taxes, $1.77.

If we are wise we will economize in government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SECREST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Charles D. Fogle, general counsel for the Ohio Oil and Gas Association.

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

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include newspaper articles.

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

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a letter written by Mr. Gordon M. Jones, president of Row, Peterson & Co., of Evanston, Ill., to the Secretary of Labor.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 133]

Allen, Calif.	Harris	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Allen, La.	Harrison	Poage
Barden	Hart	Powell
Barrett, Pa.	Harvey	Quinn
Battle	Havenner	Rains
Bennett, Fla.	Heffernan	Ribicoff
Blackney	Hill	Rivers
Boykin	Hobbs	Rogers, Mass.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hope	Roosevelt
Bulwinkle	Irving	Sabath
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	Sasscer
Carroll	Jensen	Shelley
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, N. C.	Short
Cavalcante	Kelly, N. Y.	Smathers
Celler	Keogh	Smith, Kans.
Chatham	Kilday	Smith, Ohio
Chelf	Klein	Stanley
Christopher	Kunkel	Tackett
Cole, Kans.	McCulloch	Tauriello
Colmer	McDonough	Thompson
Cox	McGregor	Tollefson
Crosser	McKinnon	Towe
Davenport	McMillen, Ill.	Underwood
Davies, N. Y.	Macy	Velde
Dawson	Mansfield	Walter
DeGraffenried	Miles	Whitaker
Douglas	Miller, Md.	White, Calif.
Doyle	Monroney	White, Idaho
Engel, Mich.	Moulder	Wickersham
Engle, Calif.	Murdock	Wilson, Ind.
Fellows	Murphy	Wilson, Okla.
Gamble	Murray, Wis.	Wilson, Tex.
Gilmer	Nixon	Withrow
Granger	Norton	Wood
Grant	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodhouse
Green	O'Hara, Ill.	Young
Gwinn	O'Neill	
Hall, Leonard W.	Patten	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 318 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TAXATION OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 371) to correct the formula used in computing the income taxes of life insurance companies for 1947, 1948, and 1949, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LYNCH, GREGORY, CAMP, FORAND, REED of New York, SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, and KEAN.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, the general appropriation bill, 1951, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement entered into yesterday, general debate on chapters I and II has been concluded.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment beginning with chapter I.

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For the general fund of the District of Columbia, $11,000,000, and for the water fund, established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), $1,000,000, both amounts to be advanced July 1, 1950.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 3, strike out "$11,000,000" and insert "$9,800,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to cut down the amount that is paid by the Federal Government as a contribution to the District of Columbia. The legislative authorization is for $12,000,000. If this amendment be adopted they will receive $10,800,000.

In justification for a payment by the Federal Government toward the operating expenses of the District of Columbia, it is set forth that there is so much exempt property in the District of Columbia belonging to the Federal Government that it would place an undue burden upon the taxpayers of the District of Columbia unless there were a very substantial Federal contribution.

Let us see what the facts are. The tax rate on real estate in the District of Columbia runs $17, $18, $19 a thousand. I do not remember the exact figure. The tax rate in almost every community which the Members of the House of Representatives represent runs from $35 to $40 a thousand. We have at home also not only State income taxes, taxes of all other descriptions, but we also have at least double the amount of taxation on a thousand dollars of property that exists here in the District of Columbia. In addition to that we have all sorts of exemptions for public buildings, including Federal buildings, all sorts of colleges, State institutions for the insane, educational institutions, State penal institutions, and so forth. We also have in a great many communities Federal institutions on a very large scale. There is not very much more exempt property in proportion to the total here in the District than there is in most of our own districts. Under these circumstances it seems to me absolutely ridiculous that we should have a Federal contribution of $12,000,000 to the District.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It seems to me that in 1948 we passed legislation that rather fixed the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia at $12,000,000.

Mr. TABER. It authorized an appropriation of that amount of money. We have had authorizations at various times and we have not at some times appropriated the full amount. We have had all sorts of authorizations, but we have to base the amount we shall carry and approach the authorization on the basis of what we are able to pay. At the present time we are in this situation: According to the announcement made by the Senator from Georgia on yesterday as the result of a study of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, we are facing a Federal deficit of upwards of $6,500,000,000 with a likelihood that it will run to a larger amount than that with a little more unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, with the rising unemployment there are estimates in the paper this morning that the deficit might be seven and one-half billion and next year it might be $10,000,000,000. It does not seem to me that the people of the District of Columbia should be set off in an exempted class and not be treated the way we are obliged to treat other communities of the country and other agencies and activities of the Government. In order to try to cut down expenses in some way or other I have proposed here a very modest and a very moderate cut, not as big as we have made in some of the governmental agencies.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe also that the sales tax this Congress passed for the District brings in between $11,000,000 and $12,000,000 a year.

Mr. TABER. I believe it does.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And if the Federal contribution stays the same, they will get $11,000,000 or $12,000,000 more than they ordinarily had.

Mr. TABER. On top of that the liquor taxes were increased, but they are still nowhere near so much as they are in most States.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. There is nothing sacrosanct about this $12,000,000 appropriation, is there? Is it not simply an authorization?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Each year it has to be passed on by the Committee on Appropriations; is that not right?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Now, would the gentleman tell us this? I share the gentleman's view about the assessed value in Washington being entirely out of proportion with what it is in most other communities, including my own.

Mr. TABER. I expect the gentleman's is at least 100 percent.

Mr. KEATING. Well, it is close to it.

Mr. TABER. Mine is.

Mr. KEATING. The rate is $30 or more, if you add everything in. Now, can the gentleman tell us how much is yielded to the District for each dollar increase in assessed value or, conversely, if the gentleman's amendment carries, how much of an increase in the assessed value of the District would be required to offset the $1,200,000 saving?

Mr. TABER. $1,200,000 would be approximately nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total District budget, and the increase in tax to cover that amount would probably be, I imagine—I am just guessing at it—perhaps 30 cents on the dollar.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. When was this amount increased to $12,000,000?

Mr. TABER. A couple of years ago.

Mr. REES. For a long while it was about five, six, or seven million dollars, was it not?

Mr. TABER. For a long time it was $5,500,000, and then for a time it was a little more. But, a couple of years ago it was increased to about $12,000,000.

Mr. REES. In other words, we are doubling the contribution as against what it was as many as 3 or 4 years ago.

Mr. TABER. Well, practically doubling it; yes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. What, really, does this $12,000,000 represent? Is it a subsidy of some kind?

Mr. TABER. It is a subsidy to the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, it is significant that at the time it was increased our fiscal situation was quite different from what it is today.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. And, our fiscal situation is getting worse and worse, and there is not any reason why the people back home should carry the whole of that big burden. We should pass it around and pass our reductions around instead of making fish of one and fowl of another.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REES. It was the understanding, I believe, of quite a number of Members of the House that when we passed the Sales Tax Act it would take care of approximately $12,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct. And, I think it has.

Mr. REES. And that would prevent the necessity of increasing this contribution.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Will the gentleman tell me how his amendment would affect the contribution of $1,000,000 toward the water rate?

Mr. TABER. I made it to the $1,000,000, which is the out and out contribution to the District.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. So it would not affect the other item?

Mr. TABER. It would not affect the water item. I did not touch that because I thought we might just as well take it out of the large item. The whole cut is on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This is the first amendment that we have now to the over-all omnibus appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It would seem to me that as we go along and offer these amendments the House should certainly back up the gentleman from New York and others who offer them, if we are ever going to hope to economize to any degree whatsoever. I think the people of America want and need economy. At least, that is what I found out when I was back home this past week.

Mr. TABER. If the Congress of the United States has no sense of its own responsibility to the people and is not willing to take the responsibility of reducing those things that can be reduced and reduced fairly, not making fish of one and fowl of another, I fear for the solvency of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the efforts of the gentleman from New York to attain as much economy as we can. I think I am as strong for it as he is, but I think we have to use some discretion about it and some discrimination.

I rise for the purpose of giving you a little of the background of this $12,000,000 authorization for the District of Columbia because I happen to know something about it. I was chairman of the subcommittee of the District Committee in charge of fiscal affairs. We found that the fiscal affairs of the District were in very bad shape, so we worked out a full program.

As you know, this matter of the Federal contribution has been one of dispute for many years. In the first place, the original law was that the Federal Government contribute 50 percent of the cost of running the District of Columbia. That was varied from time to time, and, finally, in recent years it got down, I think, as low as $8,000,000. I do not believe it ever got down to anything like $5,000,000.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, for a long time it was $5,500,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

As a part of this program of putting the District of Columbia on a sound fiscal basis, this authorization was made a part of the fiscal policy and written into permanent law in the 1948 Fiscal Act of the District of Columbia.

The gentleman says an authorization is just an authorization. Of course, any act of this Congress does not bind another Congress. Nobody is disputing that. But here was a program that was worked out with the greatest care. In that act of 1948 this language was contained:

> For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and each fiscal year thereafter, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated as the annual payment of the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia the sum of $12,000,000.

That was for every year, not for that year.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We passed the sales tax since we passed that bill. The sales tax brings in about $12,000,000 a year. Does not the gentleman feel that the situation might be altered just a little now, since we did give them an additional $12,000,000 through the sales tax?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not one iota. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the District Committee and knows some of the problems we have had to deal with in the fiscal affairs of the District. That $12,000,000 annual contribution was a part of the program that went along with the sales tax. As the gentleman knows, Congressman DIRKSEN was chairman of the committee at the time the sales tax was proposed and defeated, and I was chairman of the subcommittee last year when this Congress, under

vigorous opposition, adopted the sales tax and adopted this program for the fiscal affairs of the District.

My good friend has said that when we adopted the sales tax that raised $12,000,000. Some of you gentlemen here ought to remember why it became so necessary to have a sales tax. This Congress raised the Federal employees all along the line at great cost to the Government. The following year the District employees who had not been included in that act were included. It became necessary to put them on the same basis as other Federal employees. That took $5,000,000 a year. Congress did that. The District of Columbia did not have anything to do with it. Congress fixed those wages. That is the fact—one of the reasons we had to adopt the sales tax was that we had to pay back $5,500,000 for the previous year and we had to pay for every year $5,500,000 for increases in wages, which were very just it is true, and this same Congress did it. Now it is suggested that we back up on the program that was definitely worked out and fixed by the District committees of both the other body and the House of Representatives.

Something has been said about the low taxes of the people in Washington. I happen to know something about that because we had a joint committee of the Senate and House on the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia. We worked on that. We heard all of the evidence about whether the property was fairly assessed here or whether it was not.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We worked on that matter for months. We held hearings to hear the testimony. It was said that District property was assessed lower and the taxes were lower than property in the surrounding areas. We did not just get up and say everything is wrong about these assessments. What we did was to send out in the field, both in Maryland and in Virginia, and we took identical houses which were erected in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and undertook to see what the taxes were. The taxes in every instance were higher on individual properties in the District of Columbia than they were in the surrounding territories. There just is not anything to this business about Washingtonians getting by without paying any taxes.

The point I want to make to the House is this: That those of us who have taken some interest in the District's affairs think that we have the budget of the District of Columbia on a sound basis so that they can go ahead with their schools and hospitals and other permanent improvements. Five million of that $10,000,000 which was raised as a result of the sales tax—it is $12,000,000 really—but five and onehalf million dollars of that has to go to pay the increased wages of the District employees that the Congress put on the District. The $5,000,000 has been by common consent allotted over a period of years to do the public-school business and to improve the hospitals and other public institutions here which are so sorely needed. I expect that many of you folks who do not come in contact with these things do not realize the great need here for improvement in some of your institutions in these hospitals, and children's homes, and places of that kind. They really are in a deplorable state. Some of you folks ought to go out and look at some of them. Then you will know why this committee decided, after studying this problem, why we reached the conclusions that we did and arranged this budget so that we could year by year appropriate a sufficient amount of money to take care of these very worth while and very necessary public improvements.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. The distinguished gentleman made the statement that at one time the contribution to the District was 50 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That was the law. That was the basic law.

Mr. JONAS. Then what brought about the downgrade? What made it necessary to reduce it? Was the $8,000,000 much less than the 50-percent contribution? That is what I would like to know.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, yes; very much less. But the Congress did it because the Congress controls the District and passes the laws governing it.

Mr. JONAS. Then how was the deficit made up?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot tell you over the past years how it was made up, but the District of Columbia does not owe any money.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. YATES. With reference to the percentages that have been requested by the gentleman from Illinois, and with reference to the statement of the $5,000,000 appropriation which was made by the gentleman from New York, I have here a statement of the percentages of the share of the United States of the appropriation over the past years. In 1938 there was an appropriation of $5,000,000 only, but that was 12.35 percent of the total cost of government for the District of Columbia. The present $11,000,000 appropriation will only be 10.66 percent of the total cost of government for the District of Columbia. It is a lower contribution than was made by the Federal Government at the time the appropriation was only $5,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad the gentleman has given us that information. I did not have it immediately at hand. Will the gentleman say whether or not over a long period of years that appropriation was ever down as low as five and one-half million?

Mr. YATES. It was, during the depression years of 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938. In subsequent years it remained fairly constant. As a result, the facilities and government of the District of Columbia have had to suffer as a result of not having had sufficient funds.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the the gentleman, and I hope that you will defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has again expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are finally up against the gun. All of us who have written home stating we were for economy and that we believed in a strong financial foundation for this great Nation of ours have now reached the time when we can discharge this responsibility to our people. We can show our sincerity by helping to cut a little of the unnecessary funds out of the thousands of items throughout this big appropriation bill. We are not harming the District of Columbia by asking that the District help this move toward economy by contributing only 1 percent of their budget of about $120,000,000. That is all this proposed amendment will mean. In my opinion, the Government of the United States will be strengthened if we will cut 10 percent all the way through the entire personnel with one or two exceptions. If we are to economize, we will have to vote to reduce appropriations in which we have direct interest, as well as trying to only cut at the other fellow's expense. While we have a responsibility to our own districts, we must not forget the general over-all picture, and permit the trees to hide the forests in the distance.

Now, let us think it over. Why can we not take 1 percent off this $119,000,000 District of Columbia budget without doing any harm to this great city of Washington? We could rightfully point out that Washington, D. C., has the greatest influx of tourists of any city in the United States. This city has the greatest cash Federal pay roll in the United States. It has one of the lowest income-tax rates of any of our States. The real-estate tax is very small. Why can the District of Columbia not increase its level of taxation on real estate up somewhat near to what we have in Minneapolis or St. Paul or some of the great cities through the Midwest before they make demands on the other taxpayers of the Nation to pay at least $5,000,000 of what the local residents should pay?

As I stated, this is the first amendment that will show whether or not we mean business. I hope we will try to do something toward lessening this $7,000,000,000 deficit which is a threat to the financial stability of our great Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has expired.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man on the floor of the House in my support of economy in the Federal budget. I do think, however, that we

should use an intelligent application of effort in where we cut this present enormous budget which is running us into deficit financing to a debt which in a few years will be beyond the ability and means of this country to pay. I say that we should cut this over-all appropriations bill, but no great saving can be made in a relatively small amount of $1,200,000 which will do so much good, and will mean so very little in the final figures.

As an example, specifically, I believe that this appropriation bill could be trimmed a sizable amount, but the place for intelligent trimming is in the multimillion dollar appropriations for the Army and the Navy. Hundreds of millions of dollars can be saved in these items; but certainly the $1,200,000 that we are trying to retain here now is poor economy.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOCKMAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If we could cut enough of these million-dollar items it would soon add up to an amount that looked impressive.

Mr. STOCKMAN. That is a good point except for the fact that this $1,200,000 is so vitally needed for the purposes for which it is earmarked, and will return so much for the money spent that it is just poor business to cut it.

Now, in regard to this item, this is an amount of money that is paid by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia in lieu of taxes on the Federal property in the District of Columbia. If the Federal Government paid its just share of taxation it would be over $16,000,000 instead of $12,000,000—and we are trying to cut one million off of the twelve.

Since 1936 the taxable area in the District of Columbia has gone down from 56.7 percent to 43.7 percent. This is Government-owned property which has been taken over for Government use, which procedure is entirely justified because the District of Columbia was created for that purpose. But this $12,000,000 item is only an item to compensate the District for the $16,000,000 in taxes it otherwise would derive from Government property.

Another reason is that Washington, D. C., is a boom town, just as much so in the last 10 years as any western city has ever been. Its population has increased by over 300,000 people in that time. This means that the District has to have a lot more streets, sidewalks, sewers, schools and the like, and you certainly cannot go ahead and service 300,000 people if you cut down the money that is needed to buy these services. I think this $12,000,000 item is a bargain in view of the fact the Federal Government would be paying $4,000,000 more, or a total of $16,000,000 if it were paying taxes on Government property in the District.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the grounds of the views of my colleague from Oregon, but I also realize that this influx of 300,000 new people should mean 300,000 additional people to help pay the taxes of the District of Columbia. I do not know how many Members of Congress residing in the District of Columbia pay a personal-property or real-estate tax in the District of Columbia. I do not own real estate here but I do pay a personal-property tax. They did not come and look me up. I asked them to send me a blank so that I could pay the property tax because I was getting the benefits of the city and I therefore felt I should contribute to their costs.

Let me show you this picture. In the District of Columbia the personal-property-tax rate is $2 a hundred. You have a thousand-dollar exemption. On the same assessed value of personal property here in the District of Columbia on which I am called upon to pay the infinitesimal amount of $4, in my home town of Kansas City, Kans., on the same amount of personal property, the tax was $60. Why? Because I only have an exemption of $200 at home and our tax rate is $6.57. We pay more for schools in my home town of Kansas City, Kans., than you pay in the entire District here for all public services.

If the District of Columbia is running short of funds to furnish such things as public schools, fire protection, police protection, and all of those things that go to making up a fine municipality, the remedy is right here in the District of Columbia. There is no reason why the taxpayers of the State of Kansas, already burdened to the point where it is almost impossible to pay, should be called upon to pay more and more here until the District of Columbia brings its tax rate up somewhere close to the rate prevailing in the larger cities throughout the United States. When that is done I feel quite sure there will be ample funds in the District of Columbia to provide for themselves everything they need without asking for contributions from the taxpayers of the other 48 States.

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

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

Mr. DONDERO. How does the tax rate in the District of Columbia compare with the tax rate of the large cities of the Nation?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not have all of the details but as you can see from the example I have given of my home city the tax rate is over three times what it is here, plus the fact that here there is a thousand-dollar exemption while at home the exemption is only $200. That makes $800 more upon which we pay a tax than in the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman's argument essentially boil down to this: There should be no Federal contribution of any kind in the event the taxes are increased to a sufficient amount to pay the District's total expenses?

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; I would not necessarily go that far. I feel that there is a duty to make some contribution, but it should be held to the very lowest minimum possible so that it will be just that much lower on the folks at home.

Mr. YATES. What would be the basis of the gentleman's apportionment then?

Mr. SCRIVNER. What is the lowest we have ever contributed?

Mr. YATES. This is among the lowest we have ever contributed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. What is the lowest we have ever contributed?

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman want it percentagewise or by dollars?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am talking about dollars. The people at home do pay dollars and that is what they are interested in.

Mr. YATES. There have been appropriations of $5,000,000 and that was 12 percent of the budget.

Mr. SCRIVNER. When was that?

Mr. YATES. In 1935, in the heart of the depression. Now, with the $11,000,000 contribution, $1,000,000 going to the highway fund, it is a lesser percentage of the cost of the government of the District of Columbia than it was at the time when $5,000,000 was appropriated.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There has been a great influx of people into the District. While this may be what has been termed a boom town, they do not here have the depressions that we have in other parts of the country because you always have a large number, several thousand Federal employees, who get their pay day in and day out no matter what happens in any industrial city in the United States, such at the one I represent, where we have to depend upon the mills, foundries and packing plants for our income.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. In response to the question that the gentleman from Michigan asked a moment ago, may I say that I made a study of that matter last year when we had the bill up to appropriate $3,000,000 for the fair that is to be held here next year. I calculated that the tax rate on property in the District of Columbia is about one-fifth what it is in my district.

There is another thing I recall too and that is we put on a sales tax last year which the transients help to pay.

Mr. SCRIVNER. And quite properly so.

Mr. JACOBS. I go along with the gentleman that we should make some contribution because of the property that the Government owns in the District of Columbia, but it does not seem to me that when the District of Columbia tax rate is as low as it is we should be too generous with the money of the folks back home.

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

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill and it is very essential that we dispose of it as rapidly as possible, and much to my regret I think

we ought to adhere to the bill before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object to the request?

Mr. CANNON. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York to reduce the appropriation for the District of Columbia by $1,200,000.

This is a matter to which I gave some attention on other occasions. I favor the proposed cut in this appropriation. I do not understand how Members of this Committee can oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York when, in their own districts, in their own cities, almost anywhere in the country, taxpayers are required to pay a much higher rate of tax than in the District of Columbia. It may be said by some Members, that the tax valuation is a little different, but the small difference in valuation will not make up for the favoritism that is given to those who pay taxes in the District of Columbia. In our particular community we pay two and three times as high a tax rate as they do in the District of Columbia.

Now, I do not want the people of the District of Columbia to be penalized in any respect. I want to treat them just as fairly as the people in Massachusetts or Oregon, or anywhere else. There is an income tax in the District. But, it is the lowest income-tax rate that I know of in the whole country. If you know of any State that has an income tax at all, that has a lower rate, I would like to have you tell me about it. You have a sales tax, but you do not have a sales tax anywhere, where there is one at all, that is more favorable than the one in the District of Columbia. Not only that, but you have all of the preferences that are granted anywhere. You have only the one property tax. You do not have county taxes, city taxes, and State taxes, and school district taxes, and township taxes. You have just one property tax in the District of Columbia and that is all there is to it. And the tax rate here is lower than in any other city or community of comparative size. It is less than half of the total tax rate in the city of Wichita, Kans., or any other city in our district or our State. They tell you that they tax this property for full value. I made a little investigation with respect to that, and I found, in most cases, the tax valuation is quite moderate.

It has been suggested that contributions should be made percentagewise. I am not so much interested in that proposal. I want the people of the District to pay a fair share of taxes comparative with those paid by other people in the United States. I certainly do not want them to pay more. Incidentally, you will find that taxes on personal property are extremely mild because of the exemption of $1,000 allowed the taxpayer who is the head of a family before he pays any taxes. I can understand why a Representative of a State adjoining the District of Columbia may want to oppose this comparatively mild reduction. Someone mentioned the question of the liquor tax. I am not interested in liquor as such, but I call your attention to the fact that in New York, for example, where they sell a considerable amount of liquor, the tax rate is twice the rate charged in the District of Columbia. I am advised that to increase the tax rate on liquor compared with that of New York it would result in approximately a million dollars more money. So the District of Columbia even has a preference on liquor taxes, where more liquor is consumed annually than in any other city in the United States of comparative size.

This is a mild reduction. I should add that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are charged with the responsibility of recommending the levying of sufficient taxes to run the government of the District of Columbia. If the rate of taxes on real and personal property were increased only 10 percent, it would more than offset the amount of this reduction. Even then the tax rate would be comparatively low. They could, as I have just suggested, increase liquor taxes and income taxes and still keep well under the average taxes paid by the residents in the cities in your States or elsewhere. All they need to do is raise the real-estate rate just a little bit and take care of this extra cost, or you could increase the liquor taxes a little or the income taxes, and still keep under the average and still pay less than you are paying in your city or I pay in mine.

This amendment is more than fair. The amount is comparatively small, but is more than a million dollars. Here is an opportunity to reduce the deficit to some degree and relieve the taxpayers of a burden that does not belong to them. The amendment should be approved.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to take vehement issue with the gentleman from Kansas that this is a mild and fair amendment. I think it is a very unfair amendment. Washington is a Federal city. It belongs to the Nation. We in this Congress who govern the allocation of the tax moneys, who govern the expenditures of this city, must determine how much should be the contribution of the Federal Government to the support of this Federal city, and we must be fair in our determination. We must make a fair contribution. The gentleman from Kansas would even eliminate the contribution entirely. I should like to ask all of those on the left side of the aisle who have talked about what a fair amendment this is, how many of them have signed the home-rule petition, which would entitle the people of this city to raise their own revenues and to pass upon their own costs of government. Very few, I am sure. Yet, giving the residents of this city no voice in the matter, you would, nevertheless, cut their funds.

Mr. REES. If the gentleman will yield, Does the gentleman think, then, that if we pass this home-rule amendment the Congress will not have to make any appropriations? Is that the point?

Mr. YATES. That is not my point at all. I am just trying to point out the unfairness of cutting the funds when you refuse to give the people of the city of Washington a voice in their own government.

Mr. REES. If they would take care of it at no expense to the Government, that would be all right.

Mr. YATES. I should like to point out one other fact. This is only a portion of the total appropriation for the District of Columbia. The total appropriation for the District of Columbia will be approximately $119,000,000, which will cover the entire cost for the government of the District of Columbia.

This section of the appropriations bill deals only with the contribution that shall be made by the Federal Government. Obviously it should make some contribution for the local services it receives. Who shall determine just exactly what the amount should be that the Federal Government should contribute? How should it be allocated? I think perhaps as good a formula as any is the amount of property owned by the Federal Government within the District of Columbia, a review of the amount of space it occupies, so that we may have a comparison, as an owner of property, with the other owners of property in the District of Columbia, whom you say are paying too low a tax.

I have here a statement showing the total acres occupied by Federal properties in the District of Columbia. The Federal Government occupies almost 31,000 acres of property in the District of Columbia, with a land value of over $1,000,000,000. Based upon the present tax rate for the residents of the District of Columbia, a fair Federal share should be in the neighborhood of $52,905,000.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. REES. I do not believe the gentleman meant 31,000,000 acres.

Mr. YATES. I am sorry. I accept the correction. It is 30,909.5763 acres.

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman have the figures as to the present amount of taxable property in the District of Columbia?

Mr. YATES. Yes, I do. The total value of taxable property within the District of Columbia, based upon the assessments made against the home owners and against the commercial properties of the District is $2,645,282,928. The tax predicated upon that assessment, and it is as uniform as it is to the other properties within the District of Columbia, should be in excess of $52,000,000, or almost $53,000,000.

Mr. REES. How about the value of personal property?

Mr. YATES. There is no computation in the statistics that I have with respect to personal property.

Mr. REES. How much personal property is taxed in the District? The gentleman does not know what the amount of personal property is in the District which is taxed?

Mr. YATES. I do not have that before me. The figures I have before me are a comparison between the real estate owned by the Federal Government and the amount it should pay based upon the existing assessment, formulas, and tax rates.

Mr. REES. What was the valuation of the real property in the District 10 years ago?

Mr. YATES. I do not have that before me. Ten years ago, obviously, it was lower because the cost of government has gone up.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I pay taxes in, I believe, four States. For 15 years I have been watching this situation here in the District of Columbia. Every chance I get on an amendment of this kind I am going to vote for the amendment in order to protect the taxpayers of my district. The people of the District of Columbia have so many blessings that they do not have to pay for in the way of beautiful streets and avenues and a clean city. Consider the approaches to the two bridges which are now being opened. Think of what I would call the decorations in the approaches to these bridges. Those things cost money. Somebody has to pay for them. The people in my district do not get the benefit of these things. The people who live in the District of Columbia get the benefits. The people here who are continually crying for home rule, if they ever get home rule, and if they ever have to pay the bills like the people in my State have to pay the bills for the improvements in our State, they are going to be pretty sick over home rule. I think this goes practically to the heart of the home rule issue which many of our people, through the States are being sold on, because they think that these are a group of poor little helpless people down here in the District who never have anybody to speak for them and never have anybody help them and who are taxed without representation and all that kind of philosophy which is being spread all over the country. I write to the people in my district and tell them very emphatically that if the people of the District of Columbia want home rule, they should assume all of the burdens and pay the bills of the District of Columbia just like the people out in my State have to pay the bills in our State. When they get the home rule issue down to a proposition like that, then maybe I will be a little more sympathetic to it than I am now. I am for this amendment. I hope the gentleman from New York will offer some similar amendments to other parts of the bill so I can vote for them, too, and cut these things down.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the tremendous number of people who will be coming to the District in the next 2 years because of the Sesquicentennial celebration, will add a considerable sum to the money which is collected as a result of the sales tax.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why, they are coming here so fast now that the streets and hotels and different places cannot take care of them. They are pouring money in here all the time. Just like going into a foreign country and putting dollar exchange in that country. I wish that in the States where I own property I could have a tax rate as reasonable as it is here in the District of Columbia. I would then be quite satisfied.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

In the first session of the Eightieth Congress the joint subcommittees on fiscal affairs of the Committee of the District of Columbia under the cochairmanship of the Senator from Washington, Mr. CAIN, and the late distinguished Congressman from Massachusetts, Mr. George Bates, held extensive hearings on the budget requirements of the District of Columbia. The outgrowth of these hearings was the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1943. This act, Public Law 195 of the Eightieth Congress, authorized among other things an appropriation of $11,000,000 to go to the general fund of the District Government and $1,000,000 to the water fund as the Federal Government's share of the cost of the operation of the Government of the Nation's Capital.

At the time of the enactment of this law the Federal contribution of $11,000,000 comprised approximately 13½ percent of the cost of operation of the District Government. In the ensuing years this cost of operation has increased. A goodly portion of the cost has been the result of laws enacted by this Congress for the benefit of District workers and of Federal Government workers and agencies paid for from the funds of the District. This growth has become so pronounced that the budget, as submitted for the fiscal year 1951, totaled over $103,000,000 in general-fund requests. The percentage of the United States share has dropped to 10.6 percent. If the Nation's Capital is to be maintained by the people and the Commissioners of the District Government in a manner befitting its position as the Capital City of the greatest Nation this world has ever seen, it does not seem fitting or appropriate that a further reduction should be made in the Federal contribution.

There has been a good deal of talk that the installation of the sales tax, as a result of the act of the first session of this Congress, has resulted in such an increase in revenue that the Federal contribution can be reduced. Such is not the case. Of course, the sales tax has resulted in revenue for the District of Columbia, but it has resulted in much-needed revenue, not that of a surplus nature.

Despite this increase of over $12,000,000 in tax revenues, the construction programs and capital outlay needs, particularly in the realm of public schools and public welfare institutions, are still below the actual needs of the citizens of the District. The capital outlay program is going forward now at a substantial pace. This will be brought home more clearly to Congress when the regular appropriation bill for the District is considered at a later date. However, if this capital outlay program is to be maintained at its present rate and if the citizens of the District are to be equipped with the schools and institutions to which they are entitled, then this Federal contribution cannot be cut.

There has been a good deal of talk as to the advisability of increasing the real estate tax in the District. On the face of it, perhaps the tax appears to be a bit low, yet the true measure of revenues derived from real estate lies in a comparison of the assessments and of the actual taxes collected on comparable property in several areas. In the last study made of 38 cities of over 250,000 population, Washington ranked second to New York in the value of the per capita assessment. Since that time the assessed evaluation in the District of Columbia has been increased by over 30 percent, which is one of the largest increases in this Nation, an increase made when other cities such as Pittsburgh and Buffalo were showing actual deceases in per capita assessment.

A comparative study has been made of the revenues collected from comparable property in nearby Maryland and Virginia. Dollar for dollar, it has been found that the tax on comparable property in the District runs a little higher than that in Maryland and Virginia. I firmly believe that an additional increase in the real property tax in the District of Columbia would result in such a decentralization of business here that it would result in not an increase in revenue collections but rather an astounding decrease.

In connection with the Federal contribution, let us look for a moment at some of the things for which this money is spent. The National Zoological Park is under the sole control and supervision of the Smithsonian Institution. The District Commissioners have nothing whatsoever to say in regard to its operation, personnel selection, or anything about it and yet in the fiscal year 1949 the sum of $550,900 was appropriated for this work. In like manner, over $2,000,000 was appropriated from District funds to the National Capital Parks, an agency of the Department of the Interior, over which the District Commissioners exercise no control, even of an advisory nature. The same is true for an appropriation of almost $90,000 for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Why, the District Government is even called upon to support the National Guard to the tune of over $100,000 per year, and the District of Columbia National Guard is a strictly Federal organization under the exclusive control of the President of the United States. In addition to this the District is called upon to appropriate $200,000 annually for the maintenance and operation of the National Guard Armory, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have absolutely no control over either the armory or the National Guard. Why, if we were to have an emergency here in

Washington, the commissioners, believe me, would not have the power to call out the National Guard to enforce order. You know and I know that this is contrary to the situation prevailing in every State, and yet there are those here today who would cut the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia.

Why, I could go on and on and cite examples in the District government of their large contributions to Federal agencies. For example, the nearly $8,000,000 appropriated annually to the operation of St. Elizabeths, the Federal Security Agency's hospital here in the District. I could tell of the school operated in the Wilson Teacher's College building, a District institution maintained by District personnel for the use of the Department of State for the instruction of foreigners in this country for State Department purposes, and, mind you, the Federal Government has not contributed one red cent for the operation of this school.

Mr. Chairman, I could stand here for hours and talk on the relationship and the responsibilities of the Federal Government to the District of Columbia and vice versa. However, I shall not belabor the point or take up the valuable time of this legislative body with further discourse.

Washington is more than a city, more than a district, and, yes, perhaps more than a State, for it is a shrine in the hearts and minds of American people. It is the heart of the Government, of a nation, and of a people, dedicated to liberty, freedom, and peace. Every week finds hundreds and thousands of people from every section of America coming to Washington to see the seat of government, with its many institutions, museums, and buildings dedicated to telling the story of our country. These people come, not to see the glitter and bright lights such as we find in the other large cities of our Nation—New York and Chicago—but they come to see and to pay tribute to a city dedicated to serve as the capital of a nation, a city whose very foundation rests upon the principles which have made this Nation great, a city dedicated to serving this Nation of ours and its people. If this shrine of freedom is to be maintained as a fitting memorial to the thousands of men and women who have died that this Nation might have life, then I think that the cost of a mere $12,000,000 is a small, even paltry, sum to pay as the Federal Government's share of the operation of such a city.

The gentleman's amendment to reduce this share is not only a poor amendment—it is even an absurd one and should be voted down vigorously and by an overwhelming majority by the Members of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 61, noes 47.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BATES of Kentucky and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 86, noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: Page 2, line 5, after the period, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this chapter shall be used for any of the purposes therein mentioned by any agency, office or department of the District of Columbia which segregates the citizens of the District of Columbia in employment, facilities afforded, services performed, accommodations furnished, instructions or aid granted, on account of race, color, creed, or place of national origin of the citizens of the District of Columbia."

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. It goes beyond the scope of the chapter that we have under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes. Mr. Chairman. The amendment is a negative limitation. It does not violate the Holman rule. It provides for a saving. We had the same situation on March 2, 1949, and on April 5, 1946, and the germaneness of the amendment was sustained by the Chairmen. I call the Chair's attention to the two precedents, the one on March 2, 1949, and the one on April 5, 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I just rise to say that this amendment is not in order. In the first place it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It attempts to change a law, to change the requirements, you might say, for the use of this money in the District of Columbia, and in that way attempts to write legislation into an appropriation bill, and is therefore not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York has offered an amendment which has been reported. Of course, the decision of the Chair has to be in conformance with the precedents and the rules of the House, and it certainly does not reflect any individual views of the Chair.

The Chair invites attention to the fact that the identical amendment was offered on two previous occasions, on April 15, 1946, and on March 2, 1949. In both instances the point of order was overruled. Under the precedents here cited, the Chair is compelled to overrule the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was offered in the Seventy-ninth Congress, it was offered in the Eightieth Congress, and it is offered in this Congress.

This year it is offered against the background of a Congress composed of the two major political parties, both of which went before the country and professed love for civil rights and promised action on civil rights.

It is my best guess that this Congress will adjourn sometime around the middle of July, so we are really on our last legislative leg as far as the life of this Congress is concerned.

The record of this Congress is what on civil rights? We have done nothing. We have received double talk and we have also received the double cross on the issue of civil rights all the way down the line, from the White House to Capitol Hill. Action has been promised time and time again and action has been postponed time and time again. Whenever there has been an opportunity for action on civil rights, that opportunity has been destroyed either by surreptitious sabotage on the part of the President and his Democratic Party leadership on a Monday or sabotage open and avowed on the part of the Republican Party on a Wednesday. There has never been a more inglorious page written in the history of this country than the one on civil rights. It is a page of hypocrisy and double dealing by both the Republicans and the Democrats.

With this amendment we again have an opportunity to live up to the commitments we made in the last election. This year we again go before the electorate of this country. I suppose the Democrats will be blaming the Republicans and the Republicans will be blaming the Democrats, but the record speaks for itself. A Republican Congress, the Eightieth Congress, did nothing for civil rights. A Democratic Congress, the Eighty-first Congress, betrayed the promises and the campaign pledges the President and his party made on this issue.

What are we asking here by this amendment? We are simply asking that in the Capital of the Nation the practice of segregation cease on the part of the Government agencies connected with the operation of the government of the District of Columbia. Is that asking too much from a Congress, the majority of which was elected on a platform of civil rights?

Let me ask some of you gentlemen, by what right, legal, moral, or ethical, can you take the funds of a Negro taxpayer and use those very same dollars together with the dollars of a white taxpayer to perpetuate discrimination and segregation in the District of Columbia against the Negro? Just by what right do you do it? You assert that practice by violence, by the violence of white supremacy.

That is the only way you can assert that practice and carry it on. I repeat that. You assert it by the violence of

white supremacy. You violate every precept of decency and you subvert every principle of democracy. You violate every profession of democracy found in every great document of this Nation of ours. You violate every ethical and moral principle and you assert your white supremacy by violence so that you can keep alive this vile system of economic exploitation of 14,000,000 Negroes. Here Congress year in and year out has been placing its stamp of approval on this violence and oppression. What is worse, it has refused to lift a finger to put a stop to this abhorrent practice.

Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable, very regrettable indeed that the floor has so many present who are opposed to this kind of amendment. Where are the October friends of civil rights today? This amendment and the offering of it was no secret. It has been a yearly practice. Everybody knows that this amendment is offered to the District of Columbia appropriation bill. What is more, it was published in this morning's paper that it was going to be offered. Why the absence of these election-time friends of civil rights from the floor of the House? Where are they? Why are they not here? Is it because we are voting in the Committee of the Whole where there is no record vote on this matter? Is it because you can dodge behind this parliamentary device so that you can conceal your absenteeism and conceal your sabotage of this effort in the fight to establish equality in the District of Columbia? I do not think you are going to fool anybody. Let me tell you, you are not going to fool 14,000,000 Negro people in this country with this kind of conduct any more. You are not going to fool the other people—the white people who believe in the principle of equality and who want the Congress to act on it. You are not going to fool anybody, may I say to the leadership of the House by saying, "Well, the Dixie Democrats beat us." Well, the Dixie Democrats are not in the majority. They constitute a minority. Where are the Democrats from the big cities? Where are the Republicans who have been professing love for civil rights? Where are the leaderships of both parties? Why do they not support this amendment which is an integral part of their party platforms?

The Dixie Democrats are here, but they do not constitute a majority. Where is the majority which was elected by the American people on the basis of a promise to enact civil rights?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, you have just listened to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] arguing in favor of his so-called civil-rights amendment.

It is really an amendment to persecute white Americans in the District of Columbia, using the Negro as a smoke screen to carry out a Communist program. If you will get hold of a magazine which the Communist Party issued a few years ago, called the Negro in Soviet-America, you will find that this amendment would simply carry out the Communist Party lines.

It should be called an amendment to stir up race riots in the District of Columbia. That is what it would mean. I never dreamed that I would live to see the white Americans in the District of Columbia persecuted as they are being persecuted today—even without the Marcantonio amendment. They are being driven from their homes by this so-called antisegregation movement, promulgated by a racial minority, whose real-estate agents are taking Negroes into the white residential sections, with the result that white Americans are moving across the river into Virginia or out into Maryland by the thousands.

White Americans in the District of Columbia are being driven from their apartments in the same way, and are being forced to seek refuge in Virginia or Maryland.

These white Americans are being driven from the restaurants and hotels in the District of Columbia in the same way. They are being driven from the Federal pay roll, to escape the humiliation that is being imposed upon them under the present regime.

These racial minorities that are always whining about civil rights have a hundred times as many of their own members on the Federal pay roll as they are numerically entitled to. The result is that the service has degenerated in every branch of the Government, from the Library of Congress to the Bureau of the Census. Never have I seen such a lack of efficiency in these departments as we are witnessing today, as a result of this communistic pressure that has literally forced white Americans out of their jobs.

But the craziest step that I have ever known to be taken in a civilized country was the Executive order wiping out segregation in our armed forces. That was the greatest victory Stalin has won since Yalta. It did more to cripple our national defense than anything else that has ever been done in all the history of this Government.

How much longer, I ask you Members of the House, are you going to tolerate these communistic movements that threaten the very life of the Nation?

This amendment may sound harmless to some of you; but if it is adopted, and written into the law, in my opinion, it will intensify the racial feeling now existing in the District of Columbia, and probably result in race riots and mob violence, the like of which this Capital has never seen.

You have just witnessed the most nauseating spectacle in all the history of this Capital, when a little woman, named Ruth Weyand, a member of a racial minority—and Communist if there ever was one—passing as a white woman, wormed her way into the position of attorney for the Labor Relations Board, and went before the Supreme Court of the United States, filed a brief, and probably made an argument, urging that Court to take it upon itself to legislate through a judicial fiat and outlaw segregation throughout the United States. It developed that this woman, of foreign extraction, had been living with a Negro man. The Negro's wife sued her for alienating her husband's affection. She came back and claimed that she was married to this Negro. The case became so nauseating that she was removed from her job as attorney for the Labor Relations Board. She now claims that this was discrimination because of race, creed, or color.

It is time that the white Americans in this country—who have built this Nation and made it great, who have fought its battles in times of war, and who have sustained its institutions in times of peace—it is time they are given the consideration to which they are entitled, and that these persecutions of them cease.

I hope that Mr. MARCANTONIO's amendment will be voted down by such an overwhelming majority that it will never again see the light of day.

Let us put a stop to these communistic movements, and save America for Americans.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Before expressing my reasons for opposing this Communist amendment, I wish to call the attention of the membership to the definition of "Democratic Party" as given in an edition of Funk and Wagnall's dictionary. I am somewhat embarrassed for never having looked in the dictionary for a definition of "Democratic Party," and the matter was called to my attention by an editorial appearing in a weekly newspaper, the Easley (S. C.) Progress, in my district, which was published on April 13, 1950. According to the dictionary, "Democratic Party" is defined as "this party has always advocated a rigid adherence to the principles of the Constitution and the equality and autonomy of the States, while opposing the centralization of power in the Federal Government." Those few lines completely express the Democratic Party I believe in.

With that preface it is almost needless for me to enumerate specific reasons for opposing the proposed amendment, because, in my opinion, any public official who favors the enactment of the civil-rights program, including FEPC, or amendments designed for the same purpose, violates his oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution.

It is absolutely a shame and disgrace and an insult to the intelligent thinking American to realize that such proposals are presented to this body for consideration. I shall consider my life as a success if I can contribute in any manner toward the defeat of such un-American proposals.

The average citizen of these United States, regardless of his race, creed, or color, holds no brief or favoritism for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Apparently the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] would have us follow a philosophy that segregation of the races is a discrimination only against the Negro. However, the abolition of segregation would actually be a discrimination against the white race, the yellow race, and the Negro race as well.

The gentleman from New York, whether he realizes it or not, is advocating communism by offering the proposed amendment. That is true because he seeks to compel an employer to hire individuals against his will and desire. In other words, he seeks to make a dictator of the Federal Government. In my opinion, in so doing he is seeking the overthrow of this Government, and it is high time that the membership and his constituents, as well as the people of the United States realize it. I do not intend to cast reflection upon his personal integrity, but wish to emphasize to the membership and the people the danger in his philosophy.

I have the privilege and honor of representing a district in which there are many Negro citizens. I know their nature and I know their attitude as all southerners do. There is no race in the United States which abhors or detests the abolition of segregation as does the colored race, and it is high time that the proponents of proposals as made by the gentleman from New York come to realize it.

One cannot compel another to work for him, because that would be involuntary servitude—slavery, and our Constitution specifically prohibits same. Yet, on the other hand, the enactment of the proposed amendment would subject the employer to involuntary servitude if he refused to hire an individual because of race, creed, color, or national origin. In other words, the gentleman from New York desires to make individual business and the Government slaves to a dictatorial Government. If that is not communism, I do not know what is.

I sincerely hope that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] while disassociating myself from many of the observations he has advanced.

He knows as well as I, and as well as the other Members of this House, why we have not approved a full civil-rights program in this session. He knows as well as I that the President and his supporters in Congress have done everything in their power to secure such legislation, and have been defeated by the backsliding of Republicans who did not respect their party platform. He undoubtedly knows as well as I that such speeches as he has just delivered do the supporters of civil rights in this House an injustice and the cause of civil rights considerable damage. In the light of such knowledge, the gentleman from New York is privileged to reexamine his statements. The other Members of the House understand them well.

The gentleman's purposes aside, the amendment should stand on its own merits. This is our National Capital. We have erected here monuments to the great men and great ideas which have guided us throughout our history. We have built a spacious and beautiful city to symbolize the ideals that have made us a nation.

Yet the practices of segregation and discrimination continue in the shadow of the monuments to the men who wrote that all men are created equal, in the Capital of a nation dedicated to equality of opportunity and the dignity of man.

We are engaged in a world struggle with Soviet Russia, a struggle that is as much in men's minds and hearts as it is in the maneuverings of the cold war. We are appealing to men of all nationalities, creeds, and colors throughout the world to recognize that only democracy such as ours can make all men free and equal before the law. These men of all nationalities, creeds and colors throughout the world look toward the source of that lofty appeal, to Washington. What they see makes a mockery of the words they hear.

I think we should adopt this amendment and end this double standard of political morality. The city of Washington is not so much a geographic entity as it is the political meeting place of all Americans, and America's place of business, both domestic and foreign. The mores and customs of this city should be the mores and customs of the whole people of this Nation, the mores and customs that we rightfully claim as American throughout the world.

We are all religious men here. I personally believe deeply in the Christian tradition, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. In Christian terms, discrimination and segregation are immoral, inexcusable lapses from grace and faith.

I ask Members of this House to put aside those prejudices and ideas which threaten our unity in a time of crisis for the Nation and the world. Let us approve this amendment and make Washington an American city in the fullest meaning of those words.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have been frequently asked about the proceeding on the bill, as to whether the Committee will rise and report to the House at the conclusion of each chapter or wait until the entire bill has been completed before the Committee rises and reports the entire bill to the House with whatever amendments may be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. In answer to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from New York, the Chair will state that action will be completed on the entire bill which will then be reported to the House, unless the House orders a different procedure.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 21, noes 67.

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

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

CHAPTER II. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, $5,492,500.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of chapter II be dispensed with.

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

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman include in his request that amendments and points of order may be reserved to any part of the chapter?

Mr. McGRATH. I make that as a part of my request, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to be raised to chapter II? [After a pause.] If not, they are waived.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 25, line 6, strike out "$8,500,000" and insert "$8,000,000".

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I have offered refers to the item of congressional printing and binding, which is the only actual appropriation item over which the legislative committee has any control as far as the Government Printing Office is concerned.

The testimony showed that their estimate was based on a figure of $8,750,000 for the coming fiscal year 1951 for printing and binding, which of course takes in the matter of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Legislative Digest, all bills, reports, hearings, and all of the business before the Congress.

You will also find from reading the hearings that last year the item was $8,000,000, and the Government Printer estimated that the $8,000,000 would be sufficient to cover all congressional printing for this fiscal year of 1950.

It should be recalled that last fall—and this was one of the reasons for a great deal of the Government printing—we returned into session in the fall and remained in session until almost the 1st of November. All of us realize, of course, that this is election year, and the elections will be about the 1st of November, so I think we can safely anticipate that we will not come back into session this fall after we once adjourn. Therefore, it should be reasonably assumed that

there will be less printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and there will be fewer reports and there will be very few new bills introduced. Then, of course, we will come back into session the first of January, and the only printing we will have to pay for will be from the first of January until the end of the fiscal year, July 1. I would be less than frank with the House, however, if I did not say that should there be any greater demand for spending for congressional printing than we assume is likely to occur, the Government Printer would be perfectly justified in coming in late next spring and submitting to us a deficiency request, which of course would be proper. In this situation, however, our guess is surely as good as the Government Printer's.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman from Kansas recognizes the fact that in the report we stated that this was purely an approximation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is true.

Mr. McGRATH. And the half-million-dollar increase was partially in recognition of the wage raises that were granted in the departments. I agree with the gentleman, however, that we should be as economically minded as we can, and the committee very gladly accepts the amendment; we have no objection to it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman from New York for that statement. At this time I think it is perfectly proper that I should point out to the Members of the House that in this Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee there has been the greatest degree of cooperation, friendship, and cordiality. The statement just made by the gentleman from New York demonstrates one of the reasons why it was possible for us to work together in such a fine spirit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: Page 3, line 6, strike out "$5,492,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,135,000."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that there is no authority in law for this increase.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MULTER. No; I do not care to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] cite any authorization of law for the increase proposed by his amendment?

Mr. MULTER. Only the fact that this body has the authority to fix the salary of its Members. I think it does not matter how or in what bill the House does it. It may do so as part of an appropriation bill. This item being the item appropriating for the pay of Members of Congress I think it is subject to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, while I recognize that the Members of the House are deserving of an increase in compensation, yet my position at this time is of a legislative capacity and I must support the rules of the House.

I respectfully submit that the point of order lies against the amendement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield for a question?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. TABER. As I understand, this is an amendment to the gross amount for salaries. It is not in order, of course, because the only authority we have is to appropriate an amount equivalent to the product of the fixed salary times the number of Members. The effect of the amendment would not even be to increase the salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has offered an amendment which has been reported; the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that the amount sought to be included by the amendment is not authorized by law.

The Chair has examined the question to some extent, and it appears that the amount carried in the bill reflects the amount authorized by existing law. Therefore, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would be in excess of existing authority of law.

The point of order is sustained.

LABOR IS WORTHY OF ITS HIRE; IS NOT A CONGRESSMAN?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to provide increased funds with which to pay salaries to the Members of the House of Representatives at the rate of $20,000 per annum for the second half of the fiscal year provided for by this appropriation bill, beginning with the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. There is no intent by the amendment to increase the salaries of the Members during the current session. We were elected on the basis of fixed salaries of $12,500 per annum. It is my opinion that even if there were not legal obstacles to increasing our own salaries during our own terms of office, it would be a breach of contract to say the least for us to change that. We do have the right to increase the salaries of those who may be elected to serve in successive Congresses, and that we should do.

In offering the amendment I appreciate the parliamentary difficulties which may make it impossible for the House to consider this matter at this time. Even if the amendment were considered and carried, it still could not be effective until the basic legislation authorizing the payment of the salaries was similarly amended so as to provide for the increase, I offer the amendment at this time, nevertheless, in order to direct attention to the fact that there is pending a bill for increased salaries, and although the chairman of the committee has promised this House action on it, he unfortunately has not yet called any hearings.

The overwhelming sentiment of this House and of the country is in favor of such increased salaries. Our President, Harry S. Truman, the Hoover Commission, and any number of independent sources have recommended that salaries of Members of Congress be increased to as much as $25,000 per year. My amendment and my bill call for an increase to only $20,000 per year.

I know that many of the Members feel that this being an election year, legislation of this kind should not be brought before the House at this time. I vigorously disagree with them on that score. I doubt whether a single Member of this House who will stand for reelection in the fall will lose a single vote by his support of this legislation. I dare say Members who voice opposition to the increase of their salaries may, on the other hand, find themselves confronted with the potent argument that their constituents do not want any man serving them in Congress who thinks he is worth less than $20,000 per year.

Service in Congress today is a full-time job, requiring diligent attention to the duties of the office day and night, 7 days a week, 52 weeks in the year.

Labor is worthy of its hire; is not a Congressman?

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 24, line 18, strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$15,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 29, after line 13, insert a new section reading, as follows:

"The total sums appropriated under this chapter shall be reduced to the extent of any separate and distinct item appropriating money which is disapproved by the President."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the wording of this amendment is designed to be, and I believe is, a limitation on the appropriation. As I stated in general debate on the subject, I have introduced a bill which would have the effect of giving the President the power to veto any

single item in an appropriation bill which he does not now have. He is forced, therefore, to approve or disapprove the whole bill.

I appreciate that to endeavor to provide for that in this measure would be legislation on an appropriation bill. This, however, is not worded in that way. It provides that the sums appropriated here shall be reduced by the amount of any distinct item which the President feels should be disapproved; in other words, he will have the power under this amendment to join with us, if he is so disposed, in the battle for economy. I believe the amendment as worded, being a limitation, is in order.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, may I call the Chair's attention to the fact that this is a delegation of power from the legislative branch to the executive branch of the Government and is clearly legislative in character.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has analyzed the amendment and it appears clearly that the purpose of it is to confer item veto power on the President, which would be legislation on an appropriation bill in that it confers authority and power on the President which he does not have. Under the rules of the House, being legislation on an appropriation bill, it is subject to the point of order, and, therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The President under the budget law has the power to impound funds appropriated for any branch of the Government.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that fact and that the President has exercised that power at times in impounding funds.

I have two rejoinders to that. First, the President has failed to exercise the power in a number of instances where it might well have been exercised. In some cases he might have acted differently with advantage to the taxpayers if he had had before him a precise measure for approval or disapproval. In other words, he would be more likely to cut out appropriations lacking substantial merit if confronted with the duty of passing on each item separately, than he would to impound funds for specific purposes.

The second point is, it seems to me, that the orderly procedure for us to follow legislatively is to provide for such single item veto rather than to leave this power to the President which he now has and which he has exercised perhaps at times contrary to the will of the Congress.

It seems to me that the adoption of a measure such as this would go a long way toward enabling the President, if that is his disposition, to join with us in our endeavor to cut the budget.

When this appropriation bill reaches the President's desk, he will be compelled to sign it or disapprove it in its entirety. If there are items in it where he feels we have acted unwisely, there is nothing he can do about it. He should be given the authority to veto any single item in the appropriation bill which he feels is improper. The conferral of this power, if diligently and conscientiously exercised by the President, would be one of the most effective steps we could take to approach our goal of a balanced budget.

In our deliberations on this bill, it is imperative that we leave no stone unturned in our search for legitimate ways and means of effecting economies without impairment of essential services. The people back home expect this of us. They have a right to expect it.

I regret that the amendment has been ruled out on a point of order. I appreciate that the Chairman has rendered his ruling in a sincere effort to follow legislative precedents. Nothing further can be done at this point. I hope that the committee to which my bill has been referred, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, will give early consideration to the suggestion I have made.

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

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

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that the power that the President now has to impound funds is sufficient? In 1947, the day the Congress adjourned, I remember the President impounded about 50 percent of the funds Congress had appropriated for flood control and for irrigation and reclamation. He has pretty broad powers now, and I am wondering if the amendment that the gentleman has just offered, and which was ruled out of order, would not give the President possibly more power than he should have.

Mr. KEATING. My feeling is that it would approach this problem in an orderly way, and that if the President is going to rule out an item or items, the proper way to do it is by approving or disapproving specific items in the appropriation bill rather than by the exercise of his inherent impounding powers. That does not seem to me the proper way to approach the problem.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would not want the gentleman from Iowa to leave the impression that the President has the right or authority under the Constitution to tie up funds appropriated by the Congress. It is true that he did impound irrigation and reclamation funds, but he violated the Constitution of the United States when he did that.

Mr. KEATING. Well, there are many of us who disagree with many of the actions of the President, I feel sure. Although I am not familiar with the legal implications of this particular action on his part, there are other steps he has taken of which I have been critical.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, possibly I should have said that the President took the power to do that thing. I rather agree with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] that under the Constitution he does not have that privilege. But, of course, in his new way of doing things, why the President sometimes takes some authority that some of us cannot quite understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another clarifying amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Page 25, line 12, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$8,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have not so far offered any amendments to this chapter. I do not believe I shall offer any.

Together with the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Kansas and accepted, the total cost of this particular chapter, the legislative housekeeping job, is reduced $9,000,000. That is about 14 percent of the $65,000,000 which was recommended in the budget. The subcommittee has made substantial cuts, so that with the cuts made by the Committee of the Whole on the President's budget it looks as though we had arrived at a reasonable figure. It will not be my purpose to offer amendments for additional cuts, where proper cuts have been made, but where I feel the proper cuts have not been made I shall be obliged to offer amendments for further cuts.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman's statement is particularly true in a situation such as we find here, where many of these items are purely mathematical. For instance, one of the larger items is the salaries and expenses of Members of Congress, Commissioners, and Delegates. There is just nothing that can be done on an item like that.

Mr. TABER. Where the salaries are fixed and the employment is fixed, that is true.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. When we allow funds in a lump sum, as in the item suggested by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], and allow a certain amount to a department or agency, as a general rule it is expended by the end of the year. If you allow such an item to stay in the bill, it is more likely to be spent than not. Most of the time they have a way of spending the money if you once allocate the funds.

Mr. TABER. The departments have a bad habit of calling whatever is left in the middle of May "hot money." The

word will get out somehow or other for them to get busy and find some way of obligating that money before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. REES. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. TABER. That is a very, very bad practice all the way through the Government of the United States. You see men occasionally on a train, and without their knowing who you are, they will get to visiting with you and will tell you that because of the "hot money" they had to spend they were obliged to take a particular trip.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take a brief moment to point out on page 13 of the hearings an item of increase with which I think all the Members of the House will be in accord. I am quite sure if they knew him as the Members of the House knew him, all the taxpayers of America would be in accord with it. It is the item of increase in the office of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives made necessary by the fact that our dearly beloved Rev. James Shera Montgomery was retired as Chaplain Emeritus, and, of course, under this action his pay carries on as a tribute to his long and faithful years of very fine service and spiritual guidance for the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGRATH. I join the gentleman from Kansas on behalf of the Democratic Members in expressing the same sentiments.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman.

CHAPTER III. DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

The CHAIRMAN. Under agreement entered into in the House, there being no further amendments to chapter II, general debate is now in order on chapter III of the bill for not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

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

Mr. Chairman, the next chapter of the so-called package appropriation bill covers the appropriations for the coming fiscal year for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and for the Federal Judiciary.

At the outset, as chairman of the subcommittee, I wish to express my appreciation to my four distinguished colleagues on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], for their untiring work and splendid cooperation.

I could not pick four Members of this House with whom I would rather sit day after day and week after week listening to testimony in support of budget estimates than with these four gentlemen who are my close personal friends and for whom I have the highest regard and esteem.

The total requested by the Bureau of the Budget for the Departments of State, Justice and Commerce, and for the Federal Judiciary, was $1,184,035,897 in cash and $91,036,500 in contract authority. Taking the four subdivisions of this part, or this chapter of the package appropriation bill, the amount allowed by your committee for the four agencies is $1,110,870,462, in cash, as well as $65,786,500 in contract authority, making a total of $1,176,656,962 in both appropriations and contract authorizations.

The reductions recommended by the committee amount to $73,165,435 in direct appropriations and $25,250,000 in contract authority, making a total reduction in this chapter of the package bill of $98,415,435.

The total direct appropriation recommended for the coming fiscal year is $19,997,177 less than the amount appropriated for these four items in the current fiscal year.

The total contract authorization recommended is $2,413,500 less than the amount given as contract authority in the present fiscal year. The net amount recommended by your committee for fiscal year 1951 in direct appropriations and contract authorization is $22,410,677 less than the amount appropriated and authorized for the current fiscal year.

Included in this chapter is a new item for the Bureau of Roads which had heretofore been carried in the Independent Offices appropriation bill. The budget estimates for this Bureau alone amounted to $455,900,000, an increase of $48,400,000 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The first of the subdivisions of this chapter to which I shall refer is that which provides funds for the fiscal year 1951 for the Department of State.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the $455,000,000 for the Bureau of Roads have anything to do with road construction, or is it purely for administration?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, no. That is money for the Federal-aid highway program in cooperation with the State highway departments, and the forest highway program. The bulk of it is for construction and is turned over to the States as grants. It is really part of the money that comes to the Treasury as the result of the Federal gasoline tax, and taxes on oil, tires, new automobiles, and so forth.

Mr. DONDERO. Well, what is the purpose of the use of this money? Does it go into the general funds of the Government or is it purely for administration?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, no, not at all. It includes an amount for administration, but the bulk of it is for the construction of highways. Only about $12,000,000 of the half billion is for personal services.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason for the question is this: That the committee of which I happen to be a member, the Committee on Public Roads, is getting ready to report a bill to the House for a large sum of money, in fact, nearly a billion and a half dollars, for that very purpose. That is the reason I am asking whether this amount is to supplement that in any way.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, if the gentleman's legislative committee reports out a bill with authority for expenditure of a billion and a half dollars in it, there is not too much that the Committee on Appropriations can do. The members of the Committee on Appropriations, sitting day after day, listen to the testimony with the realization in our minds that there is nothing much that we can do about it, because the legislative committee reports out a bill spending the money before it is appropriated.

Mr. DONDERO. I think perhaps what the gentleman is saying is that that money is really being appropriated under a bill passed by a previous Congress, for the construction of roads or for the matching of funds with the States.

Mr. ROONEY. Exactly so. There is a very unusual situation with reference to this particular item for the Bureau of Roads. There is not very much that the Appropriations Committee can do, except to write a blank check, because the money is already spent before they come to us for the appropriation.

Now with regard to the Department of State, the total amount recommended in this chapter for that Department is $217,651,297, which is a decrease of $12,426,100 in the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, and a decrease of $82,754,099 below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. The largest reduction is in the item, "Contributions to international organizations," and it amounts to $42,766,611, which is due to a decrease of over $45,000,000 in the amount requested for the International Refugee Organization. The committee has seen fit to reduce the amount requested for the buildings fund of the Department of State, to the extent of $5,000,000, and in the appropriation for international information and educational activities to the extent of $13,300,000.

Included in the State Department part of the chapter is an important item entitled "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico." The committee has recommended an appropriation, and the bill now before you contains language which would expend the sum of $6,065,000 for this activity in the coming fiscal year. This is an increase of $4,030,000 over the current year appropriations and a decrease of $2,550,000 in the budget estimate.

The amount of $1,000,000 is allowed for the item, "Salaries and expenses" and $30,000 for the item, "Rio Grande emergency flood protection."

The amount of $5,035,000 is recommended for construction. One of the principal projects which comes within the jurisdiction of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is the construction of the highly important Falcon Dam. The plans and specifications for this dam have not as yet been completed; and a

reduction of $1,750,000 is made for this construction item. This will provide a total of $2,750,000 toward the cost of construction of the dam, to which must be added an estimated minimum of $4,500,000 balance which will be available from prior year appropriations. There is not any question, I say to the gentleman from Texas, about this reduction interfering in the slightest with the progress of the construction of Falcon Dam, because the amount allowed, $2,750,000 in cash when added to the unexpended balance of $4,500,000 amounts to $7,250,000, is ample to continue the progress toward completion of the plans and specifications and the start of construction of the dam and the letting of the contracts incidental thereto.

I will now refer to the Department of Justice part of the bill wherein the amount recommended is $144,230,000, a decrease of $3,195,800 in the budget estimates but an increase of $11,184,859 over the appropriations for the present fiscal year.

I trust that when you are called upon to vote on any across-the-board cuts that the membership may be called upon to consider you ask yourselves how such meat-ax cuts can be applied to an agency such as the Department of Justice, because included in this appropriation of $144,230,000 are funds for legal activities and general administration of the Attorney General's office, including the Criminal Division, the Tax Division, the Customs Division, the Lands Division, the Claims Division, the Antitrust Division, and the rest of the personnel which make up the Office of the Attorney General, the Federal Bureau of Investigation under J. Edgar Hoover, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Federal prison system, and the Office of Alien Property. In connection with the FBI which I mention may I say that the committee allowed the full amount of the budget estimate for this highly important arm of Government and has no intention of interfering in any respect with the activities of the FBI. Under the terms of this bill, as a matter of fact, there will be seven hundred and some more positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation beginning with the new fiscal year on July 1, than there are at the present time. These include 325 more agents.

The third principal item in the bill is the Department of Commerce, wherein there is a total appropriation recommended of $725,429,000. This is an increase of $49,875,098 over appropriations for the current year and a reduction of $56,990,000 in the budget estimates.

The large increase over the amount allowed by the Congress for the current fiscal year relates to the substantial increases of appropriations for the Bureau of Public Roads and for the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The increase for the Civil Aeronautics Administration amounts to $46,389,098 and for the Bureau of Public Roads it is $24,600,000. These increases are due principally to the necessity of providing funds for the liquidation of contract authorizations previously granted by the Congress. I am not too familiar with the other bills that make up this package appropriation bill but I am fairly familiar with this one, as are the members of my committee. We were really appalled when we learned of all the contract authorizations that are catching up with us and for which we must provide cash appropriations. You cannot fool the public. You cannot take an item of $40,000,000 requested for an agency, give them a million dollars in cash and $39,000,000 in a contract authorization without having to pay out that $39,000,000 in cash at some time. It is bound to catch up with you, and that is the situation with regard to a great deal of this money in the Department of Commerce part of the bill.

I shall conclude my brief general summary of the items in the bill by referring to the last part thereof which provides for the Federal judiciary, wherein the amount recommended, $23,560,156, is an increase of $1,764,465 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year and a reduction of $553,535 in the budget estimates.

It occurs to me that I might point out another matter which catches up with the Committee on Appropriations. That is the matter of mandatory pay increases. I voted for them as did most of the Members here. But let us not talk economy on the one hand and on the other hand vote these pay increases if you do not expect to pay for them because all these pay increases have had to be provided for in this year's bill. I do not recall when we first started debate on this package appropriation bill—it was weeks ago—but I believe the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] mentioned the total amount involved in this package appropriation bill for pay raises granted by this very Congress. My point is: you should not vote for pay raises and not expect to have to pay them.

If there are any questions with regard to any of the items in the bill I shall be glad to answer them to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I notice in this report quite a number of international agencies, many more than we have had in recent years.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not think it is an accurate statement to say "many more than we have had in recent years."

Mr. REES. Maybe not in the last year, but in the last comparatively few years. In any event, there are quite a number of them.

Mr. ROONEY. They are listed on pages 35 and 36 of the report.

Mr. REES. That is correct. What consideration has been given with respect to combining these agencies or discontinuing them? What has the committee done?

Mr. ROONEY. The committee has given no consideration to combining them because it has no power or authority to do so.

Mr. REES. Or recommending anything of that kind.

Mr. ROONEY. It has no compelling authority to do so. As far as cutting down the amount of the share of the United States in these international organizations is concerned, the committee time and time again and once again this year in its report has pointed out that the share being paid by the United States for its participation in them is far too much. We are in the position where we can merely raise some cain about it. We do raise some cain, and if you read the hearings I say to the gentleman from Kansas, you will find that every member of this subcommittee, your colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] joined the gentleman from New York in denouncing some of these international organizations and people in our Department of State for the amount of the share that we have been called upon to pay.

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

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

Mr. FLOOD. May I direct attention to page 35 of the report on the general bill, the first paragraph on that page, which reads as follows:

> The committee again stresses its concern over the large number of organizations to which we are required to contribute. Every effort must be made to reduce the unusually high percentage of contributions which in all too many instances this country is called upon to make. The high percentage of contribution of the United States should be reduced just as quickly as the economic conditions of other member countries make possible their assuming a more equitable share of the cost. The committee will examine carefully the Department's submission of this item next year to determine what accomplishments have been made by the Department in obtaining such reductions.

I might say to the gentleman that the Department itself has concurred with this subcommittee in expressing its concern over the number of these international agencies, and I believe it is the concern and the attitude of the State Department to agree with the chairman and with the attitude I believe, indicated by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that reply satisfactory, may I ask the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. REES. The statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the thing that attracted my attention.

No. 2, with respect to this contract authority, I want to commend the gentleman for his explanation, for his calling our attention to the fact that when Congress once authorizes a project, such as flood control or whatever it is, then it is obligating the Government for the completion of that project. I also want to commend the gentleman for the very fine explanation he has made with respect to this proposed legislation.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank my distinguished friend from Kansas.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and

the Federal Judiciary for the fiscal year 1951, I first want to pay a tribute and commend the efficient work of all members of the subcommittee and also our executive secretary. This committee has labored for several months on what, in my opinion, is a most complex appropriation bill dealing with some of the most important departments of the Government. The Honorable JOHN ROONEY, chairman of the subcommittee, who comes from the State of New York, was unusually considerate of all members of the committee, and I assure you he had the unanimous cooperation of the two members of the minority and the other members of the majority. Especially, I want to commend the Honorable DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; the Honorable PRINCE PRESTON, of Georgia; and the Honorable CLIFF CLEVENGER, of Ohio. Every member of this committee is a world traveler and a majority have visited many of the American foreign posts and many of the installations and physical activities of all of the four departments for which this committee makes appropriations. Mr. Jay Howe, our executive secretary, has done a splendid service in aiding each member of the committee to better understand the bill, and because of his efficiency the work of the membership has been made lighter.

I wish it were possible for each Member of the House to read all four volumes of the hearings in connection with this requested appropriation. It deals with every phase of the State Department and our Foreign Service, which I have always considered should be our first line of defense; all of the sections of the Department of Justice, including that great investigatory division known as the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the gigantic Department of Commerce with its many, many sections of domestic activities plus the foreign and domestic commerce and this year dealing with the Bureau of Public Roads; and finally, our Federal Judiciary. The bill contains the salaries for nearly 96,000 permanent employees and also the salaries for the approximately 150,000 temporary census takers who will start their work this month.

You will find the report for this bill beginning on page 31 of the combined hearings and the break-down of items for all four departments beginning on page 54. You will note that every regular item in the bill shows a decrease under the President's budget request with the exception of the amount allowed for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which is the full budget estimate; and in regard to this item, you will find an explanation in the hearing as to the importance of this agency. I will have more to say about this agency later as we start reading the bill for amendments. Suffice to say, however, that this bill shows a reduction of over $98,000,000 under the budget request, including contract authorizations and nearly $20,000,000 under the appropriations for the present fiscal year.

I feel that in presenting these figures and this bill, this committee has made some contribution to the demand of the public to economize, to approach the time when we can balance the budget and pay something on our public debt. In spite of this statement, I am sure there are items in this bill which could be reduced further, but as is always customary by compromise, we have come to an agreement that this is the best possible figure we can present to the House at this time, and we present it for your consideration and will be glad to discuss any question or amendment which may be asked or offered.

In presenting this bill and in spite of the large decrease made by the committee, I am not unmindful of the fact that the public debt of our Nation now has exceeded $260,000,000,000, that the one-package appropriations bill before you presently gives no hope to balance the budget. I am not unmindful of the fact also that the interest on our public debt has exceeded $5,000,000,000 annually, which is more than it used to cost not so long ago to run the entire Government of the United States, and that it costs $50,000,000 more a year to administer our public debt, and that the figures submitted in the omnibus bill indicate that if the bill would be passed by the House and eventually passed by the Senate and signed by the President, we will still be faced with a deficit for the coming fiscal year of more than $5,000,000,000.

I recommend the membership's attention to page 6 of the hearings which are in your possession and look at the figures headed "Recommended in bill." These totals indicate that while your full committee has reduced the President's budget request by $1,385,000,000, the expense of running all phases of Government during the next fiscal year will still be more than $41,000,000,000, with no prospect of balancing the budget or payon the public debt. Therefore, I hope that as each chapter of this bill is presented to the House, the membership will continue its attendance in the debates, and also when the bill is read for amendment; so if there is a possibility of further reductions without injuring the necessary functions of Government, some additional savings can be made. I tell you this because the revenues for our Government for the fiscal year 1951 are estimated at only $37,305,586,034, compared with over $40,000,000,000 expenditures. While this income estimate was made in late autumn and our committee has been advised that the agencies which make these estimates will not be able to make a closer one at present, I feel the estimates are rather high if the reports of some of the income tax collectors in my part of the country prove accurate. These predictions indicate that the income tax return in the agricultural part of our country will be much lower than they were a year ago. So the budget, as it was presented to us originally, contemplated a net deficit of $5,133,171,372. This gives you some idea why it is necessary for the membership to study this entire bill and why it is necessary to make additional reductions wherever possible.

The chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], has gone into the figures on our section of the bill at great length, and in order to save time, I will not go into them except when questions are asked and during the time permitted under the 5-minute rule. I will eliminate my usual discussion of each item in order to give other Members of the House an opportunity to speak on the bill because the time is limited to 2 hours divided between the chairman and myself as ranking minority member; so I shall yield as much of the 1 hour of time allotted to me to other Members because I know there are many items in the bill in which they are interested, and upon which they want to speak.

However, there have been several questions asked and I am prepared to answer them at this time. The first question was asked me a little while ago as to the authority for a statement I made in connection with criminal aliens who are presently in the United States. You will find most of that information documented in our hearings and the statement I made came from the documented hearing.

When the Immigration Service was before the committee, the item of deportable aliens was a matter of much discussion. During the fiscal year, it was stated that 2,000 aliens were deported, and it is estimated that the same number will be deported during the next fiscal year. The number of deportable aliens required to be deported during the present fiscal year was a little over 276,000 required to depart this year, and it is estimated 300,000 will be required to depart next year.

The committee was told that there are 3,000,000 to 3,500,000 aliens in the United States legally.

In the testimony, the matter of aliens who are in the United States from iron-curtain countries came up in the questioning of witnesses and it was stated by the Commissioner of Immigration that among those aliens who have been sentenced to be deported are 3,500 to 4,000 who must some time go back to the iron-curtain countries. These were sentenced to go back mostly to Poland, Russia, some to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the Baltic States. The immigration people told the committee that they cannot deport these iron-curtain-country aliens because they cannot get a travel order to get them into the iron-curtain country; so they are left in the United States and are mixed with our citizens. There is not a careful check made of them; and among the 3,500, there are approximately 100 who are classed as subversive and members of the Communist Party. It is stated that the Immigration Section has no way of sending them back without travel documents and no steamship company will accept them as passengers if they cannot land them. So the United States is confronted with at least 100 of these subversives and Communist aliens who are either out on bond or parole and are allowed to roam the United States as they wish.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Why are these people who are Communists allowed to be out on

bail? That hardly sounds like good practice on the part of the Government.

Mr. STEFAN. I was going to say that it was stated by Mr. Miller, the Immigration Commissioner, that many of these hundred alien Communists and subversives seem to be well fixed with money and he knows of no way of getting rid of them. However, there is some legislation before the House that is designed to correct this situation. This would authorize the Immigration Commissioner to keep these people under surveillance or detain them. At the present time, the Immigration people do not know where all of them are located.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that testimony was given to his committee to the effect that these aliens are buying their way?

Mr. STEFAN. I do not know anything about that. These 100 aliens who have been found guilty of some criminal act come from behind the iron curtain and are Communists and subversives. They are out on bond or parole and because a travel order cannot be obtained for them, they cannot land in the iron-curtain countries, and they are traveling over our country at will. What I meant by "well supplied with money" was that testimony was given to us by the Commissioner of Immigration indicating that they appeared to be well supplied with money. Where all of them are, we do not know, but they are running all over the United States.

You will recall when this bill was brought up I took the floor and gave you detailed information as to other sources of entry by subversives and aliens who are in our country presently illegally.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure the gentleman from Nebraska read the speech made in Chicago last Friday by Gen. Omar Bradley when he said, in speaking of undercover agents in our country, "Never before has our country been threatened so much from within."

Mr. STEFAN. It was for that reason I took the floor the other day and went into detail, giving documented evidence as to the entry of these aliens into our country, who are running around the country without surveillance at the present time.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES. I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska for bringing us the information that he did some days ago with respect to this alarming problem. He has called our attention to the fact that we do have thousands of alien Communists in this country, that we do not even know presently where they are. As I understand it, our officers would have difficulty in even attempting to try to locate them.

Mr. STEFAN. It was for that reason, I may say, that this committee strengthened the arm of the FBI, which is our only method of keeping in contact with those people.

Mr. REES. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman wanted to know something about the international organizations?

Mr. REES. Will the gentleman explain that, please?

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the hearings on appropriations for the Department of State will disclose the fact that our participation in various international organizations are growing by leaps and bounds and it is absolutely necessary to eliminate some duplication and cut down the number of these organizations for the sake of economy. The budget officers for the Department of State who come before our committee each year indicate that they are practically powerless to cut down appropriations for these activities because the organizations are set up through authorizations or treaties, and your committee finds it rather difficult to make any reductions in appropriations because of the commitments made before the appropriations are requested.

During the fiscal year 1949, the United States participated in 47 organizations involving a total outlay of $144,629,262. Of this amount, over $128,000,000 represented actual contributions to the permanent and temporary organizations; over $3,000,000 represented the cost of the United States missions at the seat of international organizations and the cost of the United States participation in meetings of international organizations; more than $1,000,000 was expended for entertainment or representation at occasional meetings of miscellaneous international groups and special assignments; over $11,000,000 represented an advance to the United Nations toward a $65,000,000 loan.

During that same fiscal year, the United States participated in approximately 258 conferences involving some 6,000 meetings. Of this number, 52 were concerned with the United Nations, 105 with specialized agencies, 13 with the Inter-American Organization, 14 with other international organizations, and 11 with temporary organizations. In addition, there were 63 miscellaneous conferences. Of the 6,000 meetings attended by representatives of this Government, more than 3,000 grew out of conferences of the United Nations and the specialized agencies built in New York, Geneva, Paris, London, Montreal, Shanghai, and other places throughout the world. These proceedings involved 8,000 official documents with operations conducted in five authorized languages.

The United States is paying the biggest percentage of cost for activities of these various international organizations, and instead of increasing our cost, some study should be made toward a further reduction. It has been found that the assessed United States percentage share in the international organizations has been considerable and range from about 2 percent in some cases to approximately 70 percent in other cases, and that if the total amount of the United States dollar contributions to the 45 organizations to which it contributed during 1949 is equated with the total amount of assessments against all members of the organizations, the United States' contribution percentage amounts to over 47 percent. The United States contribution percentage in the case of the International Childrens Emergency Fund amounts to 72 percent of the total; in case of IRO, 45 percent; in case of United Nations Relief for Palestine Arab Refugees, our percentage was 54 percent; and when you take the three together, it is found the United States' percentage amounted to 50.77 percent. Furthermore, the United States' contributions to these three programs in combination amounted to about 80 percent of the dollar cost of our contributions to all international organizations during fiscal year 1949, although our assessments to the 10 Inter-American organizations to which the United States contributed are at a higher figure of over 65 percent.

I call your attention to Report No. 1275 entitled "The United States Relations with International Organizations," which is a report of the Committe on Expenditures in the Executive Departments pursuant to Public Law 609 in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I recommend close reading of the report because it indicates to me that we should hesitate in passing any new legislation to increase our percentage cost to international organizations, and we should go rather slow in increasing the number of organizations instead of combining present ones with necessary new ones in order to effect some economy and also some efficiency.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES. I will say to the gentleman that I would deeply appreciate having a copy of that document. May I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. REES. The gentleman just referred to the amount of the expenditure for representations. I would appreciate having that figure once more.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, we will go into item after item when we read the bill for amendment. It is approximately $1,300,000, and it is scattered throughout the bill.

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman care to comment about that? Does he not think it is a little too high?

Mr. STEFAN. Our committee cut it down some. I hope the gentleman will be satisfied with reductions we have made.

Mr. REES. I am afraid I will not be quite satisfied. Somewhere along the line there will be an amendment offered to reduce it further.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I take advantage of this opportunity to pay my respects to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I wish to pay him a compliment he deserves and which he will modestly, I hope, accept, that the committee and the House are very fortunate in having him to represent them, a man who understands and can speak different lan-

guages. Those who talk in whispers on the outside at his hearings do not get by old KARL.

We understand each other in four different languages, principally when he talks in English, when as always he forcefully represents a farm district as do I. To it and to its welfare he has devoted his entire career in the House in an effort to help the farmers of the Nation, particularly those of his Nebraska district and their wives and children. Such service as he has so faithfully rendered is not too often the payoff for those who support such a man as KARL STEFAN is, as in his case. I believe he has done more for the farmers of Nebraska and his district than could have been done by anybody else.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for his compliment and deeply appreciate it.

There is one item in this bill that I think will be scattered throughout the entire omnibus bill carrying appropriations for the Government for the fiscal year 1951, and that is the matter of annual leave which is bothering so many Government employees and Members of the House.

Some time ago I made a statement regarding the alarming growth in the accumulation of annual leave and sick leave among Federal employees. I do not advocate a decrease in the number of leave days allowed to Government employees. I merely call your attention to the fact that something will have to be done about paying up this annual leave in order that we can start each fiscal year at a more reasonable basis and eliminate the tremendous accumulation.

In the bill we present to you today making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal judiciary there have been accumulated 7,356,968 days of annual leave and sick leave, and the cost of that when reckoned in dollars is around $116,814,804. This is in these four departments alone, and I predict that if all of the annual leave and sick leave of all the other departments of Government were totaled today, it would run into many more millions of days and the total cost will run to more than $1,000,000,000.

Federal employees are allowed 15 days sick leave every year, but in this case they are not paid for sick leave but must take it or eventually lose it. But in the matter of annual leave, it is accumulated and represents cash outlay. Employees are allowed 26 days a year annual leave. In these four departments, the accumulated annual leave represents 3,573,163 days, and this represents approximately $60,000,000 which the Government owes these employees today. The accumulated sick leave in the four departments amounts to 3,783,805 days and also represents approximately $60,000,000. If the committees who come before you with other appropriation bills for other departments have secured a break-down on accumulated leave and the cost of liquidation, we would be able to get an accurate figure of the tremendous amount of sick leave and annual leave and the tremendous amount of money represented in the cost of such liquidation. I feel the problem is important enough to call your attention to it.

The accumulated leave in the four departments in this bill is divided as follows:

	Accumulated annual leave	Accumulated sick leave	Cost of liquidation
	Days	*Days*	
Justice Department	992,160	1,222,520	$15,428,088 19,010,186
Commerce Department	1,380,661	1,617,966	25,249,859 30,016,765
State Department	1,127,945	848,197	13,947,293 10,104,887
Federal judiciary	72,397	95,122	1,291,607 1,766,119
Total	3,573,163	3,783,805	116,814,804

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. In speaking of accumulated leave the gentleman referred to it as "days of leave." I believe, however, that it is generally thought of not as days of leave, but as accumulated in cash and that the time which accumulated during the employment of a Federal employee at a lower rate of pay is paid for in the higher rate of pay at the time the employee finally takes his leave, which makes quite a difference.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about that. I have got this down to days and to cash also. I have this down to 3,573,163 days of annual leave and 3,783,805 days of sick leave. I have got it down to cash of over $116,000,000 in these four departments alone.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. But the point I am making and the real question is that in effect the employee has, intentionally or unintentionally, actually raised his own salary without action of the Congress or of his superiors when he takes the leave at the higher rate of pay which he gets at the end of the time.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 8, noes 36.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count on the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that a quorum is not present. [After counting.] Sixty-nine members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 134]

Allen, Calif.	Barrett, Pa.	Bentsen
Allen, La.	Battle	Blackney
Barden	Bennett, Fla.	Boykin
Buckley, N. Y.	Hill	Powell
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Quinn
Burdick	Hope	Ramsay
Byrne, N. Y.	Irving	Rivers
Carroll	Johnson	Rogers, Mass.
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, N. C.	Roosevelt
Cavalcante	Kelly, N. Y.	Sabath
Celler	Keogh	Sadowski
Chelf	Kilday	Sasscer
Cole, Kan.	Klein	Scott, Hugh, D., Jr.
Colmer	Kunkel	Shelley
Cooley	Lichtenwalter	Sheppard
Crosser	McConnell	Short
Davenport	McKinnon	Simpson, Pa.
Davies, N. Y.	McMillen, Ill.	Smathers
Dawson	Macy	Smith, Kan.
DeGraffenried	Mansfield	Smith, Ohio
Dingell	Miles	Stanley
Douglas	Miller, Md.	Steed
Doyle	Monroney	Tauriello
Fellows	Morrison	Thompson
Fogarty	Moulder	Tollefson
Gamble	Multer	Towe
Gilmer	Murphy	Underwood
Gorski	Murray, Wis.	Velde
Granger	Nelson	Walter
Grant	Nixon	Whitaker
Green	Norton	White, Idaho
Gwinn	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Harris	O'Hara, Ill.	Wilson, Ind.
Harrison	O'Neill	Withrow
Hart	Pace	Wood
Havenner	Patten	Woodhouse
Hébert	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	
Heffernan	Phillips, Calif.	
Herter		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 317 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, among the other items in this bill there is the item for the tentative Federal airport extension program for the fiscal year 1951. It will be recalled that last year when we brought this bill up for consideration many of you asked the membership of this committee where the airport money is to be allocated in your various districts. This year we again have funds requested for continuing the Federal airport program. There is an airport program in every one of your States and perhaps your districts. A list of the airports to be improved are contained in a volume which the committee has for your information at this time. It shows the name of every State and community and if any of you are interested in it you may look it over.

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

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

Mr. BROOKS. May I ask the gentleman if he intends to put that list in the RECORD?

Mr. STEFAN. No, it is too voluminous. I suggest that the gentleman take it and look it over because it is here and it is set up by States and by communities, also it shows the amount of the tentative local contribution and the Federal contribution. I am sure every Member of the House will be interested in looking it over in order to inform his community as to what the tentative program is for the

next fiscal year, 1951, so far as Federal airports are concerned.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. This list of airports was released to the press some weeks ago, was it not?

Mr. STEFAN. I understand so, yes.

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

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. There has been considerable discussion with reference to the employees abroad. I do not recall the number of employees we have abroad for these various agencies but I am sure there are several thousand. In any event, can the gentleman give us that figure and will he tell us whether or not in his judgment these employees are reasonably well paid? Also tell us something about the allowances that are given to these employees in addition to their salaries.

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Kansas, let me say that I intended to take up that subject when we have the bill up for amendment under the 5-minute rule, but I may as well discuss it now as a reply to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the many features of the proposed appropriation to provide funds to cover the expenditures of various branches of our Government for the fiscal year 1951, I believe it would be of interest to the Members of the Congress to invite special attention to the cost of maintaining our Foreign Service which is charged with the duties of carrying on our negotiations with foreign governments in all their political and economic aspects.

It is frequently stated in the press, by commentators and even by some Members of Congress, that the inadequate compensation of members of our diplomatic service makes it necessary for many of them in key posts to possess private fortunes to enable them to serve our Government, or that the compensation offered does not attract persons of the highest caliber for rendering good service in protecting our interests in foreign affairs.

It is believed that a comparison of the total compensation received by members of our Foreign Service will disclose that members of no other branch of our Government services is as highly paid as members of the Foreign Service, and that the Congress has been most liberal in agreeing to requests for the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Let us examine the annual amounts being paid to the members of our Foreign Service at the present time in order that the Members of Congress and other interested persons may compare them with the annual compensation and other benefits received by other employees of our Government.

I am told that a Foreign Service officer of class 1—not chief of mission, who is paid much more in most instances—at one of the most important posts, receives a salary of from $12,000 to $13,500 annually. In addition, if he has a family, he receives allowances of $3,500 annually for quarters, and a post allowance of from $1,980 to $2,040. A total of about $19,000 annually, of which $5,500 is free of United States income tax. He is given a liberal allowance for entertainment that in most cases fully covers all out-of-pocket expenses for any entertainment essential to his position. It must be remembered that the principal items of entertainment in foreign countries are beverages, which our officers obtain without taxes or import duties, enabling them to obtain a bottle of alcoholic beverage at about one-fourth the cost to others who do not enjoy diplomatic privileges. This same ratio of costs applies to cigarettes, gasoline, and other items purchased through tax-free privileges. Moreover, they have the privilege of purchasing many staple foods through Government commissaries; none of these privileges are enjoyed by other of our Government employees.

This same officer, with his family and household furniture and effects, is transported to his post at Government expense, and he is allowed a liberal per diem for himself and family to cover hotel expenses up to 30 days after arrival at his post. He is permitted to return to the United States with his family at Government expense every 2 years for 2 months' home leave, which accrues during his 2 years at his post. He also is permitted to take the usual annual leave or what is termed "post leave" while at his post, so that he is granted twice the amount of annual leave as other Government employees.

Hospital and medical services are provided to the officer and members of his family at Government expense.

Payments received for quarters and post allowances are exempt from United States income taxes.

If this officer is transferred to a post where the climate is the extreme "either hot or cold" from his previous assignment, he is paid a fixed amount for the purchase of clothing suitable for the exigencies of the climate. If he is transferred to a country whose currency based on the gold standard, is at a premium, as compared with United States currency, this differential amounting to as much in some countries as 60 percent, is added to his salary and allowances.

If he is assigned to what is classified as a hardship or unhealthy post, a further special allowance is granted.

So it will be observed that when the sum total of compensation, allowances, and the various benefits and privileges granted to members of our Foreign Service are taken into full consideration, it cannot be charged that the Congress has not been extremely liberal in making funds available for the Service, but on the other hand, employees in other branches of our Government service may, with justification, charge us with discriminatory treatment. Moreover, few persons with equal experience and qualifications employed in industry are so well paid.

However, the apparently excessive cost of our Foreign Service might be justified if the taxpayers were receiving full value in services rendered rather than have the prestige of our great Nation impaired vis-à-vis other powers as has been the case during the past several years, as a result of some obvious inefficient and ineffective plans and policies devised and executed by our Foreign Service.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when I addressed the Committee of the Whole a while ago and commended my fellow Members of this subcommittee, I failed to mention in that commendation a very, very important individual, a very, very important man insofar as the arduous work of this subcommittee is concerned. He is the executive secretary of the subcommittee, Mr. Jay Howe, who is here sitting at my right. Were it not for the long and splendid work of Mr. Howe we would never have been able to get together the committee report which is now before you. We are indeed indebted to him.

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

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, inadvertently neglected to mention our executive secretary, Mr. Howe, and I want to join the chairman and other members of the committee in paying tribute and my gratitude for the excellent and most efficient work rendered to our committee by Mr. Howe, our executive secretary.

Mr. ROONEY. I know that that expresses the thoughts of all members of this subcommittee.

A while ago the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] made a statement about subversive aliens who were loose in this country without any information on the part of the Immigration and Naturalization Service as to their present whereabouts. In that connection, I wish to read into the RECORD the testimony in regard thereto given by Mr. Watson Miller, the capable Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and by Mr. W. F. Kelly, assistant commissioner. This testimony is to be found beginning on page 298 of the committee hearings dealing with the Department of Justice:

Mr. STEFAN. Now, Mr. Commissioner, as regards to deportation of aliens, those to be deported back to their place of origin, those originated in countries behind the iron curtain?

Mr. MILLER. We almost universally fail to get travel documents from their respective countries.

Mr. STEFAN. How many do you have in the United States you cannot deport because they cannot have any place to go?

Mr. KELLY. I think we have between 3,500 and 4,000 total.

Mr. STEFAN. What country are they sentenced to be deported to?

Mr. KELLY. Well, the iron-curtain countries, Poland. The majority of cases are Russian cases.

Mr. STEFAN. Russia, Poland.

Mr. KELLY. Czechoslovakia, the Baltic states, Hungary, Poland, and so forth.

Mr. STEFAN. And you do not deport them because they cannot get a travel order to get into those countries, is that right?

Mr. KELLY. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. They are left here on bond?

Mr. KELLY. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Are they mixed up with our citizens?

Mr. KELLY. They are at large.

Mr. STEFAN. You do not know where they are, do you?

Mr. KELLY. Well, we do our best to keep them located.

Mr. STEFAN. What were they charged with?

Mr. KELLY. I think approximately a hundred cases were deportable under the act of 1918 as amended.

Mr. STEFAN. What is that?

Mr. KELLY. Former membership in proscribed organizations, subversive activities.

Mr. STEFAN. Communists and people with surversive ideas who believe in overthrowing government by force and violence, and you have no check on them, and they are scattered in society in the United States, is that true?

Mr. KELLY. We have them all under bond.

Mr. STEFAN. They are loose under bond?

Mr. KELLY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. How many?

Mr. KELLY. Approximately 100 in the group, and I cannot give you the breakdown as to causes of deportation as to the remainder, but many of these are criminals.

Mr. STEFAN. Here we have 3,500 aliens who have been sentenced to be deported back to where they came from, 100 of whom are people with subversive ideas. Why can you not send them back to Russia?

Mr. KELLY. We have no way of getting them back without travel documents, no steamship company will accept them as passengers if they cannot land them.

Mr. STEFAN. So we are helpless here in the United States and they are running at large. They believe in overthrowing our Government by force and violence.

Mr. MILLER. There are other types, like those hundred or more Hungarians that seem to be well fixed with money and that sort of thing. There is no way that I know of of getting rid of them.

Mr. KELLY. There is legislation before the House that is designed to correct them.

Mr. STEFAN. What does that do?

Mr. KELLY. It would authorize us to keep them under surveillance or detain them.

Mr. STEFAN. You do not know where these 3,500 people are, do you?

Mr. KELLY. Not all of them.

Mr. STEFAN. They are scattered all over the United States, are they not?

Mr. KELLY. As to those who have complied with the alien registration law, we do have a record on them and I suppose we have a record on a substantial number; as to the subversives we have a record on each one of them.

There will then be found, beginning at page 300 of the hearings on the Department of Justice appropriations for 1951, a list containing the file number, name, country ordered deported to, amount of bond, and address of each of these aliens of the so-called subversive classes under orders of deportation unenforceable due to inability to procure travel documents.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman perchance know the status of the so-called remedial legislation? What committee has jurisdiction of it?

Mr. ROONEY. I would assume it would be the Committee on the Judiciary. As to the exact present status of the legislation mentioned by Mr. Kelly in his testimony I cannot report at this moment.

It might be well at this point to call to the attention of the members of the legislative committee that the hands of the Immigration and Naturalization Service are tied unless they have some such legislation. I do not believe these subversives should be permitted to roam around the country, even though under bond.

Mr. CANFIELD. I agree, and I commend the gentleman and his committee on bringing out these facts.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it should be emphasized that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is not to blame.

Mr. ROONEY. They are not to blame. That is the point I make. You cannot hold them responsible if they do not have the jurisdiction or the funds, and have no legal right to hold these people.

Mr. McCORMACK. If additional legislation is necessary, that is the responsibility of the Congress.

Mr. ROONEY. It most certainly is.

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

The chairman of our subcommittee read the statistics a little while ago and referred to a table in the hearings in which he stated the Immigration Service had the address of those who are out on bond. If the gentleman will read further, he will find they are not all on bond, and that the hearings and table would indicate that some of them are on parole.

Mr. ROONEY. The table will indicate the exact situation with regard to each of these people by name.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, you have just heard from the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member about the concern we have had with the subversive and dangerous people whom we can do nothing with, even after we have convicted them. The five men on this subcommittee have certainly been assiduously applying themselves to routing out so far as lies in their power from the State and Commerce Departments these subversive people. Many of you may have lost sight of the fact that it was this subcommittee a couple of years ago which kicked some of these people out of the brush where the Committee on Un-American Activities could get action on them. There has been no partisanship in this committee in going after these subversive people.

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

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there any evidence or testimony before the gentleman's committee with respect to the number of people who were separated from the service in the Department of State who had later acquired positions in other departments of Government? I refer to those whose employment was considered a security risk. Was anything said before your committee on that subject?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I will say to the gentleman, I brought that question up a year ago, as to whether the other departments would be alerted so that they might not hire these—we can name them now—these homosexuals. Until the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Peurifoy, made that word public over in the other body, we had insufficient information so far as the committee was concerned and could not tell you. In reply to my question we were informed they were not, and unofficially we were told, or at least I was told, that they have been employed in other sections of the Government, at least most of them were.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason I asked that question is that I made inquiry by letter to find out where these people went and whether they are now employed by our Government and I have not yet received a reply giving me any information on the subject.

Mr. CLEVENGER. If the gentleman will look at the report he will find some information on that subject.

I am going to address myself now to conditions we have discovered in the Department of Commerce. When I asked the security officer if he would flag them, he said he would. I told him I was very much afraid he could not, because of an Executive order which was issued restricting the information being given on these people.

The air is full of stories. The press is full of stories. I am not passing on that.

In discussing the constitutionality of the so-called loyalty program, John Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, had occasion to cite a decision of the circuit court of appeals rendered on August 11, 1949, involving the Joint Anti-Fascist Committee. A portion of that decision is worthy of repetition here:

> Contrary to the contentions of the committee, nothing in the Hatch Act or the loyalty program deprives the committee or its members of any property rights. Freedom of speech and assembly is denied no one. Freedom of though and belief is not impaired. Anyone is free to join the committee and give it his support and encouragement. Everyone has the constitutional right to do these things, but no one has a constitutional right to be a Government employee.

For emphasis permit me to repeat the last phrase, "but no one has a constitutional right to be a Government employee."

It seems to me that the crux of our entire security program lies in that phrase. It is indeed a privilege and certainly not a right to work for the Government and it is time we cleared the air on the misconceptions of a good many well-intentioned people who have been misled by the propaganda of the Communist and the fellow traveler into the belief that the burden of "proof of qualification" lies on the employer in this case, the Government, rather than on the employee. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Government has the right, nay the obligation, to set up standards for performance of duty not only for prospective employees but for those already on the rolls. This sacred obligation to the taxpayer implies the summary removal of any employee who does not measure up to these standards, the wails and crocodile tears of the fuzzy-minded to the contrary

notwithstanding. It is tragically true that our present administration has been sadly lacking in the courage or capacity necessary to carry out these obligations but this does not excuse, or in no way alter or mitigate these obligations.

We have heard a great deal in recent weeks concerning the security risks within the Department of State and I would like to say that while I am not familiar with the charges being bandied about I think the basic issue has been somewhat obscured in the unfortunate partisanship that has developed in this inquiry that is of prime importance to every American, Republican or Democrat.

The sob sisters and thumb-sucking liberals are crying for proof of disloyalty in the form of overt acts, on any security risks who are being removed from the Government rolls, but shed no tears for the lives lost as a result of the activities of the Hiss', Coplon's, and the Wadleigh's, all of whom would or did pass the loyalty standards with flying colors.

I wish the American people would keep in mind the fact that a security risk does not have to be a member of the Communist Party or even of a Communist-front organization. It is not only conceivable but highly probable that many security risks are loyal Americans; however, there is something in their background that represents a potential possibility that they might succumb to conflicting emotions to the detriment of the national security. Perhaps they have relatives behind the iron curtain and thus would be subject to pressure. Perhaps they are addicted to an overindulgence in alcohol or maybe they are just plain garrulous. The most flagrant example is the homosexual who is subject to the most effective blackmail. It is an established fact that Russia makes a practice of keeping a list of sex perverts in enemy countries and the core of Hitler's espionage was based on the intimidation of these unfortunate people.

Despite this fact however, the Under Secretary of State recently testified that 91 sex perverts had been located and fired from the Department of State. For this the Department must be commended. But have they gone far enough? Newspaper accounts quote Senate testimony indicating there are 400 more in the State Department and 4,000 in Government. Where are they? Who hired them? Do we have a cell of these perverts hiding around Government? Why are they not ferreted out and dismissed? Does the Department of State have access to information in the files of the Washington Police Department? Are we to assume that the State Department has a monopoly on this problem? What are the other Departments of Government doing about this?

For years we had a public prejudice against mentioning in public such loathsome diseases as gonorrhea and cancer. In effecting cures for these maladies the medical people recognized the first step was in public education. These matters were brought before the public and frankly discussed and it was not until then that progress was really made. It is time to bring this homosexual problem into the open and recognize the problem for what it is.

The Commerce Department hearings are somewhat enlightening in regard to the entire security problem and I would suggest that interested Members read them in detail beginning on page 2260.

Here we find that the Commerce Department has not located any homosexuals in their organization. Are we to believe that in the face of the testimony of the District of Columbia police that 75 percent of the 4,000 perverts in the District of Columbia are employed by the Government, that the Department of Commerce has none?

What is wrong with this loyalty program that does not uncover these matters, and when it does, adopts an attitude of looking for proof of disloyalty in the form of overt acts rather than elements of security risk? Is it not possible for the Government to refuse employment on the grounds of lack of qualifications where risk is apparent? This is not necessarily an indictment or conviction; it is merely the exercise of caution for the common welfare.

Our Commerce hearings detail one case in the Bureau of Standards where the chief of an important group was not cleared for 15 months and was in the ridiculous position of being denied access to certain areas, where classified work was being performed, while at the same time his subordinate employees enjoyed full access. I do not know the reason for the 15-month delay and what security risks were involved, but I do know that if serious matters of this type are not more quickly resolved, I for one, lack confidence in this system.

Note further, in these hearings that 369 loyalty investigations acquitted 273 but despite this action of the Loyalty Board the Commerce Department still considers 26 of these individuals to be security risks and must keep them under some kind of surveillance to insure that they will not yield to their temptations and turn over State secrets to emissaries of the Communist horde. This is a horrible example of the inability of the administration to deal with probably our most pressing problem.

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

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wish to repeat a statement made in Chicago last Friday by Gen. Omar Bradley. He said: "Never before has our country been threatened so much from within"; and he was speaking then of the under-cover spies in our country.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I agree with the gentleman's statement.

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

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentleman called attention to the fact that there is included in this bill insofar as the Department of Commerce is concerned a rider which would permit the Secretary of Commerce to summarily dismiss anyone who might be connected with subversive activity?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I just mentioned that.

Mr. ROONEY. And will the gentleman kindly explain to the House that this rider is legislation on an appropriation bill, that it is subject to a point of order, but that the Committee unanimously hopes that no Member of this House will rise as the bill is being read for amendment to make a point of order against it.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I agree with my Chairman; and I should dislike to be the individual who had the temerity to move to strike it out of this bill.

In this bill we are providing almost $15,000,000,000 for national defense yet we lack the capacity to separate from the service individuals whose combined machinations could well negate this entire expenditure.

I am happy to say that our committee has, in this bill, provided the means for the Department of Commerce to terminate these security risks without further ado, embarrassment, or red tape and if this provision is adopted by the House, I hope to see some forthright action in this regard.

I could perhaps do more than read to the House one portion of the testimony of Mr. Gladieux, of the Department of Commerce, to illustrate the lack of competence of the loyalty review system—page 2243:

> The investigation has been completed and the adjudication of the case has been completed in varying terms; some only a month ago and some perhaps as long as 2 years ago. But they have been completed and for loyalty purposes the employees in question have been adjudged not disloyal. But we, in our own discretion in the Department of Commerce, have determined that notwithstanding the clearance as to loyalty, they are security risks.
>
> I might say that we are probably on very dubious grounds in this whole security business. It has bothered a lot of us because we have no authority to designate someone as a security risk. For example, when the Loyalty Review Board clears an individual on appeal and does not find reasonable grounds for believing he is disloyal—in some cases we then say, "All right, we have to accept that position as to loyalty, but in our own discretion we are going to designate the employee as a security risk even so." We have no authority to do that and I always feared that it could be challenged successfully. This unclear situation does lead us into all kinds of complications when it comes to reductions in force, transferring people off security work, and other personnel actions.

Quotations of this type are scattered throughout the testimony indicating the lack of confidence that is prevalent in the efficiency of the loyalty system.

It sometimes appears to me that in our zeal to protect the rights of the individual we neglect the welfare of the Nation. No individual is bigger than our broad objectives. I am not suggesting a lessening of individuals' rights but I am suggesting that history has shown that great nations lost their freedom by an unrealistic interpretation of the rights of those who achieved their ends by an abuse of privilege and thereafter destroyed the rights that permitted them to achieve their nefarious ends. Let us not overemphasize tolerance.

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

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am pleased to note that the committee is going to put a rider on this bill similar to the McCarran amendment. I think it should be put on some of the other bills.

A few weeks ago I spoke on the subject of homosexuality. Within the last 10 days a gentleman from CIA told me that Mr. Goering of Germany and others had a complete list of all the homosexuals in the State Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Defense and that they knew who to contact when they came over here on espionage missions. The danger of spies, the danger of blackmail, their fear of blackmail, has caused those people to sabotage our Government. It was an interesting angle to me. I do know from very extensive reading the last few weeks that the Russians rather glory in the accomplishments resulting from homosexuality and they undoubtedly have the same list of homosexuals who were in key positions in Government in this country, so they knew who to contact when they came here. They are like birds of a feather, they flock together. I hope that the amendment will stay in and I think a similar amendment should be in all the bills that deal with these sensitive Government positions. As a physician I recognize that some of these people are more to be pitied than censored. They are pathological cases, like the kleptomaniac or the pyromaniac, but certainly they have no business being in sensitive positions of the Government where foreign agents seeking out our secrets can contact them and use them as a weapon to destroy our form of Government.

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

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] who just spoke, realizes that this rider is already in the bill now before the House and is to be found at page 84, section 305. It reads as follows:

SEC. 305. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I knew the amendment was in there and I hope the Secretary makes full use of it. I think he should. I think the same amendment ought to be in other bills that come before this Congress.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps some Members may have wondered sometimes when I have voted in the negative so far as expenditure bills are concerned; however, it has gotten to the point with me that I am against anything that we can do without but which, if agreed to, will add to the deficit that faces our country. I do want to say, though, that for 3 years this subcommittee has restored various cuts of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We have restored to that agency cuts made by the Bureau of the Budget and have given it the full request. I believe with all my heart that the greatest national defense this country has in this hour is the Federal Bureau of Investigation that can lay its hands on thousands of these dangerous people on a moment's notice.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the particular attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and to the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] that in the testimony of Mr. Boykin, of the Department of State, at page 672 of the committee hearings, part 1, Department of State appropriation for 1951, eleventh line from the bottom of the page, there is this answer:

Mr. BOYKIN. Yes, sir.

As a matter of fact, that answer of Mr. Boykin was "No, sir." This is a typographical error, is that not so, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], I will say that the answer should have been printed "No, sir." The error was typographical.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had more time in which to get together all of the things I think about to talk about a lot of things that have been discussed the last few days. Fortunately for myself, but probably unfortunately for those who served under me or lived with me, for 14 years while I was president of a university. In that group we had homosexuals, but we did not advertise the fact. We did not make it known to the world at large that there were such extroverts and such people as would divert and so divorce themselves from natural laws as to indulge in these unnatural practices to which allusion has been made. I regret very much that it has become so common to discuss to attract the attention of those of high senses, not intellectuals, but of ordinary capacity to the end that they are induced to know what all is going on among those who divert their attention to the base passions of human nature about which the less said the better. It all sets down to the impossibility of changing human nature, which is not a matter to be accomplished by legislation, if ever.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about the manner in which the members of this subcommittee worked during the months, day and night, that we spent in listening to the testimony that produced about 3,000 pages of records of these three great departments of this Government, the State Department, the Justice Department and the Federal Judiciary, and the Department of Commerce. Of course, the record for appropriations for the judiciary itself is largely appropriating money pro forma because of the action of the various legislative committees. There is not a great deal except in detail that this committee can do as far as our jurisdiction goes.

I should like to make this observation as the result of one I made a year ago when this bill was before the House. Many of my colleagues on the subcommittees and the legislative committees concurred with me. We noticed this year that the department heads and the bureau chiefs have finally taken our instructions and have not meddled with and have not changed and have not inserted contradictions or entirely different versions in their testimony. As a lawyer, there was nothing that used to offend me more than to see testimony come back from a department head or a bureau chief in such a condition that you would never recognize it. That offends the soul of a trial lawyer. I think that under the insistence of the chairman of this committee and our members we may have finally driven into the heads of the people downtown that when you make a statement before a committee up here you are supposed to leave it alone. "That is what you said, and you do no second guessing and sending us back something else." This year I think I can say that they have pretty generally complied.

I should like to point this out. This subcommittee have labored long and well to cut down, to lower the appropriations set up in budget requests under the jurisdiction of this committee. On both sides of the aisle this subcommittee have been unanimous. They worked together well and they concurred in these things. I think this committee and this House should know how well these able men did this job, and I can speak for them.

I want you to know that there is a reduction in the cash appropriations of $19,997,177 in this subcommittee's bill below the appropriations for these departments for the current fiscal year. In addition, this subcommittee has reduced the budget estimates. We have cut the budget estimates $73,000,000. We are recommending $73,000,000 less than the budget recommended to the Appropriations Committee. That is a milestone in this kind of work. The action of this committee is second to none. These are important Government departments, State, Justice, and Commerce, of great importance. Long and well we have analyzed these requests, and we have cut them. In many cases we may have cut too deeply, perhaps. In other cases perhaps more could have been cut. But the over-all effort of this committee is sound, well reasoned, and to the best interests of the Government and the taxpayers.

It is not the purpose of the members of this subcommittee, as you may have noticed, at this time, to dwell upon the

various subdivisions of this long and important bill. We will devote ourselves, as we understand it, to these matters as they arise for amendment or during the reading of the bill from now on.

There has been a lot of inquiry, I have received a lot of mail about it, and I understand from the secretary of our subcommittee that there seems to be the impression that we have cut the United Nations appropriation. That is not so. Wherever they got that idea I have not the faintest idea. We did not cut the United Nations appropriation. This subcommittee has recommended every penny that has been asked for the United Nations.

There is a small reduction of $36,000 only with reference to the Commissions to International Organizations, but that can be well absorbed. It deals not only with the United Nations Commissions, but with a series of others. Any cuts they may have in mind, and this may be the source of the confusion, are the cuts that have to do with international contingencies. These are appropriations for our delegations to international conferences and to provide for commissions, or are contributions to what may happen in future, in the field of international conferences or delegations.

But we have not cut the appropriation to the United Nations and I would like to cure at this time that error. And I purposefully want to close my remarks with the statement that the employees of the State Department are as loyal, and as hard working and as devoted to the best interest of this Nation and its form of government, as any group of employees in any department in the Federal or any other service. America and the world is fortunate that Dean Acheson is now our Secretary of State and that John Puerifoy, his Deputy Undersecretary of State, is serving in that vital and important capacity. These are patriotic Americans the equal of any man in the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and I ask for tellers on the motion.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. CANFIELD.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 28, noes 49.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-four Members are present; not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 135]

Allen, Calif.	Andresen, August H.	Bates, Ky.
Allen, La.	Barden	Battle
Anderson, Calif.	Barrett, Pa.	Bennett, Fla.
Blackney	Boggs, Del.	Boggs, La.
Bolling	Bosone	Boykin
Breen	Buchanan	Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Burdick	Byrne, N. Y.
Carroll	Case, N. J.	Case, S. Dak.
Cavalcante	Celler	Chelf
Cole, Kans.	Colmer	Cooley
Cox	Crosser	Dague
Davenport	Davies, N. Y.	Dawson
Deane	DeGraffenried	Dingell
Douglas	Doyle	Eaton
Engle, Calif.	Fallon	Fellows
Fernandez	Fisher	Fogarty
Fulton	Gamble	Garmatz
Gillette	Gilmer	Gorski
Granger	Grant	Green
Gwinn	Hall, Leonard W.	Hardy
Harris	Harrison	Hart
Havenner	Hays, Ark.	Hébert
Heffernan	Herter	Heselton
Hill	Hoffman, Ill.	Holifield
Hope	Irving	Jennings
Johnson	Jones, N. C.	Kearns
Kelly, N. Y.	Keogh	Kilday
Klein	Kunkel	Larcade
Lichtenwalter	Linehan	McCarthy
McConnell	McKinnon	McMillen, Ill.
Macy	Mansfield	Miles
Miller, Md.	Mills	Monroney
Morrison	Moulder	Multer
Murphy	Murray, Wis.	Nelson
Nixon	Norton	O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.	O'Neill	Pace
Patten	Powell	Quinn
Rains	Rivers	Rogers, Mass.
Roosevelt	Sabath	Sadowski
Sasscer	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Scudder
Shafer	Shelley	Short
Simpson, Pa.	Smathers	Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio	Stanley	Tauriello
Thomas	Thompson	Tollefson
Towe	Underwood	Velde
Vinson	Walter	Whitaker
White, Idaho	Wickersham	Willis
Wilson, Ind.	Withrow	Wood
Woodhouse		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7786, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 285 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a few observations I would like to make about the chapter of the bill now under consideration. First, however, I would like to say that in the mind of the average Member of Congress who has not had an opportunity to serve on the Committee on Appropriations there might arise some question of doubt about the thoroughness with which the problem is approached. I have heard doubts expressed by various Members about the effectiveness of the Committee on Appropriations when it comes to the proposition of bringing about economy. Before I was privileged to serve on this committee, I entertained some doubt about the efficiency of the committee and also as to how thoroughly the field under the jurisdiction of the respective subcommittees was explored by each committee. Since serving on the committee all doubt has been completely dissipated. For the almost 3 months that this chapter was under consideration the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] subjected witness after witness to the most searching examinations in an effort to bring forth the truth about the departments being interrogated. Time and again he elicited information most valuable in nature which enabled us to apply effective cuts. I stand here today completely convinced as one who believes in economy that this bill has been intelligently cut to the bone by the subcommittee and any further reductions would endanger the effective operations of the departments under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee.

I would like to make some comment about the Department of State. The Department of State has been made the whipping boy of the Congress for many years and no doubt will in the future because it deals with foreign countries. It is constantly involved in international difficulties. It takes positions sometimes not consistent with the views of individual Members of the Congress. It has been recently severely criticized by many people on the ground that there were within the Department many people subversive in nature. Devastating and serious charges have been made. These charges are wide in scope. Our subcommittee has taken cognizance of these charges. Last year and this year we looked into these charges without fanfare or publicity but strictly behind closed doors. We have made no public utterances about our findings. We earnestly and seriously sought to ascertain the truth with respect to these charges. As one who believes himself to be reasonably conservative I do not accept or believe in the main the charges that have been made against the Department of State. First of all I want to say that the man responsible for the employees of the State Department is a man by the name of John E. Peurifoy. No finer or more loyal American is employed in the United States Government than Mr. Peurifoy. He was chosen by General Marshall to head up the personnel section of the State Department, knowing that it was a very difficult job. He requested this man and placed him in that position and gave him unlimited authority. As far as anyone has been able to ascertain, not a single instance has been established where the judgment of John E. Peurifoy proved to be faulty.

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

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has he passed upon the character of these other people, aside from Communists, who admittedly have been in the various departments?

Mr. PRESTON. To which group do you allude?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I refer to the unmentionables.

Mr. PRESTON. Oh, you mean the people that Dr. MILLER has talked about so much on the floor?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, now, you know and I know and every Member knows

that nobody is going around snooping around trying to find homosexuals in any department in the United States Government. You know and I know that if one is discovered he is going to be discharged.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I do not know that. You said, "I know." I do not know that.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, I feel the gentleman has been around Washington long enough to know that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman from Michigan has been around Washington long enough to know that. The gentleman from Michigan knows, I am sure, that the percentage of homosexuals uncovered in the State Department is no higher than will be found in any other large organization in America.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, I cannot agree with that.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, you will find a certain percentage——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But I do not believe the percentage is anything like that which you find here. I have been here long enough to know that these charges have been rumored around here for the last 10 years, and from time to time various committees have uncovered it, but they still continue on the pay roll. I cannot countenance that.

Mr. PRESTON. The thing we should be doing is commending Mr. Puerifoy for having initiative to tackle that problem and solve it within his own Department. It cannot be said that it has been tackled in any other department of the Government.

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

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not a fact that this is no news at all to this committee? As far back as 3 years ago the State Department was being cleared of those people.

Mr. PRESTON. It is true. Mr. Peurifoy testified in closed session 3 years ago, if I remember correctly, and certainly last year, that this problem was being attacked and solved within the State Department.

Now, if you want to make capital of something, if you will refer to the hearings and read what was said about the Commerce Department, it might even be more startling than what has been said about the State Department.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRESTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have not been snooping around about the business, but when they begin to publish it in the newspapers my folks want to know who I am associating with down here and now long they are going to keep those fellows on the pay roll and use the taxpayers' money to pay them. That is bad business.

Mr. PRESTON. I agree it is bad business, and I do not think any Member of the House would condone that for a minute.

Now, let me say this about the State Department: Not in a single case since the war ended has the Congress of the United States failed to follow the recommendations and policies established by the State Department, even through the Eightieth Congress when the Republicans were in charge of the Congress. You would believe from what you read in the papers and what is so loosely said by some people in high position in Washington that nothing goes on in the State Department but a continuing conspiracy to undermine the United States Government. We found no such condition to prevail in the investigation that our subcommittee has made.

We have offered no criticism, but on the other hand we have complimented Mr. Peurifoy for the fine job he has done within the State Department. So long as he remains there as Under Secretary, I, for one, feel safe in the belief that the State Department will be as free from subversives as any other agency in the United States Government.

In the course of the hearings we developed many things of interest that we think at the proper time should be brought to the attention of the House. Time will not permit me this afternoon to go into many, but there is one I should like to mention. For the first time in our committee we considered public roads and had public roads under our jurisdiction. We ascertained upon close examination of Mr. MacDonald that although a survey has been made to establish a military highway encircling the United States and crossing it, nothing has been done to implement this plan for such a highway; we have no four-lane highways in this country on which to move our vast armies and military equipment in the event of an emergency. We have highways so narrow that two of our larger-type prime movers could not pass each other on the highways. We have done nothing about implementing the program that was wisely suggested and authorized at one time by Congress—that is to the extent that a survey should be begun. It is my personal opinion that we should give serious thought to implementing that program. We should give serious thought to implementing the recommendations that have been made on this subject of establishing a four-lane military highway that would enable us to move our military vehicles in the event of an emergency.

Another thing that was brought forcefully to my attention was the fact that the time had arrived when it is necessary to separate in all of our transportation agencies, the ICC and the CAB, the promotional functions from the rate-making functions. I believe that the time has come when we should establish within the Department of Commerce a division of transportation and take away completely from these other agencies that have under their jurisdiction transportation, all promotional functions and place them under the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further general debate the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including line 24 on page 32.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

NOTE OF THE UNITED STATES TO RUSSIA ON THE SINKING OF AN AMERICAN PLANE

Mr. FLOOD. 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. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to utilize this time to commend the Department of State for the temper and the quality of the note addressed to Soviet Russia with reference to the shooting down of an unarmed American plane over the open Baltic Sea. I believe I express the sentiments of this House when, I, with emphasis, repeat that I pay compliment to the distinguished Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, for the nature of that note and the quality of that note, its strength, force, and determination in making clear to the Soviet that the American position is clear and united.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to authorize the award posthumously of an appropriate decoration to members of the crew of the United States Navy Privateer, who lost their lives in or over the Baltic Sea on April 8, 1950, while in the performance of duty.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks on the subject of wildlife management.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a resolution by the executive council of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor.

Mr. LODGE (at the request of Mr. STEFAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming (at the request of Mr. STEFAN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is recognized for 1 hour.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Members that the subject I intend to discuss merits the attention of every Member of this House. In the appropriation bill now before us we are being asked to contribute some $14,000,000,000 to the military defense of our country. I am going to vote for that appropriation. I know nothing else to do. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States say that this is the irreducible minimum with which the interests of the United States of America can be protected and safeguarded at home and abroad. Who am I to say that I know more about what it takes to protect the interests of the United States of America at home and abroad than do the distinguished gentlemen I have just mentioned and our President of the United States. I have got to vote for that appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, you know Napoleon found out years ago that an army marched on its stomach and when a nation reaches the place that it cannot feed an army, and many nations of the world have already reached that place, then is when the subject I want to discuss here this afternoon comes into focus.

What I wish to talk about is found on page 189, line 10, of the bill we have had so long under consideration and that we will probably have under consideration for some time to come. I refer to the $282,000,000 appropriated for the PMA, soil conservation in the United States. Considering the things that the Federal Government is doing in other directions and the amount of appropriations for other things the world over, that $282,000,000 is pitifully inadequate.

It is the one thing that is justified above all the other agricultural expenditures in the Nation at the present time, and I am thinking of offering an amendment when that section is considered before this House to raise the figure from two hundred and eighty-two to four hundred million dollars.

You know, we like to brag about our country; what a great Nation we are. We are the greatest Nation in the world at the present time, but we like to hook our thumbs in the armholes of our vests and say, "We did this. This is the result of American ingenuity; this greatness is due to the kind of Government we have; it is due to our superior knowledge." Now, that is only partly true. I think we have great ingenuity. We have the best form of Government in the world, but a government has to have something besides people to govern.

When you wake up in the morning, what do you want? You want your toast, and bacon and eggs, and orange juice; that is what you want. Where does it come from? Why, the corner grocery store; they have got it down there. That is only part of the story.

It comes from the soil of the United States, and there never has been a nation of people since the dawn of history that has destroyed their natural resources and depleted their soil at the rate we have been doing and are doing in the United States. One hundred and seventy-five years ago, which is a very short time in the history of lost nations, the Thirteen Colonies had just won their independence and had started to form a nation, and everything from Pittsburgh, Pa., west, and part of the country east of Pittsburgh was nothing but a jungle, a wilderness, peopled with savages. We have taken over all of that country now and populated it out to the Pacific.

We say we are the greatest country in the world, which is true, but let me recall something to your minds. India, Korea, China, Manchuria, Formosa, Burma, Indochina, with their teeming populations, have only four-tenths of 1 acre of land that is fit to grow food per capita. We say that is Asia; those are the backward countries of the world, the countries that we need to help. And, I voted on the floor of this House for appropriations to help them. How do we stand in the United States from the standpoint of something to eat? We have 3½ acres of good agricultural land for every man, woman, and child in the United States, figuring that we have a population of 150,000,000. What would we have in the United States if we were crowded like Asia is crowded? Instead of having 150,000,000 people in the United States to live off of our soil we would then have more than 1,300,000,000 people in the United States to live off of our soil. If we should double our population and add 1,000,000,000 people to it, then we would be in the condition that Asia is in today, and today in the United States we have some unemployment even with only 150,000,000. Today in the United States we do not have enough houses with only 150,000,000 people. What in God's name would we have if we had 1,300,000,000 people in the United States to live off our soil instead of the 150,000,000 that we do have? Why are we the greatest Nation in the world? Because God almighty gave us so many natural resources in the beginning that with all of our profligacy, with all of our waste, with all of our disregard for our natural resources, we have not been able to dissipate all of it yet. That is the reason we are the greatest Nation in the world today. Providence just gave this United States of America so much that in 175 years we have not been able to tear it all up and throw it all away, but we are doing a pretty good job of it. We have lost half of our topsoil already, that little black film of topsoil from 8 to 18 inches thick spread over this United States, that carries less than 10 percent of the relationship to the solid content of this earth that the varnish carries to the solid content of a globe. When it is gone, we are gone.

China saw the day when they had no idea that 50,000,000 people would starve in 1 year in that country. India saw the time when they said, "We have lots of soil. Our river valleys are fertile. There is no reason why we should ever be hungry." But we are following the very same road that has been followed by every nation of antiquity.

I have heard men say on the floor of this House that the soil is the problem of the American farmer, that it does not concern anybody else; why does not the farmer himself take care of his own soil? I wish it were that simple.

We do have farm prosperity in the United States compared with some of the conditions we have had in the past, but I want you to remember this, and these figures are fresh. They came from the Department of Agriculture yesterday:

In 1949, with approximately 6,000,000 farm families in the United States, 1⅕ million of those farm families had a cash income for last year of less than $225 per family. The next one and one-fifth million families had a cash income of $705 per family. The third group of one and one-fifth million families had a cash income of $1,425 per family. The fourth group of one and one-fifth million families had an income per family of $2,775, and the highest bracket group, the highest income group of families engaged in agriculture, one and one-fifth million of them, had an income per family of five, of $9,870, and that just about reaches the average nonfarm income of the United States.

That is one of the reasons the farmer cannot stand the entire burden of soil conservation if it is going to be done in time to save the soil of the United States. We are doing the job but we are not doing it fast enough. I can tell you how fast we are doing it. I have checked the figures. That is one thing I do know about.

We have terraced, in God knows how many years, 20,000,000 acres of land in the United States. That is all the Soil Conservation Service has terraced plus what PMA has terraced, plus what individual farmers like myself have terraced, all working together. We have built terraces to protect 20,000,000 acres of land in the United States, and there are another 100,000,000 acres that need that protection and need it now. Yet we appropriate $282,000,000 a year to do the job, and we send $100,000,000 to Korea, we send $100,000,000 to China, and we send enough money to implement the Marshall plan in Europe to build every mile of terrace that needs to be built in the United States. Then we come down to $282,000,000 for the one thing this Nation needs most of all, soil conservation.

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

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very much interested in the speech the distinguished gentleman from Missouri is making, because he is talking along a line which I am sure he knows I have a very deep interest in. As a matter of fact the gentleman knows that these vast deficits we are incurring go on the national debt. Is that not true?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman feel that any program which involves agriculture should do something for future generations who are going to be called upon to pay that obligation?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Unless we do something for the soil of the United States—soil which we do not own—we just have a life tenure on it—no farmer owns the farm he lives on. When he dies it falls into the lap of the nearest probate judge—he just has a life tenure on it. If we are not careful the father will not leave anything to the son but a sheet of subsoil covered by nothing but a mortgage.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in what he says, but it seems to me when we are contemplating drawing out of the Treasury of the United States billions of dollars to finance this farm plan or that farm plan by way of the Brannan route or by way of the present route, the fact remains, unless we are able to step up and amplify tremendously the soil conservation, tree planting, and reforestation programs in this country we are going to leave a legacy to the people who come after you and me and their great-grandchildren which will be an obligation for them to pay with no corresponding benefit to them—benefits which would result if we stepped up this soil conservation, tree planting and reforestation program. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his contribution. Let me also state to him we are not trying to discuss the Brannan plan this evening because I am talking about soil conservation. I have a statement I want to make if the gentleman will permit me and I will proceed with that statement now. At some future time we will discuss the Brannan plan at great length probably.

As I was saying a few minutes ago, farming is not a corporate enterprise. Farming is a means of sustenance. It is a way of life. Perhaps a dozen corporations could take over the agriculture of the United States and conserve the soil and operate more efficiently than the 6,000,000 farmers who are living on that soil today, but I do not want to live to see the day when that happens. I believe in the family-sized farm and the people who live on those farms because they love the soil and they love the livestock and love the work they do. They would not stay out there if they did not.

Let me tell you a few of the things that go on on the farm. First I want you folks to visit a field with me. Maybe in this House where we talk about foreign countries—where we talk about armies and where we talk about navies and where we talk about the Air Force and our State Department and our great banking institutions and the tariff and such things as that that really amount to something—maybe a field is an anticlimax. But we live out of those fields and any time we do not live out of those fields we will not live at all. So I want to ask you folks to visit a field with me, if you can, in your mind, I would like for you to go back to 1895—5 years before the turn of this century. Go with me and my old father to visit a field. There are only 25 acres in this particular field. Its only importance lies in the fact that its prototypes are in every community in this country. Oh, in 1895 the soil in that field was 2 feet deep. It was nice black, sand loam and the leaf mold was laying over that field so that you could walk with no more noise than you make on this rug as your footsteps passed over those rotten leaves on top of the ground.

The first time I saw that field was in late June, and the mulberries were ripe. The young squirrels were ripe, too. My father was an old squirrel hunter. He learned to hunt squirrels in southern Indiana, not long after the Civil War. I went with him to that Missouri field. It was a flat 10 acres, and then a hill that covered about 15 acres. The hickory trees stood there, the black walnut, and the mulberry trees full of mulberries that the squirrels were eating in late June. I walked around the tree while father stood still. The squirrel went around the other side of the tree and he would motion me to stop when the squirrel came around and he would shoot the squirrel. I pulled the grape vines that ran up to their nests that were made with green leaves, and I carried the squirrels. That field was like God had laid it down there. But that farm changed hands. Father and I went down there a few years later to that field, and a sawmill had been set in there. Every tree that would make a few boards had been felled, and the logs taken out and sawed up. There was a pile of sawdust on the creek bank, and the mill was gone. The owner of that field said to the folks who lived out on the prairies, "I have got wood down here. If you will come down here and clean it up, I will give it to you." So the neighbors came and cleaned it up, and he went in there with what we called a jumping shovel plow. You pushed down on the handles to make it go into the ground. He dug up a little loose dirt in there and he planted corn and pumpkins. Then in the fall he cut that corn up and shocked it. You could almost step from one yellow pumpkin to another. The corn made 50 bushels to the acre and a wagonload of pumpkins or more on every acre in addition. That shows you what kind of soil it was.

Well, it was farmed in corn a few years, and then they sawed the stumps off level and sowed it to wheat, and it made 35 bushels to the acre without fertilizer. I helped thresh it.

Go look at that field today. I can carry in one of my hands all of the black soil that is left on that 25 acres. There are gashes down the side of that hill 6 feet deep into the red clay. It will never raise another bushel of corn. Never in the memory of any man living today or any child living today will it ever grow another bushel of corn. It cannot even be seeded to grass. It is absolutely ruined for all time.

It is only 25 acres. What is the difference? Just this difference. It is part of the United States of America, and today that 25 acres, properly handled, could have been producing beef and pork, milk, eggs, or wheat; but it is ruined. The man that owned it did not know enough to take care of it. The name of such men today is legion. Some men can take care of their farms and do not do it. Others can and do, and others absolutely cannot do it.

Let us go out into the country. Here is a young farmer. We will say he is a GI. He has saved up a thousand dollars, and he makes a down payment on a little piece of land. He has to buy the cheapest piece of land in the neighborhood so as to have enough money to make the down payment on it, and he borrows the rest. He has to pay a little insurance. He has to pay a little taxes, and he has to meet the payments on his home. He goes out to these fields that ought to be terraced. They ought to be limed. They ought to be fertilized. They ought to be sown in clover. But what can he do? He has not got the money to do it. He has to go out to those fields and say, "I have got to deplete you still more in order that I may ever own you."

That is one case. Here is another man. He owns 160 acres of good land that has been taken care of. He has two sons and two daughters. One of his sons is already in the city. The two daughters are married and moved away. There is one boy left at home with dad. That one boy would like to have the farm. Dad lays down and dies; the two girls come home and the son comes home; they are interested in the estate. The boy who wants to stay on that farm does what? What little money he has saved up he spends to buy dad's tractor and some of the cows that sell at the sale. Two or three days later he goes into town, goes down to the loan company, and mortgages that farm for 75 or 80 percent of its value to pay Susie and Jean and Bob in order that he may stay on that farm. Then he goes out to those fields, and he says to them: "I cannot take care of you any longer; I have got to mine you to the uttermost. I want to own you some day, and in order to do that I have got to abuse you." And suppose about the time he gets it paid for that the work has disgusted him with farming and he goes to town and he says to the real-estate man: "Sell my farm; I am not going to stay on it any more." Another man comes along with 25 percent of the price of that farm and mortgages it for the rest. He goes out to the land and says: "You have paid Joe; now pay me." Do you see the reason that the farm land of the United States is being destroyed? The time has got to come in these United States—and now you may choose to call me a Communist if you want to, and if you do, just crack away; I have been called everything but a gentleman anyhow, so you cannot insult me. The time has got to come in this Nation when a deed to a tract of land will not carry with it the right to destroy that tract of land. Now, I do not know what you are going to make out of that statement, but it has got to come.

Take the case of a man who lives on 160 acres of land but is no longer able to operate it; his children are gone, there is nobody there at home any more, and he moves to town and rents a little house;

he gets out to the farm only twice a year, and the only interest he has in the farm is the number of dollars it will bring him every year in order that he and his wife may live. That farm is going down and being depleted.

Then there is the last proposition that I am going to take up with you in this part of this program, and that is the man who buys a farm for an investment. There are still plenty of people in the United States who think that if you want to get rich just buy yourself a farm, rent it out, and live off the rent. That is very disappointing to the landlord and it is very bad on the farm. Now I want to talk about this little graph here.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he discusses that graph?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. I was interested a moment ago when the gentleman stated that the time is coming when an owner of land or the holder of a deed would not be permitted to do as he wished with his land. What solution does the gentleman have to offer? What sort of control or regulation does the gentleman propose whereby the owner would be compelled to practice good soil conservation policies in connection with his land?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I think the time will have to come in these United States when the farmer will have to be required to terrace the land that needs terracing, to spread lime on land that needs to be limed, and when he will not be allowed to plant it all to corn, to plant it all to cotton, or to plant it all to tobacco; he will have to observe good farming practices. I realize it will raise the devil whenever it is proposed, but we have either got to do that or the time is going to come in these United States when the production of our farms will not feed half of our population. I believe it.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is making a very interesting speech here this evening, and I am sure that every Member present is thoroughly enjoying it. Is it not true that at this time, while the regulation is not compulsory, we do have regulations which require farmers to comply with certain practices in order to obtain soil-conservation payments and benefits? This is an effort to induce him to follow good farming practices. So what the gentleman is suggesting now is that ultimately the time will have to come when he will be obliged to do that.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The only thing that will keep him from being compelled to do that is the chance that he will do it without compulsion, and that is what I am hoping for.

Mr. PRESTON. I quite agree that it is an educational program that we must follow up vigorously if we are ever to get put into effect the things the gentleman so strongly recommends.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. That is right, and I want to say that the PMA program in the United States is the program that has gotten more soil conservation for the money than any program we have ever had in the United States. It makes soil conservation semicompulsory. It says: We make the payments if you do these things; if you do not, we will not.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take up this graph. A man comes into a town, let us say, and he buys a hardware store. He has money to pay for the building and a stock of goods. His shelves are full. Let us say he has enough money in addition to buy a residence in town for him and his family. He has had business experience. He knows where to buy advantageously. He can mix with the public well. His wife and children get along well with all the folks in town. He and his wife are social successes. He gets along all right. Let us give him every break.

Well, he has to make enough money to pay his help, he has to make enough money to pay his taxes, he has to make enough money to pay for his water and lights, he has to make enough money to support his family, he has to make enough money to help support the institutions that are in his town because if he is going to be a businessman there he has to be one of them, he is going to act like one of them, he is going to spend money like one of them. Let us say he makes enough money to do all of those things.

But when he takes inventory on the first day of January after he has owned that store 10 months, he finds his stock of goods lacks $5,000 of invoicing as much as when he bought the store. He has made enough money to do everything else, but he has not made enough money to replenish the goods on his shelf. Now, if he continues to do that, is it not a fact that at the end of a certain number of years he will either sell a depleted stock at a sacrifice, for whatever he can get, or he will be forced into bankruptcy? One of those two things await him. Now we are going to bring a farmer into that community and let him buy 160 acres of land or a half section if that suits you better. Let us give him every break. Let us let him pay cash down for his farm and let him have $3,000 or $4,000 over and above his stock and implements to buy fuel, oil, and food and fertilizer until he can harvest his first crop. Let him make enough money to pay all of his expenses excepting to put that calcium, nitrogen, phosphorous, and potash back into his soil. If he does not make enough money to do that, or if he fails to do that and continues to crop that ground year after year, his end is the same as the merchant's.

He does not know it; maybe his neighbors do not know it; maybe they will say that the man is making a success. He is meeting all of his obligations; he is educating his children; he is keeping his home in repair. But what is happening out in those fields? There is where he will succeed or fail out in those fields. Look at the graph. Note the mineral content of 40 bushels of corn. Note these figures represent the mineral content of 40 bushels of corn. These figures do not take into consideration the plant food lost by leaching or erosion on the acre of land during the year in which that acre was producing that 40 bushels of corn. In many cases an acre of land producing 40 bushels of corn loses twice as much plant food by leaching and erosion as the 40 bushels of corn contain. The mineral content of the 40 bushels of corn is 45 pounds of calcium, 60 pounds of nitrogen, 20 pounds of phosphorus, and 50 pounds of potash. Again notice the graph, 20 bushels of wheat contain 48 pounds of calcium, 36 pounds of nitrogen, 15 pounds of phosphorus, and 20 pounds of potash; and 2½ tons of alfalfa contain 73 pounds of calcium, 70 pounds of nitrogen, 23 pounds of phosphorus, and 113 pounds of potash. Many farmers say that alfalfa improves land; that is not true. Note the minerals that a crop of alfalfa removes from the soil; unless they are replaced the alfalfa will fail. It will simply starve to death.

The oil driller receives a depletion allowance because he is depleting his natural resources; that allowance is often as great as 27½ percent. The same is true of the mining industry. But some folks consider the soil as eternal and the farmer is allowed no deduction for depletion. I tell you that the people of these United States have got to wake up.

Mr. Bennett, of the Soil Conservation Service, says that we are losing enough of our topsoil every day to put topsoil 12 inches deep on 8,000 acres of land every day, and that 1,000 acres of land goes out of the mouth of the Mississippi, in the Delta down there, when the Mississippi is at full flood, every 24 hours. How long can we stand that with our soil going down and our population going up? It is time and high time that the people of the United States and the Government of the United States woke up to the fact that soil conservation is the greatest need of the country at the present time and that our loss of topsoil is our greatest misfortune. The PMA program has taught the American farmer and helped him financially in a program of terracing and liming and has done more for actual soil conservation accomplished in the fields than all other programs combined. Every dollar of taxpayers' money that has been spent by PMA has already returned to the Federal Treasury in income taxes paid by farmers who would never have made enough money to pay an income tax had it not been for the PMA program. The appropriation for the PMA program should be raised to $400,000,000 per year. The two greatest needs today are lime and terraces. Terraces to protect the body of the soil itself and lime to increase the growth of legumes. Money spent for soil conservation is not an expense but the best investment the taxpayers of the United States have ever made or ever will make because it helps guarantee food, clothing, and shelter not only for themselves but for their children and grandchildren.

PATRIOTS' DAY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this is Patriots' Day in Massachusetts. We

from the old Bay State are grateful to the Congress for the concurrent resolution commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the battles of Lexington and Concord.

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood" the farmers and townfolk stood up to the professional soldiers of Britain and gave such a good account of themselves that the spirit of revolt was sparked throughout the Thirteen Colonies.

They fought against taxation without representation and it might be well for us in 1950 to remember that excessive taxation stirred the colonists to rebellion in 1775. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that many of our citizens might consider themselves as long-suffering colonists today and rise up—in political protest—if we do not give them a dollar's worth for every one of the billions of dollars which this Congress will appropriate.

As we honor the patriots of Concord and Lexington let us be mindful of the fact that the spirit which motivated them is not absent from their descendants of today.

Although the functions of Government have increased in order to balance the social and economic tensions in modern society, there is a limit to the extension of such powers.

The colonist of 1775 put his home or his farm first—of a value far more important than the Government he and his fellow citizens established to maintain law and order.

There are vast differences between the agricultural—almost pastoral quality of life in 1775—and the feverish tempo of our complex times.

But people were human beings then, as they are now. They have individual needs and wants and aspirations that require a climate in which there will be some opportunity for realization.

It is necessary for us to provide them with some protection against the economic hazards of modern life. But there is some danger in our preoccupation with security that may lead us to neglect opportunity. Our approach may become negative, rather than positive.

That is why the events that we commemorate this day are of such value to us. They remind us of the courage and self-reliance which made this Nation great. This is no time for us to rest upon the efforts of those who preceded us. This Nation has not reached the age of retirement. The worth of any people is measured less by its material achievements than by the growth of its intelligence and its character.

We cannot go back to those stirring days when men first tasted the fresh air of freedom. We would not want to go back. There are more of the good things of life to enjoy today.

But we of today need the spiritual fulfillment which was theirs.

It will not be found in complete dependence upon others.

When we finally complete the job of providing basic economic security for our people, I hope that we will then concentrate on bending every effort to encourage them with incentives.

This is the miracle ingredient in our way of life: the one that inspires extra effort and extra satisfaction.

The men and women of Concord and Lexington had it in abundance. We, in the years ahead that will test us as never before, will need this self-reliance at its best. For the whole is only the sum of the individual parts of which it is made. So, too, with a nation.

I pray that our people on this Patriot's Day and on every holiday that calls to mind our glorious past, will determine not only to emulate but to excel in the sturdy virtues of courage and individual effort for which there is no substitute.

That is the lesson to be learned from Concord and Lexington.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. MARSALIS), for this week, on account of official business.

To Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. SHEPPARD), for 10 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. MILLER of Maryland (at the request of Mr. BEALL), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 18, 1950, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6656. An act for the relief of Peter Michael El-Hini.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 20, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1387. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 4, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, Chariton River and tributaries, Iowa and Missouri, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on July 16, 1945, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 561), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

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. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4969. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Army to transfer and convey certain lands and thereby facilitate administration and give proper cognizance to the highest use of United States lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 1915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5913. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ross County, Ohio, for lands within the Symmes Creek purchase unit in Lawrence County, Ohio, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1916). 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. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3169. A bill for the relief of Agustín Cortés Martínez, his wife Guillermina Díaz de Cortés, his children Santiago Cortés Díaz, Agustina Guillermina Cortés Díaz, and Guellermo Augustín Cortés Díaz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6169. A bill for the relief of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6652. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., son of an American soldier; with amendment (Rept. No. 1912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7065. A bill for the relief of Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana; with amendment (Rept. No. 1913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7066. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Amano; with amendment (Rept. No. 1914). 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. DURHAM:

H. R. 8103. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 8104. A bill to provide reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the burial of those who served in the military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while such forces were in the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 8105. A bill to extend until July 1, 1951, import control powers with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 8106. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 8107. A bill to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 8108. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide

minimum annuity payments for certain officers, employees, and widows; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 8109. A bill to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 8110. A bill to amend Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, chapter 681, first session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8111. A bill to amend Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, chapter 681, first session; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 8112. A bill to provide for the transfer to the States of the replicas of the State seals removed from the Chamber of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 8113. A bill relating to the construction of school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELLIOTT (by request):

H. R. 8114. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1937 (ch. 443, 50 Stat. 478), and to provide for the retirement of certain noncitizen employees of the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Co. on the Isthmus of Panama; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 455. Joint resolution authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 8115. A bill for the relief of Dr. C. A. Schenck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 8116. A bill for the relief of Arthur N. Forsmark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 8117. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Emory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 8118. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Ismael Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 8119. A bill for the relief of Midori Ohta (also known as Mary Stephen); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 8120. A bill for the relief of Anite Clara Taube; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 8121. A bill providing for the payment of $810.50 to George W. Purdy, of Oak Bluffs, Mass., in settlement of claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 8122. A bill providing for the extension of patent No. 2,094,279, issued September 28, 1937, relating to rubber rail seats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 8123. A bill for the relief of Lee Yee Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 8124. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 8125. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hisae Kawauchi Kelly; 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:

2071. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of the Cambridge Woman's Club, Cambridge, Md., in opposition to compulsory health insurance legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2072. Also, resolution of the Cambridge Rotary Club, Cambridge, Md., in opposition to compulsory health insurance legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2073. By Mr. RICH: Petition of American Legion Auxiliary Post No. 519, Westfield, Pa., in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2074. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the members of the Twentieth Century Study Club, of Beloit, Wis., opposing any form of socialized medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

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

Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, D. D., pastor, National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Create in us clean hearts, O Lord, and renew right spirits within us. Make sacred this day and all its duties that it may be lived as unto Thee.

Judge us in the secret places of the soul and in the public ordering of our lives. Make us wise enough and strong enough and great enough and good enough to be fit stewards of the devices and the destinies which, by Thy providence, now rest in our hands. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 19, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

On April 19, 1950:

S. 46. An act for the relief of Primitivo Urcelay-Ruiz;

S. 2911. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Col. Charles H. Bonesteel as executive director of the European Coordinating Committee under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, without affecting his military status and perquisites; and

S. 2734. An act 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.

On April 20, 1950:

S. 2246. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KILGORE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate, Friday and Saturday of this week.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Malone
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Neely
Butler	Hunt	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Cain	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Chapman	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kerr	Sparkman
Cordon	Kilgore	Stennis
Darby	Knowland	Taft
Donnell	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Douglas	Leahy	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Tydings
Eastland	Lodge	Watkins
Ecton	Lucas	Wherry
Ellender	McCarran	Wiley
Ferguson	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McFarland	Withers
Frear	McKellar	Young
Fulbright	McMahon	
Green	Magnuson	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has before it the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended. The bill is open to amendment.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolu-