NORTH CAROLINA

Lloyd H. Taylor, Archdale. Stella H. Bowers, Newland. Harold W. Grant, Seven Springs.

#### OREGON

Clinton E. Atherton, Canyonville. Eldene F. Frenger, Central Point.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

Minnie Mae Gray, Boston.
Daniel J. Cullinan, Cambridge Springs.
Rosemary F. Schettig, Ebensburg.
Donald J. Watts, Millville. Arthur E. Stanfield, Renfrew Ralph M. Henry, Rochester Mills. Carrie M. Ketner, Strausstown. Sarah E. Vensel, West Alexander. Jerry J. Kasprisin, Yukon.

## RHODE ISLAND

Rudolph Z. Choquette, Hamilton. Ambrose G. Bliss, Little Compton.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Kenneth M. Kennedy, Blackstock Benton Sheorn, Camden. Isabella P. Frick, Chapin. Willie H. Nims, Fort Mill.

#### SOUTH DAKOTA

Marvin H. Westin, Alcester. Leo C. Huss, Faulkton. William Klein, Howard. Mary E. Becking, Marty. Sylvester K. Krokaugger, Pickstown. Edward P. Ryan, Weaver.

#### TENNESSEE

James J. Patton, Lexington.

#### TEXAS

William Virgil Samples, Blue Ridge. Horace L. Turns, Bowie. Gladys R. Kenner, Hemphill. Henry W. Haynie, Kemp. Walter P. Freytag, La Grange. Willard Grigsby, Nocona.

John L. Biggerstaff, Whitewright.

Joseph R. Mills, Pleasant Grove.

## VERMONT

Joseph M. Durick, Fair Haven. Louis F. Martin, Jr., Manchester Center. Ernest R. McDonald, Jr., Plainfield. John T. Pickett, Proctorsville.

Robert M. Waters, Chilhowie. Dorothy Cox Moore, Chuckatuck. Charles C. Anderson, Clintwood. Robert S. Griffith, Jr., Dante. Jefferson W. Newman, Pennington Gap. Mount Vernon Damron, St. Paul.

## WEST VIRGINIA

James C. Gum, Durbin. Barnes E. Hall, Masontown. Owen E. McKay, Jr., Paden City. Ronald C. Bell, Smithers. Evelyn A. McBrayer, Thorpe. Wallace J. Varney, Williamson.

## WYOMING

Clifford L. Hanson, Kaycee.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by whose mercies we are spared and by whose power we are sustained, may we daily meet life's duties. difficulties, and dangers with faith and courage, confident that as our days so also shall be our strength.

Thou alone knowest the answer to the many questions which are haunting and perplexing us. May we realize that the supreme question is not whether Thou art on our side but whether we are on Thy side.

We pray that as we plan and think about mobilizing our material resources to meet humanity's desperate needs we may not fail to lay hold of our spiritual resources. May we understand more clearly that Thou art not with the many and the strong unless the many and the strong are with Thee.

Grant that each to the extent of his ability and all with equal fidelity may help to bring in that day when the kingdom of righteousness and peace shall be established everywhere.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S.3258. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3776. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ACTION IN THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mr. BIEMILLER. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's prompt action in the Korean situation has received the praise it deserves. Of all the Nation's newspapers only the Chicago Tribune and the Daily Worker—along with their satellites-have raised their voices in opposition. It looks like the same old alliance of the extremists.

The record is now in on the reaction in most of the free world and the record is singularly satisfying.

For that reason, I want to single out the State Department for special praise today. Its careful and effective diplomatic handling of the Korean crisis in the United Nations has made our cause in Asia the cause of the free world. It has stripped Soviet aggression of its peaceful pretensions. And through Secretary of State Dean Acheson, it has forcefully stated the case for intervention by members of the United Nations.

Acheson and the State Department have recently been the victims of one of the most vicious, stupid, backhanded assaults in the history of this country. Penny-ante politicians from my own State have attempted to play with the high stakes of American foreign policy through these assaults.

They must now recognize their mistake or discard all pretensions to interest in the Nation's welfare. Their alternatives now are complete retreat or abject silence.

Meanwhile, Acheson and his colleagues deserve our plaudits for their share in the drawing of the line in Asia.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MA-RINE ACADEMY

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I submit the report of the Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marine Academy and ask unanimous consent that the report of the board and of the Superintendent be printed in the RECORD.

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

York?

There was no objection. The reports referred to follow:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE United States Merchant Marine Academy, 1950, Kings Point, Long Island, N. Y., APRIL 21-22, 1950

The PRESIDENT of the SENATE.

The Speaker of the House of Representa-TIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 11, 1944, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1950 Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

## SENATORS

By the President of the Senate: Senator

ERNEST McFarland, Arizona, Democrat.
By the Committee on Interstate and
Foreign Commerce: Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Colorado, Democrat (ex officio); Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Maryland, Democrat; Senator Homer E. Capehart, Indiana, Re-

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

By the Speaker of the House: Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York, Democrat: Congressman HARRY L. Towe, New Jersey, Republican.

By the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee: Congressman Edward J. Hart, New Jersey, Democrat (ex officio); Congressman Donald L. O'Toole, New York, Democrat; Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina, Democrat; Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Ohio, Republican.

Congressman EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland, Democrat, was subsequently appointed by the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to replace Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, who was unable to

be present.
The meetings of the Seventh Congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Mer-chant Marine Academy took place on the 21st and 22d of April 1950.

Congressman DONALD L. O'TOOLE, of New York, was accompanied from Washington, D. C., to Kings Point by Rear Adm. Telfar Knight, United States Maritime Service, Chief, Bureau of Maritime Services, of the United States Maritime Commission. United States Maritime Commission, and

Commandant of the United States Maritime Service; Capt. J. T. Everett, United States Maritime Service, Assistant Chief, Division of Cadet Corps Training, and Deputy Supervisor, United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps; and by Commander Calvin R. Shorter, United States Maritime Service, Chief Liaison Officer, Bureau of Maritime Services of the United States Maritime Commission. Congressman Eugene J. Keogh, New York, and Congressman Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland, subsequently arrived at Kings Point. The remaining members of the Board were prevented from attending because of the press of affairs in Washington.

## TOUR OF THE GROUNDS

Individual tours of the grounds and Academy facilities were conducted for the members of the Board of Visitors by their officer escorts. This tour included visits to cadet-midshipman living quarters and Cleveland Hall, the several academic departments including the television classrooms of the Department of Naval Science where joint experiments on the effectiveness of instruction through the medium of television are being conducted by the United States Merchant Marine Academy, the Naval Special Devices Station at Sands Point, N. Y., and Fordham University. Inspection was also made of the new planetarium built by Academy personnel for use in implementing the course in navigation taught by the Department of Nautical Science. An inspection of the new installation of a ship's steering engine in the Department of Engineering was included in the tour of the engineering facilities.

Upon the conclusion of the tour the cadet-midshipman regimental commander was presented to the members of the board to extend them an invitation to lunch with the regiment in Delano Hall.

#### MEETING WITH THE REGIMENT OF CADET-MIDSHIPMEN

After lunching with the regiment the members of the board met in the cadet-midshipmen's lourge in private conference with cadet-midshipmen from their home States, from 1245 to 1400.

## FIRST MEETING OF THE BOARD

The board assembled at Wiley Hall, Kings Point at 1400, Friday, April 21, 1950.

The following members of the board were present: Congressman Eugene J. Keogh, Democrat, New York; Congressman Donald L. O'Toole, Democrat, New York; Congressman Edward A. Garmatz, Democrat, Maryland.

The members of the board convened in the conference room in Wiley Hall for purposes of organization under the temporary chairmanship of Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH at 1400 Friday, April 21, 1950.

The board elected Congressman Keoch to serve as permanent chairman and confirmed the appointments of Commander Clifford W. Sandberg and Lt. Maurice W. Price, United States Maritime Service, as secretary and assistant secretary respectively.

The secretary outlined the proposed plan of the day to the chairman and the members of the board. The chairman then directed the secretary to invite the Chief of the Bureau of Maritime Services and the Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy and their respective staffs to join the board in conference.

At the request of the chairman, the Superintent read his annual report to the board.

Upon the conclusion of the reading of the Superintendent's report to the board the chairman and the members of the board discussed the needs of the academy at considerable length with the Chief of the Bureau of Maritime Services and the Superintendent and their respective staffs. The matters discussed are contained in this report under

the sections devoted to general comments and specific recommendations.

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

The board desires to express its high admiration of the splendid esprit de corps that exists in the regiment, and among the officers, and personnel of the academy. Of equal note is the excellent condition of the physical facilities.

The board is impressed with the obvious contribution made by the United States Merchant Marine Academy to the national defense structure. This is clearly evidenced by the great interest manifested by the Navy in the Kings Point program.

Of particular gratification to the board is the progress the Academy administration has made in those matters specifically recommended by the academic advisory board as a result of their meetings on March 9, 10, and 11, 1949, at Kings Point. This unquestionably is largely responsible for the accreditation of the Academy's curriculum extended by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools on November 26, 1949. It is felt that the efforts of all concerned who have made this recognition possible are to be greatly commended.

possible are to be greatly commended.

The board was pleased to observe that a general policy of keeping operating expenses at a minimum has been rigidly followed and many noticeable economies have been effected.

With respect to the reductions in personnel and operations at Kings Point recently effected by the Marine Commission in conference with the Budget Bureau's formula, the board notes with considerable concern the additional arbitrary 10-percent reduction of the Federal maritime training budget for the fiscal year 1951 recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. This additional reduction would cause, insofar as Kings Point is concerned, a further release of 36 in personnel by June 30, 1950. in addition to the 46 already released or awaiting release during 1950. It is evident to the board that the efficiency of operations at Kings Point would be most seriously impaired by this additional release of staff members. The board is fully cognizant of the very important position Kings Point has assumed in developing superior Naval Re-serve officers and is of the opinion that any additional curtailment of this program would not be in the national interest.

The board notes that discussions are now under way concerning retirement and tenure for the officers and personnel of Kings Point. The board concurs with the specific recommendation on this matter made by the Board of Visitors in 1949 who suggested that an adequate retirement and tenure policy be effected consistent with the practice of the United States Government to provide such benefits for all personnel in Government service.

In part V of the Superintendent's report to the board the attention of the board has been invited to H. R. 1251, Eighty-first Congress, first session, now pending before Congress. This is a bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 46 of the United States Code, entitled "Shipping." Briefly, section 545 of chapter 25 of this bill clarifies the status of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, and the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point. The board believes that enabling legislation in form similar to section 545 as revised by H. R. 1251 should be enacted.

The campaign inaugurated to raise funds for the construction of a chapel at Kings Point to serve as a national shrine memorializing the men of the merchant marine is deserving of special comment. The board commends those responsible for the administration of this splendid project, believing that recognition of the valor and heroism of the men of the merchant marine is long overdue.

The need for a suitable library is self-evident in view of the present inadequate facilities. The board is of the considered opinion that a request by the Maritime Commission to the Bureau of the Budget to present to the Congress an estimate for an appropriation to complete the construction of the chapel and library should receive the favorable attention of the Congress.

The suggestion of the academic advisory board relative to the publicizing in certain geographical locations of the merchant marine and the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps is deserving of serious consideration. The board feels that a comparatively small expenditure which an adequate program will entail would contribute in a material way to the national interest.

#### SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

The board specifically recommends that the discussions now under way concerning retirement and tenure for officers and personnel at Kings Point be continued with the object in mind of establishing adequate retirement and tenure privileges, consistent with the civil service nature of their duties.

The board specifically recommends that early action be taken to obtain passage of enal-ing legislation in form similar but broader than that contained in H. R. 1251, title 46, chapter 25, section 545 (a result of the Report of the Committee on Revision of the Report of the Committee on Revision of Laws, House of Representatives, under the Chairmanship of Congressman Eugene J. Keogh, New York) now pending before Congress with the object of establishing the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York as a permanent institution. This legislation should be broadened to specify the complement and pay of cadet-midshipmen.

The board specifically recommends that the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress give favorable consideration to a request from the Maritime Commission for such appropriation as may be necessary to complete the construction of the Memorial Chapel and the Library.

The board specifically recommends that a definite allotment of funds be provided for the publicizing of the merchant marine and the advantages offered to American youth by the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps program.

## CONCLUSION

The board wishes to again enter upon the records its appreciation of the Maritime Commission, Bureau of Maritime Services, Division of Cadet Corps Training, the regiment of cadet-midshipmen and the officers and personnel of the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the effective contribution they are making to the United States merchant marine and to the national defense structure of the Nation.

The board wishes to thank Rear Adm. Telfair Knight, Chief of the Bureau of Maritime Services and Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, the Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, cadet-midshipmen and officers and personnel of Kings Point for the valuable information and hospitality extended to the members of the board.

The chairman and members of the board wish to express their appreciation for the able assistance given by Commander C. W. Sandberg, secretary of the board and Lt. M. W. Price, assistant secretary of the board.

EUGENE J. KEOGH. DONALD L. O'TOOLE, EDWARD A. GARMATZ.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF MARITIME SERVICES,
U. S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY,
Kings Point, N. Y.

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT TO THE SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL BOARD OF VISITORS, APRIL 21, 22, 1950

GENTLEMEN: We are most happy to welcome the Seventh Congressional Board of

Visitors to Kings Point. In these times, when all phases of our national security are under close scrutiny by the Congress, the status and problems of the merchant marine, as a vital element in our security planning, are deserving of the best attention. Since we realize that the effectiveness of our merchant fleet can be no stronger than the efficiency of the personnel manning our vessels, our concern at Kings Point is with the development of thoroughly educated and competent officers who will reflect credit upon our Nation. In the furtherance of this obligation, we will be grateful for the advice and counsel of your Board and for a continuance of the necessary support and guidance which, for the past several years, has stemmed from these annual visits. We want your visit to be both informative and enjoyable and to that end we hope you will call upon us freely to be of service to you.

In these opening remarks, we believe it fitting to pay our respects to the memory of your long-time colleague, and the academy's proven friend, the late Honorable Schuyler Otis Bland. The "Judge," as he was affectionately known, was chairman of our First Congressional Board of Visitors and a member of all succeeding boards up to the present. The same untiring efforts and devotion he displayed over the years to the upbuilding and maintenance of a strong American Merchant Marine characterized his interest in the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its academy from its early beginnings and we feel that, in his passing, Kings Point has suffered the loss of one of its stanchest advocates and truest friends.

#### PART I Introduction

For the benefit of those members of your board who have not previously visited Kings Point, we feel that, perhaps, an effective means of introduction is to set forth the mission of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy:

To attract a high type of young American with a definite ambition to become an officer in the United States merchant marine; To impart to him the necessary academic

background and the fundamentals of a practical nautical education essential to a successful career at sea;

To develop in him high sense of honor, uprightness, and loyalty;
To instill in him a pride in his profession,

and a determination to uphold the traditions of the merchant marine; and

By effective teaching, training, and guidance, to send him forth to his calling with a deep respect and affection for the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and its Academy.

To effectuate this mission, a course of 4years' duration was promulgated in 1938, providing a curriculum finely balanced between subjects in the areas of general education and the professional-technical fields for the effective training of deck and engin-eering officers. As was the case with the other Federal academies and with many colleges and universities, the necessities of the recent war compelled the abridgement of this curriculum. To fulfill the increasing demands for officers to man our rapidly growing merchant fleet and to serve as commissioned officers in the Navy, our courses, during the war years, were reduced to 18 and 24 months. With the cessation of hostilities, these were gradually extended to meet the requirements of the several groups in various stages of transition until, on 1 July, 1946, the full 4-year curriculum was resumed and the first of the classes pursuing the reinstituted full course will be graduated in June of this year.

Up to this time, approximately 9,100 officers graduated from the cadet corps with merchant marine licenses as third mates or

third assistant engineers. These men were also commissioned as ensigns in the United States Naval Reserve. Of this number, about 6,600 were graduated while the war was in progress and, of these, more than 2,100 were selected for active duty in the Navy, many of them remaining to accept permanent commissions in that service.

Since its early beginnings, the Academy's relationships with the Navy have been extremely close. The Navy has been most cooperative in making available surplus equipment for instruction purposes and has mani-fested its interest in Kings Point in countless other ways. Our records are replete with commendatory expressions from high-ranking Naval officers on the performance of Kings Point graduates, and this fine spirit of recognition has been a source of real strength and genuine satisfaction. Because of its national defense implications, it is believed that the Academy's contribution to the development of Naval Reserve officers is deserving of the particular notice of your Board. At Kings Point, besides courses in naval science and tactics the cadet-midshipmen devote their entire 4 years to a nautical education, including 1 year of prac-tical application at sea, and, throughout, are subjected to the rigid discipline of barracks life and the routines of military procedures designed to develop effective leaders.

### PART II Operation

The physical plant of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, including land and equipment, as it now exists, represents a capital investment by the Government of approximately \$12,000,000—less than the cost of one modern submarine, the merchant vessel's most dreaded enemy. Certain for-eign powers are spending untold millions to build up their submarine fleets and our Navy is allocating multimillions in the development of antisubmarine weapons. This academy, at a cost of less than 2/100 of 1 percent of our total national defense budget, can play a vital role in that program since every Kings Point graduate, as a highly trained and skilled merchant marine and Naval Reserve officer, becomes a potentially effective antisubmarine weapon.

During the past year, every effort has been made to conduct the affairs of the academy at a high standard of efficiency, despite considerably curtailed budget allowances. expenditure of Government funds for new equipment and apparatus has been comparatively small, that being acquired having come to us through the medium of transfer of surplus materials from the Navy and Maritime Commission and by direct presenta-tions by manufacturers. Unfortunately, the availability of surplus materials from Government agency sources is lessening rapidly and the benefits we have enjoyed up to now in this respect will, before long, be denied to us. The maintenance of grounds, buildings, and equipment has had our best attention with a limited staff, which will be even further reduced in the approaching fiscal year. The maintenance problem becomes one of growing importance as our buildings and plant become older and the costs of materials increase.

The present complement of cadet-midshipmen at the academy is 1,019, inclusive of 69 Filipinos in training on behalf of the Philippine Government. These are divided:

First class (upper)	220
First class (lower	145
Second class (upper)	179
Second class (lower)	141
Fourth class (upper)	194
Fourth class (lower)	140

This total, comprised of young men from practically every State in the Union, is somewhat higher than would normally be the

Total\_\_\_\_\_ 1,019

case at this time and is explained by the transfer last month of 91 cadet-midshipmen (Fourth class, upper) from the cadet school at Pass Christian, Miss., which had been closed because of an anticipated radical reduction in the appropriation for cadet corps training in fiscal 1951.

The third class cadet-midshipmen, now at sea, total 445, including 20 Filipinos. this number, approximately 290 are in the upper half and the remainder in the lower half. All of these men are serving as cadets on merchant ships in regular operation and are paid (at the rate of \$82.50 per month) by the companies operating the vessels.

In conformance with the policy outlined by the Bureau of the Budget and approved by the President, our total cadet-midshipmen complement for fiscal 1951 will be materially reduced. This complement, ashore and affoat, during the current fiscal year, will average 1,280. The budget proposed for fiscal 1951 will cause this to be reduced to 1,116 and, because of the necessity for further limiting the number of young men admitted each half-year, the over-all complement will, shortly, be reduced to approximately 800.

The cadet corps system of education has its critics and, while on the subject of cadetmidshipman complement, it seems appropriate to comment upon certain statements which have been made by these opponents at various House and Senate committee hearings and on the floors of Congress. The principal burden of these criticisms is: (1) that because of the postwar unemployment situation prevailing in the merchant marine, the training of additional officers for an over crowded field should be discontinued; and (2) that, having been trained at Government expense, a large proportion of the academy's graduates have made no attempt to the sea, or, after sailing for a short time, have undertaken extended educational programs elsewhere or have entered other than maritime fields of employment.

With respect to the first, the unemployment situation is recognized, but this is typical of the merchant marine. From time immemorial, there have been varying numbers of mariners "on the beach," but, in the present instance, the ranks are swelled by the many less competent who readily found berths when shipping was at its height during and in the years immediately following the war, but who lack the qualifications to justify their employment in these more com-petitive times. There has been a constant decline in the number of vessels in operation since the war, accelerated somewhat in recent months by the approaching deadline (June 30, 1950) terminating the bareboat charter of Government-owned ships. anticipated that this decline will continue in a slight measure for the next year, when the active fleet will reach a total of approximately 1,200 ocean-going vessels, employing, roughly, 12,000 licensed officers. This does not take into consideration a large number of other vessels staffed by merchant marine officers such as the Military Sea Transportation Service, Army engineers, inland waterways, and the Great Lakes fleet which, at the height of its seasonal operation, comprises some 450 American-flag vessels. As the result of many years of study, it has been determined that the approximate attrition or turn-over in officer requirements is about 10 percent per annum. On this basis, our national needs, for ocean-going vessels alone, would be about 1,200 officers per year. Under our present plan, Kings Point will admit 200 applicants per year and, with a normal attrition of about 25 percent, will graduate about 150 officers per year—12½ percent of these anticipated requirements. With the four State academies combined graduating about the same number, this leaves 75 percent of the vacancies to be filled by men in unlicensed positions qualifying to become officers. Obviously, the governing consideration in this matter should not be one of quantity but, rather, the technical and proessional competence of the officers to whom the operation of our fleet is to be entrusted. The great technological strides that have been made in recent years in ship design, high-pressure propulsion plants, intricate auxiliaries and electronic aids to navigation, demand technically trained and educated men. Kings Point is producing such men. and in only such numbers as to provide the nucleus necessary to uphold the standards of a merchant marine as envisioned in the national policy declared in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—the same act under which the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps was created.

The second criticism is evidently founded upon a comparison of the number of Kings Point graduates now following the sea, with the total number graduated by the cadet corps since its inception. Such a comparison is neither fair nor valid. From 1941 to 1945, when the war was at its full tempo. our country was seeking men and yet more men to officer our increasing merchant fleet. Of the numbers of young men who responded to the call and entered the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps during that period, many of them, perhaps the majority, selected this service not because they had any idea or intention of following the sea as a career, but as their contribution to the war effort. Like the many thousands who entered the Army, Navy, and Air Corps to make this contribution, a large proportion had predetermined careers in diversified fields and, when entering the cadet corps, interrupted educational programs projected to-ward those ends. Again, like their counter-parts in the other services, they resumed those programs upon their release. the benefit of Government assistance for their tuition, such as other veterans enjoy, many of our wartime graduates undertook service on their licenses for a time to accumulate sufficient funds to see them through. Of those who may not have determined upon other careers prior to entering the cadet corps, a number were undoubtedly influenced by the enactment of the so-called GI bill rights providing, among other things, college education for veterans. The benefits of this bill were denied the men of the merchant marine. It became apparent to our young men, who entered the cadet corps from the motivations of war service that they were destined to meet degree-equipped contemporaries at any time they sought to establish themselves ashore, and, accordingly, many decided to similarly equip themselves. At that time, our Academy had not been accredited and we were not awarding degrees. In the light of this background, the fact that only a comparatively modest percentage of the total number of our graduates is now following the profession of the sea will be more readily understandable.

For the past 2 years or more, a number of the Great Lakes operators have been evincing increasing interest in the Kings Point program. In January of this year, Mr. John L. Horton, marine superintendent of the Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., visited the Academy to address the regimental assembly on the topic, A Career on the Great Lakes, which was particularly well received by the cadetmidshipmen. This company together with three others, is accepting cadet-midshipmen for their third-class year service and, to provide for the essential differences between fresh-water and deep-sea routines, we have prepared special assignments for study by these cadet-midshipmen while on the Great Lakes. A number of our graduates are already employed in licensed capacities on Great Lakes vessels, while many now at the Academy look forward to making their futures on those waters.

## PART III Academics

Under this heading, we are extremely happy to report a most significant event-

the accreditation of the Academy on November 19, 1949, by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This action followed a careful examination of the prescribed courses of study, the qualifications of personnel, and an exhaustive investigation of every detail of the operation of the Academy by the association's inspection committee from the commission on higher education. Understandably, we have been greatly pleased and encouraged with the result of their findings which we consider marks a most important milestone in the Academy's development and progress. Pursuant to authorization contained in Public Law 247. Eighty-first Congress, introduced by fellow Board member, the Honorable EUGENE J. Keogh, and approved August 18: 1949 we are now empowered to confer the bachelor of science degree upon our graduates. The first to receive the degree will be the members of the class to graduate on June 21, next, and studies are now in progress for the formulation of regulations setting forth the requirements to be met by previous graduates to qualify for the degree

On March 2, 3, and 4, 1950, we had the pleasure of welcoming our Academic Advisory Board on its third annual visit. This Board. appointed by the United States Maritime Commission in accordance with Public Law 214, Eightieth Congress, for the purpose of advising the Superintendent concerning the curriculum is composed of seven of the Nation's outstanding educators, of whom all but one were in attendance. The Board was most thorough in its review of our academic program and activities, particularly with respect to the action taken on the specific recommendations it had made on previous visits. The general satisfaction expressed by them with respect to our academic progress was, naturally, most gratifying to us

The Academic Advisory Board made a strong recommendation regarding the publicizing of the merchant marine and the advantages of the Academy in certain geographical areas of the United States. though the benefits of a program of this kind are fully appreciated, our activities in such fields are woefully restricted because of inadequate funds. As a consequence, in many sections of the interior of our country, numbers of young men are unaware of the promising careers that might be theirs. From our standpoint, the greater selectivity of applicants resulting from an increased number of applications is much to be desired and it is hoped your Board will give consideration to ways and means by which the Academic Advisory Board's suggestion may be imple-

## PART IV

## Current problems and planning

Public Law 485, Eightieth Congress, approved April 17, 1948, authorized the United States Maritime Commission "to construct a suitable chapel for religious worship by any denomination, sect, or religion, and a library, at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y." Maritime Commission was further "authorized to accept private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction of the chapel and library provided for" herein.

After a careful survey made by an Academy committee, it was determined that the solicitation at this time of private subscriptions for the construction of a library would probably have little public appeal. Concerning the chapel, it was decided that, rather than to present this as a strictly Academy or Cadet Corps project, popular interest would be encouraged by constructing the chapel as a perpetual national memorial to all of the heroic officers and men of the American merchant marine who have given their lives in the service of our country. Accordingly, prominent persons from banking, insurance, industry, the clergy of all denominations, and the professions, were invited to serve on an honorary national committee

and as members of working regional committees comprising the Atlantic coast and Great Lakes region, the Pacific coast region. and Gulf coast region. The national campaign was inaugurated on January 1 of this year under the director of the supervisor. Rear Adm. Richard R. McNulty, who has been designated national secretary of the committee, and is to continue until October 31, 1950, with the goal set at \$500,000, each region being allocated a fixed quota. The Academy personnel is, of course, very active in the campaign and we anticipate no difficulty in raising and exceeding our quota of \$7,500. The reports of the general public response have, up to now, not been too encouraging. To a large extent, the campaign has been retarded by newspaper accounts and other reports of appropriation reductions affecting Cadet Corp training. The obvious handicaps created by such impression, not only with respect to the chapel fund but in many other ways, serve to emphasize the Academy's dependence upon an adequate and stable budget structure which can be solved only by constructive and understanding congressional support.

Although the procurement of funds through private subscription for the confunds struction of a library has not been deemed feasible, our need for such a structure is nonetheless very real. As an institution of learning accredited to rank with our other academies and leading colleges, Federal Kings Point deserves a properly housed library of adequate size and facilities for the efficient conduct of instructional and re-

search activities.

In the area of planning, such matters as teaching methods, examination procedures, grading practices, and similar academic problems, common to all educational institutions, are under constant review. We do not permit our curriculum to remain static, and, after appropriate study, such changes as may be required to keep our courses in line with the latest technical developments, the shipping industry's needs, and current trends in the fields of general education, are adopted. The maximum educational needs of the cadetmidshipmen are our first consideration and, with due recognition of the limitations of the learning process, our courses are designed to fulfill those needs.

## PART V

### Matters submitted for consideration (A) Sufficiency and Stability of Annual Appropriation

The budget estimate for the fiscal year 1951 submitted to the Congress by the President provides the sum of \$1,984,267 for the operation of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, as against \$2,404,483 appropriated for the current fiscal year of 1950, or a reduction of \$420,216. This is exclusive of the cost of training 89 Filipino cadets, funds for which are provided by the State Department. In this budget estimate for fiscal year 1951 the President has also directed a change in the method of covering expense allowances for cadet-midshipmen after July 1, 1950. Heretofore they have been allowed \$65 per month, from which they have purchased their uniforms, textbooks, and other required equipment, and have paid other incidental expenses, including laundry, dry cleaning, haircuts, and cost of Academy activities. Begining with July 1, 1950, the expense allowances will be eliminated and they will be supplied with required uniforms and textbooks not to exceed a cost of \$200 per cadet-midshipman per year and institutional (not personal) laundry at Government expense.

The budget estimate for the fiscal year 1951 includes a limitation on staff salaries which will provide funds for a staff of 363 persons as against 409 for the fiscal year 1950. The House Committee on Appropriations has recommended a further reduction of \$257,-340 from the over-all budget estimate of \$3,600,000 for all phases of Federal maritime training of which the allowance for Kings Point is a part. Should this further reduction be approved by the Congress, it will result in the necessary release by June 30, 1950, of 36 additional members of our staff, since the proposed reduction is applied to the limitation for salaries and is a flat additional 10 percent of that limitation (less \$9,640 for other staff expense). The over-all staff to conduct the training program has already been reduced by 15 percent in the budget estimate. The Maritime Commission is asking that this budget cut be restored. It will be impossible for us to operate the Academy efficiently with this further proposed staff reduction.

It is hoped that future appropriations for the Academy can be stabilized now that the number of cadet-midshipmen to be trained has been reduced to conform to peacetime conditions. It is most difficult to plan ahead for an educational institution with a 4-year course of training unless appropriations can be depended upon with some degree of certainty. The Bureau of the Budget has indicated its agreement with this policy.

#### (B) Retirement and Tenure for Staff Personnel

The Sixth Congressional Board of Visitors in May 1949 recommended that the attention of the Maritime Commission be drawn to the need for adequate tenure and retirement for officers and personnel of the Merchant Marine Academy, consistent with the practice of the United States Government to provide those benefits for all personnel in Government service. The Maritime Commission has taken cognizance of this recommenation and is engaged at the present time in discussions with the Bureau of the Budget on the subject. The Bureau of the Budget is on record as approving the principles of retirement and is now making a study of the best method of bringing it about.

(C) Clarifying Legislation for the United States Merchant Marine Academy and the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps

The attention of the Board is respectfully invited to H. R. 1251, Eighty-first Congress, first session, now pending before Congress, which is a bill to revise, codify and enact into law, title 46 of the United States Code, entitled "Shipping." Section 545 of Chapter 25 of this bill (maritime training) clarifies the status of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point and reads as follows:

"Legislative authority for the education of officers for the American merchant marine stems from powers granted to the United States Maritime Commission under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, which specifically authorizes the training of American citizens in the status of cadets and cadet officers to become officers of American vessels. Supplementing this general power are a few public laws on specific matters such as the degree-granting power, the appointment annually of a congressional board of visitors, the creation of an academic advisory board, the appointment of cadetmidshipmen from the Latin-American Republics and from the Philippines, H. R. 1251, Eighty-first Congress, first session—is a bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 46 of the United States Code, entitled "Shipping." Section 545 of chapter 25 of this bill (maritime training) clarifles the status of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, and reads as

"The Maritime Commission may train American citizens to become licensed officers of the merchant marine of the United States in a status of cadets and cadet officers at shore-based units, including the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., on training vessels of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, on Government-owned or subsidized vessels, in cooperation with other governmental and private agencies, or other vessels, and for instructional purposes only, in shipyards, plants, and industrial and educational organizations.

"'Such training shall be upon terms arranged by the Commission. Expenditures incident to such training are authorized.'

"The attention of the Board is respectfully invited to this pending legislation."

## (D) Chapel and Library

As previously reported herein a campaign has been inaugurated to raise funds for the construction of a memorial chapel at Kings Point in accordance with provisions of Public Law 485, Eightleth Congress, approved April 17, 1948, which authorizes the United States Maritime Commission "To construct a suitable chapel for religious worship by any denomination, sect or religion and a library, at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to accept private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction of the chapel and library provided for" therein.

This campaign is scheduled for conclusion on October 1, 1950, after which we will request the Bureau of the Budget to present to the Congress an estimate for such appropriation as may be necessary to complete the

two buildings.

GORDON MCLINTOCK,
Rear Admiral, United States Maritime Service, Superintendent.

### REDUCTION IN EXCISE TAXES

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the passage of the bill (H. R. 8920) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House realize how futile it is to attempt to obtain an over-all reduction of our taxes.

Long after the fighting of World War II has ceased, while we are in the most prosperous years of our existence, this wasteful administration, hoping to attract votes, is each year spending more than it receives—going ever deeper and deeper into debt.

The efforts of the Republicans and those on the other side who believe that the only way to prevent inflation, bankruptcy, and a grievous depression is to reduce needless spending, rather than to increase taxation, find themselves faced with a situation which makes it impossible for the Congress, if needful Government activities are to continue, to put through a tax bill which would reduce the total take obtained by taxation.

President Truman, who was never conspictions, so far as we know, as an individual who achieved financial success or who engaged in any activities other than governmental which returned him a livelihood through his own efforts, has issued a decree that any tax bill which does not net his administration spending money approximately equal in amount to that which he is now wasting will be vetoed.

Unfortunately for the citizen, for the good of the Republic, he forces us into a situation where, if the Government is to continue to operate at all, in order to get a reduction in excise taxes we must vote for additional taxes on corporations. His argument is easily understandable.

It is that there are more people who pay excise taxes than there are who real-

ize that they contribute to the payment of taxes levied upon corporations, hence, it is politically expedient to reduce excise taxes but increase corporate taxes, for, says the President—at least, by his action—the poor dumb citizen will think he is getting a reduction in the tax he pays on many an article he purchases over the counter but will not realize that the taxes on corporations are, by the corporations, passed on to him. Excise taxes—war taxes—should be repealed—not just reduced—expenditures should be reduced instead of taxes increased.

My vote shall be cast for the motion to recommit the bill and, if that fails, I will then be forced by the President's action to vote against the bill itself.

It is my hope—yes, and it is my prayer—that before it is too late we will get for President an American who has sound economic ideas, who believes in America first, and that his first duty is to the taxpayer and the citizen of this country, rather than to a political machine.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the providing of relief from wartime excise taxes is long overdue and I am supporting the measure which the committee, after lengthy study and work, has brought before the House at this time. This measure will bring about a substantial reduction of the excise taxes which were imposed during the war and which were necessary as a wartime measure. The public has been long-suffering and patient in the payment of such wartime taxes for more than 5 years after the cessation of hostilities.

As you know, these wartime taxes would have expired automatically during 1947. However, they were continued by action of the Eightieth Congress as permanent legislation and it is, therefore, necessary to pass this measure here today in order to repeal this permanent wartime tax legislation and to effect an excise tax reduction.

It is hoped and believed that this measure will be approved by President Truman. He has indicated that no excise tax reduction bill would be favorably considered by him-in fact, the same would be vetoed-unless there were coupled with the reduction feature of the bill provision for needed revenue-which would thus be lost-from other sources. And this bill does just that. It provides for excise tax relief and, at the same time, provides for necessary revenue by levying an additional tax on corporate enterprises with earnings in excess of approximately \$167,000. This bill will provide for both consumers and small business much needed relief and encouragement.

This bill affords both relief for consumers and for additional taxes for the Government from those best able to pay. I am supporting this measure and, by reason of the fact that it is long overdue, I urge that it be passed.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill which is before us is an admirable measure and I rise to urge its adoption. It seems to me that the Democratic majority on the Ways and Means Committee has done an outstanding job of balancing the needs of those taxpayers who most need tax relief, and the needs of

the Federal Government in meeting the great costs of making America strong and secure. In some respects, the bill does not go as far in readjusting the tax burden as I might like but by and large it is an excellent measure.

What it does, in brief, is-

First. To reduce substantially inequitable excise taxes on a number of consumer goods.

Second. To plug a number of tax loopholes so that part of the revenue lost by the excise tax reduction will be made in

Third. To increase the tax rate for a small group of high-income corporations, while reducing the tax load on many

small businesses.

I have urged the reduction or elimination of wartime excise taxes on the floor of the House and to the Ways and Means Committee in the past. Because of the large number of small, consumer goods business firms in my district in New York, I have had a great deal of information about these taxes, particularly as they affect furs, jewelry, luggage, cosmetics, photographic equip-ment, and electrical appliances. In addition, when the movie industry asked for a cut in the tax on admissions, I obtained a pledge from the theater industry's leaders so that all of the benefit of tax reduction would be passed along to movie-goers in the form of lower prices. The committee estimates that the excise tax reductions or eliminations in this bill will total \$1,010,000,-000. Perhaps \$100,000,000 will come back to the Federal Government from these industries, since their volume of business will almost surely go up as a result of this cut.

Part of this net loss of \$910,000,000 will be made up by plugging loopholes in our present tax laws. For example, salaries and wages paid to most Americans are now subject to taxes which are withheld. But taxes on corporate and patronage dividends are not now collected by the withholding technique. This bill plugs that loophole, and it is estimated that the Government will gain \$170,000,000 that way. Another \$100,-000,000 will be made up by taxing the business ventures of various trusts and foundations, and \$70,000,000 more will come in from stop-gap taxes on insurance companies.

Almost half of the revenue loss from the excise-tax cut will be made up by plugging these loopholes. The final major change in the tax structure is the readjustment of the corporate-tax

structure.

Under this bill, some 20,000 corporations whose net income after taxes is \$167,000 will pay a slightly higher tax At the same time, some 170,000 rate. smaller corporations whose net income is under \$167,000 will pay at a lower rate than they did this year. For those opponents of this bill whose greatest concern is with the welfare of big business, I should like to present several excerpts from the recent study of the joint committee of the House and the Senate on the economic report-Joint Economic Report; Report No. 1843, Eighty-first Congress, second session.

First, on the question of what has happened to corporate and personal income taxes in the last few years—pages 76-77:

In the last 10 years marked changes have taken place in the distribution of the burden of taxation on individuals. In 1939 individual income taxes took up 15 percent of the total tax burden. In 1949, the figure is estimated at 37 percent, representing an increase of more than twofold while that collected by taxes on corporations increased less than one-half. The reduction in the percentage obtained from customs duties and from estate and gift taxes is likewise striking. Between 1945 and 1949 the percentage collected by excise taxes increased 6 points from 12 percent to a figure of 18 percent, while the tax burden borne directly by corporations went down 5 points from 32 percent to a figure of 27 percent.

The second notable change in the individual income-tax structure has been the large increase in the percentage of the total that is paid by those with incomes less than \$10,000. \* \* \* In 1947, the last year for which the Bureau of Internal Revenue has published detailed data, those earning less than \$10,000 paid 62 percent of all income taxes. The smaller group in 1939, paid 18 percent of the total. Contrariwise, those in 1939 whose taxable net income was \$25,000 or over, paid roughly 65 percent of the total, in 1947 about 23 percent.

Second, the joint economic report is very illuminating on the relative ability of big and small businesses to pay increased corporate taxes—pages 54-55:

There is evidence that small business has not fully shared in profit bonanza since 1947.

\* \* \* All manufacturing corporations are classified into five groups according to the size of their total assets. \* \* \* Thus at the end of the second quarter of 1949 the five classes had sorted themselves out so that the level of their profits was a direct reflection of their relative size. The biggest corporation had the largest rate of profit, the smallest corporations had the smallest rate of profit. The three middle groups fell in between in the order of size. In the second half of 1949, the profit rates of the two groups with the highest volume of assets

\* \* \* rose while the profit rates of the three smallest groups fell.

In the postwar boom, when most goods were scarce, there was an unlimited market for everyone's goods. For the time being, the small businesses of this country did well. Their profit rates rose to levels as high or higher than those of the business glants. When this exceptional period of scarcity came to an end, big business was scarcely affected. The earnings rates of little concerns started downhill.

It is these economic facts that prove the wisdom of lightening the burden of taxation on small business, while increasing it on big business. Many thousands of small businesses will also benefit from the reduction of excise taxes. Whether it is considered from the standpoint of the stability of the economy, or the justice or relative tax loads, this bill deserves to be passed immediately.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that I have long been urging congressional action to substantially reduce, and in some instances to repeal entirely, the war-emergency excise taxes. I note with real satisfaction the proposal before us now incorporates a great many of the provisions included in the bill—H. R. 8765—which I personally introduced. I am, therefore, very glad to

speak in support of this measure and urge my colleagues to join with me in voting in favor of it.

We have today the opportunity to answer the American taxpayers' demands for relief from excessive taxes assessed against certain goods as wartime emergency measures to aid the war effort. These excise taxes have proved to be an unbearable handicap on the bowed shoulders of our already heavily overburdened taxpayers. They constitute a definite drag on legitimate business expansion and full employment.

Although they were supposed to be levied on luxuries only, I submit such a concept is obviously a hoax. Excise taxes are an unjust burden on every housewife, every family man, every career girl, every wage earner, every businessman, and almost every manufacturer.

Who will say that transportation is a luxury, that telephone and telegraph messages are luxuries, that baby toilet articles are luxuries, that women's cosmetics are a luxury, along with many other numerous items and services which carry the penalty of taxes for ordinary usages?

The war-emergency taxes have been patiently borne by our people for a period of 9 years, 5 of which are after the end of hostilities with both Germany and Japan. In the Revenue Act of 1945 reductions were made in corporation income taxes, the corporate excess-profits tax was repealed, and individual income taxes were somewhat reduced. Further reductions were made in the individual income taxes in the Revenue Act of 1948. However, the war-emergency excise taxes are still in effect at their wartime levels. Today you and I have the chance to correct this injustice being visited mainly on the ordinary man and woman in this country. I earnestly hope you will all take advantage of it.

I make this plea to you with full realization that we are faced with, and will perhaps face for a long time to come, an extraordinarily large and oppressive budget. This is due principally because of the cold war, lately becoming hotter, in which we are forced to engage. The United States is a competitor with a great foreign power that is bending all its resources to overtake us in technology and production and military effectiveness.

It is, therefore, vitally necessary for us to realistically confront the fact of gigantic expenditures for national security in self-defense. It is only at the peril of slavery that we can afford to fall behind in the race for world leadership with our competitor. Although the outlook is a grim one, I earnestly believe we can maintain our obligations, at home and abroad, and still, by this excise-taxrepeal action, extend a measure of tax relief to the American citizens. For the sake of a high American morale, in these threatening times, we must demonstrate to our own American people that we are not forgetting them.

I further believe we can accomplish this long-sought objective without endangering the national security or increasing the existing budget deficit. The

Rees Rich

Sadlak

Saylor

Shafer

Short

Stefan

Taber Talle Taylor

Velde

Kennedy Kilburn

Kunkel

Latham

Lodge

LeCompte

Lovre McConnell

McCulloch

McDonough

McMillen, Ill.

Mack. Wash.

Martin, Iowa Martin, Mass.

Macy Marshall

Mason

Nelson Nicholson

Nixon

Merrow

Meyer Michener Miller, Md.

Miller, Nebr.

Murray, Wis.

Norblad O'Hara, Minn.

O'Konski Patterson

Lichtenwalter

bill we are presently considering contains provisions for plugging up definite tax loopholes which will make up, in good amount, for the loss of revenue resulting from excise-tax reductions. Of course, as a natural corollary to reduction of excise taxes there should be, and there must be, a real reduction in Federal expenditures. The elimination of waste and extravagance in Government spending along with curtailment of nonessential Federal functions can and must be developed into reality in order to maintain the integrity of this country. As a member of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which considered the Hoover Commission recommendations, I have supported. and will continue to support, every Hoover proposal to sensibly save the American taxpayers' money and to see to it that he gets a dollar value service for the dollar he contributes. We have already enacted into law several of the Hoover suggestions, and I hope we will adopt a good many more of them before this Congress adjourns.

Of course, these deliberations this afternoon serve, as I stated many times before, to emphasize the absolute need of completely overhauling the tax system structure, and I earnestly hope effective action toward this objective will soon be initiated.

If we follow these tenets of a sound fiscal policy, we can forestall the Soviet strategy of sabotaging the American economy and, at the same time, demonstrate to the American taxpayers that the United States Congress exists primarily to promote the welfare of Americans first.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves to recommit the bill H. R. 8920 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report it back forthwith as two separate bills, the first bill containing those provisions relating to excise taxes and the second bill containing the remaining provisions of H. R. 8920.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 239, answered "present" 1, not voting 43, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 188] VEAS\_147

	11110-11
Allen, Calif.	Bishop
Allen, Ill.	Blackney
Anderson, Calif	. Boggs, Del.
Andresen,	Bolton, Ohio
August H.	Bramblett
Angell	Brehm
Arends	Brown, Ohio
Auchincloss	Byrnes, Wis.
Barrett, Wyo.	Canfield
Bates, Mass.	Case, N. J.
Beall	Case, S. Dak.
Bennett, Mich.	Chiperfield

Clevenger Cole, Kans. Cole, N. Y. Corbett Coudert Crawford Cunningham Curtis Dague Davis, Wis.

Dolliver	
Dondero	
Eaton	
Ellsworth	
Elston	*
Fenton	
Ford	
Fulton	
Gamble	
Gavin	
Golden	
Goodwin	
Graham	
Gwinn	
Hale	
Hall,	1000
Leonard	ıw.
Halleck	
Hand	
Harden Harvey	
Herter	
Heselton	
Hill	
Hoeven	
Hoffman.	Mich
Holmes	MAICH
Hope	
Horan	
James	
Jenison	
Jenkins	
Jennings	
Jensen	
Judd	
Kean	
Kearney	
Kearns	
Keating	

Abbitt

Abernethy

Addonizio

Albert Allen, La

Andrews

Aspinall

Bailey .

Baring

Barrett, Pa.

Beckworth

Bentsen

Blatnik

Bosone

Boykin

Brooks

Bryson

Burke

Burleson

Burnside

Byrne, N. Y.

Burton

Camp

Cannon

Carlyle

Carroll

Celler Chatham

Chesney

Clemente

Colmer

Combs

Cooley

Cooper

Crook

Crosser

Dawson

Delaney

Denton

Dollinger

Donohue

Deane

Davenport Davies, N. Y.

Davis, Ga. Davis, Tenn.

DeGraffenried

Klein

Cox

Christopher Chudoff

Chelf

Carnahan

Cavalcante

Brown, Ga.

Buchanan

Buckley, Ill.

Biemiller

Boggs, La. Bolling Bolton, Md.

Doughton Douglas Dovle Durham Eberharter Elliott Fallon Feighan Fernandez Flood Forand Frazier Bennett, Fla. Fugate Furcolo Garmatz Gary Gathings Gordon Gore Gorski Granahan Granger Grant Green Gregory Buckley, N. Y. Gross Guill Hagen Hardy Hare Harris Harrison Hart Havenner Hays, Ark. Hays, Ohio Hébert Hedrick

Pfeiffer, William L. Phillips, Calif. Potter Poulson Reed, Ill. Reed, N. Y. NAYS-239 Lane Engle, Calif. Lyle Heffernan Heller Herlong Hoffman, Ill. Holifield Howell Huber Jackson, Wash. Peterson
Jacobs Pfeifer,
Javits Joseph L. Jonas Jones, Ala. Pickett Jones, Mo. Jones, N. C. Poage Polk Powell Preston Karst Karsten Kee Price Kelly, N. Y. Priest Keogh Rabaut Kilday Rains King Kirwan Ramsav

Richlman Rogers, Mass. St. George Scott, Hugh D., Jr. Scrivner Sheppard Simpson, Ill. Simpson, Pa. Smith, Kans. Smith, Wis. Stockman Tollefson Towe Van Zandt Vorys Vursell Wadsworth Weichel Widnall

Wigglesworth Wilson, Ind. Wolcott Wolverton Woodruff Kruse Lanham Larcade Lind Linehan Lucas Lynch McCarthy McCormack McGrath McGuire McKinnon McMillan, S. C. McSweeney Mack, Ill. Madden Magee Mahon Mansfield Marcantonio Marsalis Miles Mills Monroney Morgan Morrison Morton Moulder Multer Murdock Murphy Murray, Tenn. Noland Norrel1 Norton O'Brien, Ill. O'Brien, Mich. O'Hara, Ill. O'Neill O'Sullivan O'Toole Pace Passman Patman Patten Perkins Philbin

Rankin

Redden

Regan Rhodes Stanley Whitaker White, Calif. White, Idaho Steed Sullivan Ribicoff Whitten Whittington Richards Robeson Tackett Rodino Tauriello Wickersham Rogers, Fla. Wier Teague Thomas Thompson Rooney Williams Roosevelt Wilson, Tex. Sabath Trimble Winstead Withrow Sadowski Underwood Secrest Vinson Smathers Smith. Va. Wagner Walsh Woodhouse Yates Spence Staggers Young Zablocki Walter Welch

# ANSWERED "PRESENT"-1

## Miller, Calif.

### NOT VOTING-43

Andersen.	Hall,	Quinn
H. Carl	Edwin Arthur	Rivers
Barden	Hinshaw	Sanborn
Bates, Ky.	Hobbs	Sasscer
Breen	Irving	Scott, Hardie
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Calif.	Shelley
Burdick	Johnson	Sikes
Dingell	Keefe	Sims
Engel, Mich.	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Ohio
Evins	Kerr	Stigler
Fellows	McGregor	Thornberry
Fogarty	Mitchell	Werdel
Gillette	Morris	Wheeler
Gilmer	Phillips, Tenn.	Wilson, Okla.
Gossett	Plumley	Wood

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Wilson of Oklahoma against.

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

Mr. Fellows for, with Mr. Barden against. Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Kerr against. Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. H. Carl

Andersen against. Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against. Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr.

Miller of California against. Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall for, with Mr. Gilmer

against. Mr. Sanborn for, with Mr. Sims against. Mr. Johnson for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

## Until further notice:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Burdick. Mr. Rivers with Mr. Werdel. Mr. Breen with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. JACKSON. If he were present he would have voted vote and vote "present." I withdraw my

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 375, nays 14, not voting 41, as follows:

## [Roll No. 189] YEAS-375

Abbitt Abernethy Addonizio Albert Allen, Calif.

Allen, Ill. Andrews Allen, La. Angell Anderson, Calif. Arends Andresen Aspinall August H.

Ford

Frazier

Fulton

Furcolo

Gamble

Garmatz

Gary Gathings

Golden

Goodwin

Gordon

Graham

Granger

Grant

Green

Guill

Hagen Hale

Halleck

Harden

Hardy

Harris

Hart Harvey

Harrison

Havenner

Hays, Ark. Hays, Ohio Hébert

Heffernan

Hedrick

Heller

Herlong

Herter Heselton Hill

Holifield

Holmes Hope Horan

Howell

Huber

Jacobs

James

Javits

Jenison

Jenkins

Jennings

Jensen Johnson

Jones, Ata. Jones, Mo.

Jones, N. C.

Jonas

Judd

Karst Karsten

Kearnev

Kearns Keating

Kelly, N. Y.

Kennedy

Keogh Kilburn

Kilday King

Kirwan

Klein

Kruse

Lane

Kunkel

Lanham

Latham

LeFevre

Linehan

Lodge

Lovre

Lucas

Lynch McCarthy McConnell

McCormack McCulloch

McDonough

McGrath

Spence

Staggers

Lind

LeCompte

Hull

Hoeven Hoffman, Ill.

Hare

Hall.

Gregory

Granahan

Gore Gorski

Bailey Baring Barrett, Pa. Barrett, Wyo. Bates, Mass. Battle Beall Beckworth Bennett, Fla. Bennett, Mich. Bentsen Biemiller Bishop Blackney Blatnik Boggs, Del. Boggs, La. Bolling Boiton, Md. Bolton, Ohio Bonner Bosone Boykin Bramblett Brehm Brooks Brown Ga. Brown Ohio Bryson Buchanan Buckley, Ill. Buckley, N. Y. Burke Burleson Burnside Burton Byrne, N. Y. Byrnes, Wis. Camp Canfield Cannon Carlyle Carnahan Carroll Case, N. J. Case, S. Dak. Cavalcante Celler Chatham Chelf Chesney Chiperfield Christopher Chudoff Clemente Clevenger Cole, Kans. Colmer Combs Cooley Cooper Corbett Cotton Coudert Cox Crawford Crook Crosser Cunningham Curtis Dague Davenport Davies, N. Y. Davis, Ga Davis, Tenn. Davis, Wis. Dawson DeGraffenried Delaney Denton D'Ewart Doilinger Dolliver Dondero Donohue Doughton Douglas Doyle Durham Eaton Eberharter Elliott Ellsworth Elston Engle, Calif. Evins Fallon Feighan Fellows Fenton Fernandez Fisher Flood

McGuire McKinnon McMillan, S. C. McMillen, Ill. McSweeney Mack, Ill. Mack, Wash Madden Magee Mahon Mansfield Marcantonio Marsalis Martin, Iowa Martin, Mass. Merrow Meyer Michener Miles Miller, Calif. Miller, Md. Miller, Nebr. Mills Monroney Morgan Morrison Leonard W. Moulder Multer Murdock Murphy Murray, Tenn. Murray, Wis. Nelson Nicholson Nixon Noland Norblad Norrell Norton O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill O'Sullivan O'Toole Pace Passman Patman Patten Patterson Perkins Pfeifer, Joseph L. Pfeiffer, William L. Jackson, Wash. Philbin Phillips, Calif. Pickett Poage Polk Potter Poulson Powell Preston Price Priest Rabaut Rains Ramsay Rankin Redden Reed, Ill. Rees Regan Rhodes Ribicoff Richards Riehlman Robeson Rodino Rogers, Fla. Rogers, Mass. Rooney Roosevelt Sabath Sadlak Sadowski St. George Savlor Scott, Hugh D., Jr. Scrivner Scudder Lichtenwalter Secrest Shelley Sheppard Short Simpson, Ill. Smathers Smith, Kans Smith, Va. Smith, Wis.

Velde Stefan Stockman Sullivan Wigglesworth Williams Vinson Vorys Vursell Sutton Willis Wilson, Ind. Tackett Wagner Talle Walsh Wilson, Tex. Winstead Withrow Tauriello Walter Weichel Taylor Teague Thomas Welch Whitaker Wolcott Wolverton White, Calif. White, Idaho Thompson Thornberry Woodhouse Woodruff Tollefson Whitten Yates Whittington Wickersham Young Trimble Underwood Van Zandt Widnall NAYS-14 Gwinn Hoffman, Mich. Morton Simpson, Pa. O'Hara, Minn. Taber Kean Marshall Reed, N. Y. Towe Wadsworth Mason Shafer NOT VOTING-41 Andersen, Hinshaw Rivers Hobbs H. Carl Sanborn Barden Irving Sasscer Bates, Kv. Jackson, Calif. Scott, Hardie Breen Bulwinkle Kelley, Pa. Sims Burdick Kerr McGregor Smith, Ohio Dingell Steed Macy Mitchell Stigler Werdel Engel, Mich. Fogarty Wheeler Wilson, Okla. Gillette Morris Peterson Phillips, Tenn. Gilmer Wood Gossett

So the bill was passed. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Plumley

## On this vote:

Edwin Arthur Quinn

Hall

Mr. Engel of Michigan for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

#### Until further notice:

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Wilson of Oklahoma with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Jackson of California. Mr. Dingell with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. McGregor Mr. Sims with Mr. Plumley

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Sanborn. Mr. Sikes with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee,

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Werdel

Mr. Breen with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the

#### RESCINDING THE PASSAGE OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 494

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 673, Rept. No. 2397). which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the action of the House in passing on June 27, 1950, the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend for 2 months the existing suspension of certain import taxes on copper" is hereby vacated and the Clerk of the House is hereby directed to request the Senate to return such joint resolution to the House.

### INVESTIGATION OF EXPLOSION AT SOUTH AMBOY, N. J.

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 643, Rept. No. 2398). which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed (1) to conduct a full and complete investigation to determine the cause or causes of the disastrous explosion which occurred at South Amboy, N. J., on May 19, 1950, and to determine whether negligence was involved on the part of the United States Coast Guard, and (2) on the basis of such investigation, to make such recommendations as it deems advisable for promoting greater safety in the transportation and shipment of high explosives and for preventing similar disasters in the future.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with it recommendations.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems neces-Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

RESCINDING PASSAGE OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 494 RELATING TO SUS-PENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 673) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the action of the House in passing on June 27, 1950, the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to extend for 2 months the existing suspension of certain import taxes on copper" is hereby vacated and the Clerk of the House is hereby directed to request the Senate to return such joint resolution to the House.

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

Mr. KEATING. I object, Mr. Speaker. Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly the action just taken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] had just offered his bill to vacate the consent request granted in the House 2 days ago to extend for 2 months the suspension of the excise tax of 2 cents a pound on imported copper.

This 60-day suspension was passed under very irregular circumstances because the bill was not referred to the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Doughton], was not even consulted. Furthermore, the gentleman from North Carolina had announced that hearings would be held by his committee to consider an extension of this suspension on July 10.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to a permanent lifting of the excise tax on copper. I am opposed to the unprincipled method by means of which the 60-day suspension bill was passed. The procedure was certainly undemocratic and unnecesary and to the best of my knowledge this is the first time a bill has been passed through the House in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, I only ask that the proper procedure of this House be upheld in the consideration of legislation. I deplore the methods which have been used and I hope the House will reconsider its action so that hearings can be held, the true picture of the copper situation presented, and the will of the House expressed in an open and aboveboard manner.

The present situation may well make it necessary to allow a limited extension of the suspension. However, let us have all the facts presented and then use our own best judgment in arriving at a decision. Let us make absolutely sure that if an extension is granted that such an extension will not become permanent. This is a tremendously important question and the facts should be made known to the American people and their representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I want the House to know that my main reason for making these remarks at this time is because I object to the undemocratic, unprincipled, and unfair way in which this 60-day suspension was passed.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues who are interested in the future of copper mining in the United States in protesting the action that was taken by the House on Wednesday, June 28, 1950, on House Joint Resolution 494. It is significant that the action was taken on this resolution near the end of a long day when all of the announced business of the House had been disposed of.

There is hardly a single Member of this body, including the author of the resolution referred to, who is not aware of the fact that any further suspension of the import tax on copper is a highly controversial subject.

The fact that the resolution was not even referred to a House Committee and acted upon almost immediately after it was introduced, without notice, and with only a handful of Members in attendance, is indeed regrettable. If legislation of vital concern to large segments of this country is to be handled under procedure that even a police court lawyer would shy away from, it is time that the country knew about it.

Bills to provide for further suspension of the copper tariff have been pending before the Ways and Means Committee for months. Hearings on these bills have been set by the committee for July 10. Everyone concerned with this problem was to have an opportunity to be heard. But the sponsors of legislation to further suspend the copper import tax could not wait for the opposition to be heard. They thought they would beat the gun by using this cute strategy in the hope of gaining some momentary advantage.

I have introduced a resolution similar to that sponsored by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Baring] which was objected to a few minutes ago by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keating].

I hope the Ways and Means Committee will act immediately to correct the injustice which has been done by this precipitous and unusual action. I am convinced that when the House has had an opportunity to hear both sides of this question, it will act in the interest of protecting the American copper miner and the critical metal which he produces. EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944), and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi

There was no objection.
The Clerk read the statement.
The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2373)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944), 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 paragraph 9 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a). as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Provided, That, except as provided in this amendment, no regulation or other purported construction of title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, shall be deemed consistent therewith which denies or is designed to deny to any eligible person, or limit any eligible person in, his right to select such course or courses as he may desire, during the full period of his entitlement or any remaining part thereof, in any approved educational or training institution or institutions, whether such courses are full time, part time, or correspondence courses: Provided further—
"'A. That the Administrator shall disap-

"A. That the Administrator shall disapprove a course in any institution which has been in operation for a period of less than one year immediately prior to the date of enrollment in such course unless such enrollment was prior to August 24, 1949, but this shall not require or permit the disapproval of (a) any course in a public school or other tax-supported school, (b) any course in an institution which has been in operation for a period of more than one year which does not completely depart from the whole character of the instruction previously given by such institution, or (c) any course in an institution which has been in operation for a period of more than one year, by reason of a change in the location of such institution from one point to another within the same

general locality: Provided, That upon the certification of any State approval agency, that a new or existing institution is essential to meet the requirements of veterans in such State, the Administrator in his discretion may approve such an institution notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph;

"B. That in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 (a) of this part, the Administrator may, for reasons satisfactory to him, disapprove a change of course of instruction, and may discontinue any course of education or training if he finds that according to the regularly prescribed standards of the institution the conduct or progress of such person is unsatisfactory;

"'C. That if any eligible veteran, who has completed or discontinued (for any reason other than unsatisfactory conduct or progress) a course of education or training, applies for an additional course in the same or any other field of education or training, the Administrator may deny initiation of such course only if he finds (1) that it is precluded by the first proviso, paragraph 1 of this part VIII, as amended, or (2) that it is not in the tame general field as his original educational or occupational objective, and that such veteran has already made one change from one general field to another, or (3) that it is precluded by limitation of paragraph D below: Provided, That, in any case in which the veteran has already made one change from one general field to another, the Administrator may require advisement and guidance before approving another such change, but where the Administrator requires such advisement and guidance and the veteran is not notified of the decision of the Administrator within forty-five days following the date of application for such change, such change shall be deemed to have been approved;

"'D. That the Administrator shall refuse approval to any course elected or commenced by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1. 1948, which is avocational or recreational in character. The following courses shall be presumed to be avocational or recreational in character: Dancing courses; photography courses; glider courses; bartending courses; personality-development courses; entertainment courses; music courses-instrumental and vocal; public-speaking courses; courses in sports and athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, and sports officiat-ing (except applied music, physical educa-tion, or public-speaking courses which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a course leading to an educational objective); but no such course shall be considered to be avocational or recreational in character if the veteran submits complete justification that such course will contribute to bona fide use in the veteran's present or contemplated business or occupation; and the Administrator may find any other course to be avocational or recreational in character, but no such other course shall be considered avocational or recreational in character when a certifi-cate in the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits by two competent disinterested persons has been furnished by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education or training will be useful to him in connection with earning a livelihood. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, education or training for the ose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation shall not, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, be considered avocational or recreational when a certificate in the form of an affidavit supported by corroborating affidavits by two competent disinterested persons, has been furnished by a physically qualified veteran stating that such education or training will be useful to him in connection with earning a livelihood.'

"SEC. 2. Paragraph 11 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph (d) as follows:

"'(d) As used in this part, the term "customary cost of tuition" or "customary charges" or "customary tuition charges" shall mean that charge which an educational or training institution requires a nonveteran enrollee similarly circumstanced to pay as and for tuition for a course, except that the institution (other than a nonprofit institution of higher learning) is not regarded as having a "customary cost of tuition" for the course or courses in question in the following circumstances:

"'(A) Where the majority of the enroll-ment of the educational and training institution in the course in question consists of veterans in training under Public Laws 16 and 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amend-

ed; and "'(B) One of the following conditions prevails:

"'1. The institution has been established subsequent to June 22, 1944.

"'2. The institution, although established prior to June 22, 1944, has not been in continuous operation since that date.

"'3. The institution, although established prior to June 22, 1944, has subsequently increased its total tuition charges for the course to all students more than 25 per centum.

"4. The course (or a course of substantially the same length and character) was not provided for nonveteran students by the institution prior to June 22, 1944.

"'For any course of education or training for which the educational or training institution involved has no customary cost of tuition, a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges for such course shall be determined by the Administrator. In any case in which one or more contracts providing a rate or rates of tuition have been entered into in two successive years, the rate established by the most recent contract shall be considered to be the customary cost of tuition notwithstanding the definition of "customary cost of tuition" as hereinbefore set forth. For the purpose of the preceding sentence "contract" shall include contracts under Public Law 16 (Seventy-eighth Congress, March 24, 1943), Public Law 346 (Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944), or any other agreement in writing on the basis of which tuition payments have been made from the Treasury of the United States. If the Administrator finds that any institution has no customary cost of tuition he shall forthwith fix and pay or cause to be paid a fair and reasonable rate of payment for tuition, fees, and other charges for the courses offered by such institution. Any educational or training institution which is dissatisfied with a determination of a rate of payment for tuition, fees, or other charges under the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, or with any other action of the Administrator under the amendments made by Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1950, shall be entitled, upon application therefor, to a review of such determination or action (including the determination with respect to whether there is a customary cost of tuition) by a board to be known as the "Veterans' Education Appeals Board" consisting of three members, appointed by the President. Members of the Board shall receive, out of appropriations available for administrative expenses of the Veterans' Administration, compensation at the rate of \$50 for each day actually spent by them in the work of the Board, together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall provide for the Board such stenographic, clerical, and other as-

sistance and such facilities and services as may be necessary for the discharge of its functions. Such Board shall be subject, in respect to hearings, appeals, and all other actions and qualifications, to the provisions of sections 5 to 11, inclusive, of the Administrative Procedure Act, approved June 11, 1946, as amended. The decision of such Board with respect to all matters shall constitute the final administrative determination. In no event shall the Board fix a rate of payment in excess of the maximum amount allowable under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. Nothing contained in these amendments shall in any way affect the provisions of the first proviso in paragraph 1 of this part VIII, as amended.

"'Any institution having a "customary cost of tuition" established under this part may revise and improve an existing course (or establish a new related course) of substantially the same length and character subject to the same customary cost of tui-tion: Provided, That nothing in the foregoing amendments shall be construed to affect adversely any legal rights which have ccrued prior to the date of enactment of the Veterans' Education and Training Amend-ment of 1950, or to affect payments to educational or training institutions under contracts in effect on such date: Provided further, That during negotiations for a contract, and during the pendency of any appeal which a school may make, the Veterans' Administration shall continue to make further payments to the school in such amount as the Administrator considers to be "fair and reasonable", but not less than 75 per centum of the most recent rate paid to the school.

'Any educational or training institution which has a contract covering any period subsequent to August 24, 1949, shall be entitled to a review by the Veterans' Education Appeals Board of the rate of tuition, fees and other charges established in such contract. Application for such review must be made within sixty days following the date of enactment of the Veterans' Education and Train-

ing Amendments of 1950.

"SEC. 3. Paragraph 5 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: 'And provided further, That for the purpose of applying the governing stat-utes and applicable regulations of the Veterans' Administration respecting the payment of tuition and other charges, in the case of nonprofit institutions, any institution shall be regarded as a nonprofit institution if it is exempt from taxation under paragraph (6), section 101, of the Internal Revenue Code, whether it was certified as such by the Bureau of Internal Revenue before or subsequent to June 22, 1944: And provided fur-ther, That for the purpose of applying the governing statutes and applicable regulations of the Veterans' Administration respecting the payment of tuition and other charges, any professional or graduate school which has been continuously affiliated with an educational institution since June 22, 1944, may elect to be subject to the nonresident tuition rates established for such educational institution, with respect to payments made for tuition during any school year beginning on or after August 1, 1949, even though the administrative function of such school is separate and distinct from that of the institution with which it is affiliated."

"Sec. 4. The third sentence of section 3 of Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, is hereby amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'or (4) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of proprietary institutions for furnishing education and training under the of part VIII of such Regulation and in the supervision of such institutions.'

"Sec. 5. That paragraph 11 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

(e) 1. In order to secure or retain approval to train veterans, any school operated for profit which, during any period, has fewer than twenty-five students, or one-fourth of the students enrolled (whichever is larger), paying their own tuition, in addi-tion to meeting all requirements of existing law, will be required to submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application, in form and contents prescribed by the State approving agency, set-ting forth the course or courses of training. The written application covering each course must include the following:

"'a. Title of the course and specific description of the objective for which given.
"b. Length of course.

"'c. A detailed curriculum showing subjects taught, type of work or skills to be learned, and approximate length of time to be spent on each.

"'d. A showing of educational and ex-perience qualifications of the instructors.

"'e. A description of space, facilities, and equipment used for the course.

'f. A statement of the maximum number of students proposed to be trained in the course at one time.

"'g. A statement of the educational pre-

requisite for such a course.

'2. The appropriate approving agency of the State or the Administrator may approve the application of such school when the school is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"'a. The curriculum and instruction are consistent in quality, content, and length with similar courses in the public schools or other private schools with recognized and

accepted standards.

"'b. There is in the school adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training. When approval is given, it shall state the maximum number authorized to be trained in each course.

'c. Educational and experience qualifications of the instructor are adequate as deter-

mined by the State approval agency.

"'d. Adequate records are kept to show attendance, progress, and conduct, with periodic report to be provided to the Veterans' Administration; and there are clearly stated and enforced standards of attendance, progress, and conduct.

"'e. Appropriate credit is given for previous training or experience, with training period shortened proportionately. No course of training will be considered bona fide as to a veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the course objective.

'f. A copy of curriculum as approved is provided to the veteran and the Veterans' Administration by the school.

'g. Upon completion of the training, the veteran is given a certificate by the school indicating the approved course, title, and length, and that the training was completed satisfactorily.

"'h. Such additional criteria established by the State approving agency as it may deem necessary for approval of schools training

veterans under this part.

'3. No new course, or additions to the capacity of an existing course, in any school operated for profit, shall be approved if the State approving agency shall determine that the occupation for which the course is in-tended to provide training is crowded in the State where the training is to be given and that existing training facilities are adequate.

"'4. The Veterans' Administration is not authorized to award benefits under this part if it is found by the appropriate State approving agency that the course offered by a school operated for profit fails to meet the applicable requirements of this subparagraph (e); but the findings of the State approving agency on such requirements shall be final.

"SEC. 6. Paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting '(a)' immediately after '6.', and adding the

following new subparagraph:

"'(b) For the purpose of this part, a trade or technical course, offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level, involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of thirty hours per week of attendance is required with not more than thirty minutes of rest period per day allowed. A course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of twenty-five hours per week net of instruction is required. provisions of the first sentence of this subparagraph shall not be applicable prior to July 1, 1951, in the case of any school or institution in which, for a period of one year immediately preceding the date of enactment of the Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1950, a minimum of twenty-five hours per week of attendance was required for any seek of attendance was required for a seek of ance was required for any course in compliance with regulations of the Veterans' Administration.

"SEC. 7. Paragraph 5 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting '(a)' immediately after '5.', and adding a new subparagraph (b) as follows:

"'(b) In any case where it is found that an overpayment to a veteran of subsistence an overpayment to a veteran of subsistence allowance (which overpayment has not been recovered or waived) is proved in a hearing before the Committee on Waivers of the appropriate Veterans' Administration regional office to be the result of willful or negligent failure of the school to report, as required by applicable regulation or contract, to the Veterans' Administration unauthorized or excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran, the amount of such overpayment shall, at the discretion of the Administrator, constitute a liability of the school for such failure to report, and may be recovered by an off-set from amounts otherwise due the school or in other appropriate action: Provided, That any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is received from the veteran. This amendment shall be construed as applying only to matters arising after the effective date of this amendment, and shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal action under any other statute.'

"SEC. 8. This Act shall become effective on the date of its enactment except that sections 5 and 6 shall become effective the first day of the third calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 9. The matter beginning with the first proviso in the item 'Readjustment benefits' under the caption 'Veterans' Administration' in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, approved August 24, 1949, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 10. This Act may be cited as the 'Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1950'."

And the House agree to the same.

John E. Rankin,
A. Leonard Allen,
Olin E. Teague,
Bernard W. Kearney,
GLENN R. Davis,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
LISTER HILL,
PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
WAYNE MORSE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944), submit the following statement in explanation of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

#### SECTION 1

Section 1 of the bill has been amended to generally conform to the version as approved by the House. Language was agreed upon which provides that nothing in this section or in this act shall be construed in any manner so as to change the cut-off date of July 25, 1951, now provided in the law. While it was not the intention of the Senate in originally passing the bill to affect this date, nor in the House committee in reporting the measure, the language contained in the conference report leaves no doubt on this subject.

The provision contained in Public Law 266 requiring the disapproval of any course in an institution which has been in operation for a period of less than 1 year immediately prior to the date of enrollment, unless such enrollment was prior to August 24, 1949, was not in conflict between the two Houses and thus is unchanged. Certain exceptions are made, however, to provide that this ban shall not apply or permit the disapproval of any course in a public school or any tax-supported school or in any course in an institution which has been in operation for more than 1 year which course does not depart completely from the whole character of instruction previously given by such institu-tion. Exception is also made for any course in an institution which has been in operation for more than 1 year but which has changed its location from one point to another within the same general locality. These changes were agreed upon by the conferees since they are clearly within the intent and meaning of the law and since it has been found that many institutions have moved from one place to another in the same general locality and by reason of such move have been denied approval.

The Senate conferees have agreed to the technical changes made in the language permitting the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at his discretion, to approve schools which have been in existence for less than 1 year, upon approval and certification by State approval agencies that a new or existing institution is essential to meet the requirements for training veterans in a State. This authority is completely discretionary. It is not mandatory. The Administrator is not required to approve such a school even though it has been recommended and approved by a State approval agency. In other words, the findings of the need for a new or existing institution must be concurred in by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order for this provision to be operative.

In the opinion of the managers, the training of veterans and the taking of future courses by veterans has been considerably tightened over the version originally passed by the Senate. The language in the conference report provides that the Administrator may deny initiation of any course only if he finds (1) that the veteran is not eligible by reason of the July 25, 1951, cut-off date, or (2) that it is not in the same general field as his original educational or occupational objective and that such veteran has already made one change from one general field to another, or (3) that it is precluded by reason of the fact that it has been found to be avecational or regrestional in character.

avocational or recreational in character.

Thus under this paragraph, a veteran who entered training at any time since the en-

actment of the original law, June 22, 1944, who is receiving education or training under the act and has had one change of course from one general field to another and who applies for a change of course which is not in the same general field as his original educational or occupational objective, cannot make the second change without the approval of the Administrator. For example, if a veteran has been preparing for a medical career and decides to drop his studies in this field and begin the study of law, assuming he has not had a previous change, he could begin the study of law. But should he at some future date decide to study for the ministry and drop his law preparation, he would be precluded without the approval of the Administrator from taking any such course under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

On April 1, 1950, the Administrator issued a regulation providing that a veteran must have commenced and actually be pursuing his course of training on July 25, 1951, and remain continuously in this training except for periods of vacation or for other reasons beyond his control. In other words, if the veteran is not in training on that date, he is precluded from taking any training or additional training under the act.

The Administrator has subsequently made two exceptions to this general rule: One applies in the case of teachers who take work during summer-school sessions in order to obtain graduate degrees. In such cases the Administrator has ruled that a teacher, as long as he is engaged in graduate level work and remains in the teaching profession, may continue to take consecutive summer-school work after July 25, 1951, to the extent of his entitlement. The second exception relates to applicants for medical and dental schools who are not admitted due to failure of an approved medical or dental school to accept the veteran's application for enrollment. In such cases, where the veteran continues to apply for admission and is accepted subsequent to July 25, 1951, he will be permitted to continue his training as long as his entitlement continues.

The conference agreement is not intended in any way to change the Veterans' Administration regulation issued on April 1, 1950, as described above governing training on and after July 25, 1951.

The conference committee also has inserted language providing that, where a veteran has already made one change from one general field to another, the Administrator may require advisement and guidance before approving such change but where advisement and guidance is required and the veteran is not notified of the decision of the Administrator within 45 days following the date of application for such change, the change shall be deemed to have been approved.

This provision is not intended, however, to permit the veteran, after advisement and guidance has been ordered, to defeat its purpose by failing to appear at the time required for advisement and guidance or otherwise failing to cooperate in receiving this service. This amendment is intended solely to provide that advisement and guidance be given promptly where required and that a decision as to whether or not the change may be rendered within 45 days from the date of the application for the change. Evidence has been presented to the effect that the procedure for advisement and guidance has resulted in much delay. It is the opinion of the conference that 45 days is an adequate time within which to process an application for a change of course.

for a change of course.

Subsection D of section 1 was not in conflict between the two Houses. This section lists the courses which are presumed to be avocational and recreational in character but provides that such courses shall not be so construed if the veteran submits complete justification that such course vill contrib-

ute to the bona fide use in his present or contemplated business or occupation. This section conforms to Public Law 266 of the Eighty-first Congress. The enactment is not intended to require or permit the discontinuance of any school now in existence and operating in this field which meets present Veterans' Administration and State approval agency requirements and standards for approval and operation.

Subsection D of section 1 gives the Administrator authority to declare "other courses" to be avocational or recreational in character. The authority conferred by this subsection should be interpreted and applied in context: It is intended that this authority be used to classify as avocational or recreational only those courses similar to, or of the same general character as, those courses specifically listed in the subsection. It is not intended that the classification avocational or recreational shall be applied to all courses regardless of their nature.

#### SECTION 2

Section 2 relates to the customary cost of tuition and to other charges required by educational institutions for the training of veterans under this act. Much of the language contained in this section will replace that contained in Public Law 266, Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1950. law provides that in any case in which one or more contracts providing for a rate of tuition have been executed for two successive years, the rate established by the most recent contract will be considered the customary cost of tuition. The conferees amended this language to provide that where one or more contracts have been "entered into in" two successive years, in order to remove any ambiguity which might have This would have the effect of freezexisted. ing the tuition rates as prescribed by the most recent contract as the customary cost of tuition.

The provisions of section 2 apply to all courses which were covered by contract or other agreement, without respect to the calendar duration established or the weekly hours of attendance required for such courses. It is also intended that where a contract includes tuition, fees, or other charges for a course, such contract shall be considered as an entity in determining the rate or rates to be paid to the institution for such course.

Under the terms of Public Law 266, a Veterans' Tuition Appeals Board, consisting of three members appointed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, was created to hear the complaint of any school which was dissatisfied with the determination of the rate of payment for tuition fees and other charges. This section creates a Veterans' Education Appeals Board which replaces the present Veterans' Tuition Appeals Board. The information of the conference is that the present Board, while in receipt of numerous appeals, has delayed action pending final consideration of this legislation. Cases pending before the present Board would be transferred and decided by the new Board. The conferees agreed to give the new Board

The conferees agreed to give the new Board authority to review any contract entered into by any education or training institution which covered a period subsequent to August 24, 1949, the effective date of Public Law 266 of the 81st Congress. Thus, if a school had entered into a contract on January 1, 1949, which expired October 30, 1949, and was dissatisfied with its provisions, a review and appeal of the contract could be had before the Veterans' Education Appeals Board. On the other hand, any contract which expired prior to August 24, 1949, would not be covered by this provision. Application for such review must be made within 60 days of the enactment of this act.

The new Board is to consist of three members appointed by the President and is to be an independent board. Board members

are to be paid from administrative expenses of the Veterans' Administration, and the Administrator is directed to provide such stenographic and clerical assistance and facilities as may be necessary for the discharge of the functions of the Board. It is provided that the decision of the Board with respect to all matters coming within its jurisdiction shall be the final administrative determination. It would not of course have jurisdiction over the determination as to whether a veteran was eligible in the first place for training under this act, or other matters primarily affecting the veteran. An appeal of this sort would be processed through the existing Board of Veterans' Appeals. It is not intended that the juris-diction of the Veterans' Education Appeals Board created by this act shall in any way conflict with or infringe upon the jurisdiction of the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

The Veterans' Education Appeals Board shall in its independent judgment promulgate rules and regulations governing its own operations and determine all disputes between the schools and the Veterans' Administration which this act authorizes the Board to review. In the proper exercise of its review function, and on the basis of the administrative record of the hearing, the Board shall take cognizance of, but shall not be bound by, such regulations as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may have issued or issue for implementing the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. For example, regulations which prescribe the method of computing fair and reasonable payments to schools. However, the Board shall have the authority to determine which of these regulations are applicable to the facts in the given case and whether the application of such regulations would result in fixing a rate of payment which, in fact, was not fair and reasonable in the opinion of the Board. The Board in rendering its decision shall give careful consideration to long-established policies and decisions of the Administrator but shall not be bound with respect to any regulation or decision of the Administrator or other official of the Veterans' Administration construing the provisions of any statute. since this would result in curtailing the jurisdiction of the Board in rendering independent decisions as contemplated under this

A provision was included that nothing contained in this section creating the Board shall in any way affect the provisions that provide that training under this act must be initiated on or before July 25, 1951.

One of the House amendments provided that the Veterans' Administration should continue to make payments to a school while the school and the Veterans' Administration were negotiating a new contract. The House provision provided originally that the payments should be such an amount as found by the Administrator to be fair and reasonable. The conferees have accepted this language, and have included a provision that in no event shall less than 75 percent of the most recent rate paid the school constitute a fair and reasonable minimum. This is the figure now paid to institutions of higher learning during the conduct of negotiations, and it is believed fair to extend this same rate to all schools concerned.

In carrying out the provisions of this section, it is intended that the Veterans Administration shall make these payments to the institutions in prompt and regular installments. When a contract is finally negotiated, the contract rate agreed upon shall apply and be paid for the whole of the contract period, and not just for that portion of the contract period remaining on the date on which the contract is agreed to.

## SECTION 3

Section 3 provides a method for determining whether or not a school shall be regarded

as a nonprofit institution. It was provided in both versions of this act that any institution shall be regarded as a nonprofit institution if it is exempt from taxation under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The Senate conferees agreed to accept a House provision providing that any professional or graduate school which has been continuously affiliated with an educational institution since the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act may be subject to non-resident-tuition rates established for the parent educational institution, even though the administrative function of the affiliated school is separate and distinct from the parent institution.

#### SECTION 4

Section 4 authorizes payments to the States for rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of proprietary institutions for furnishing education and training under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. This section is contained in both the House and Senate bills and only a technical amendment was added. It conforms to the practice under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1943 which governs the education and training of service-connected disabled veterans.

#### SECTION 5

Section 5 generally conforms to recommendation 7 which accompanied the message of the President of February 13, 1950 (H. Doc. 466), calling for the enactment of legislaprescribing minimum standards for profit schools. The Senate version contained no such standards and the House amendment has been accepted with modifications. Amendments were agreed upon in the conference which provide that schools making application to train or to continue to train veterans in submitting their written application should file such application in the form and contents prescribed by the State approving agency. Authority is also granted the State approving agency to provide such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary for approval of schools training veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

The conferees agreed on elimination of one of the standards originally suggested which would have required that the salaries of teachers and administrative personnel be comparable to the prevailing salary rates of teachers and administrative personnel in similar schools located in the same area. This standard was deleted since it was believed that adequate control of this factor is being achieved under present policies and procedures.

Language was also added which provides that the State approving agency rather than the Veterans' Administration shall make final decision as to whether or not the private school meets the requirements set forth in the standards.

One of the suggested standards contained in the President's message to the Congress provided that no new course or additions to the capacity of existing courses should be approved, if the State approving agency acting in consultation with the State employment service determines that the occupation for which the course is intended to provide training is crowded nationally and in the State and locality where training is to be given, or that existing training facilities are more than adequate to meet the demand. The bill as passed by the House did not contain the requirement for the occupation to be crowded nationally but restricted it to States and localities. The conferess further restricted it to the State in which the veteran is training.

## SECTION 6

Recommendation 6 made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to accompany the President's message, mentioned above, urged the enactment of legislation requiring

a minimum of 36 hours of attendance in those courses which are customarily learned through apprenticeship. The Veterans' Ad-ministration regulation in effect today requires 25 hours. The bill as passed by the House included a requirement of 30 hours while the Senate version was silent on this subject. The conferees have agreed to accept the House version with an amendment that the requirement for 30 hours per week of attendance shall not apply until after July 1, 1951, to any school which has been operating on the 25-hour schedule in accordance with the regulation for a period of at least 1 year immediately preceding the date of enactment of the act. In other words, schools which have been operating at a required attendance level of 25 hours per week in accordance with regulations of the Veterans' Administration and which have been in existence for 1 year prior to the enactment of this law may continue to operate at such 25-hour level until July 1, 1951, when 80 hours will be required. This would be applicable both to courses in existence at the time of enactment of this act as well as any new courses instituted by such schools.

#### SECTION 7

This section contained only in the House bill further carries out recommendation 5 accompanying the President's message to assure that schools will make prompt reports to the Veterans' Administration when enrolled veterans discontinue, interrupt, or fail to report their courses, with suitable penalties for failure to comply. This is expected to greatly reduce the volume of overpayments of subsistence to individual veterans and the Senate conferees agreed to accept this section without change. A hearing is provided before the Committee on Walvers of the Veterans' Administration.

At the hearing before the Committee on Waivers provided for by this section, the school or schools involved shall be given opportunity to appear and present evidence bearing upon the question as to whether or not the overpayment resulted from the willful or negligent failure of the school to submit the reports required by this section.

In the case of any overpayment to a veteran, the Veterans' Administration shall continue to make every reasonable effort to recover the amount of such overpayment from the veteran, and to reimburse the schools wherever possible.

## SECTION 8

This section provides for sections 5 and 6 to become effective the first day of the third calendar month following the date of en-actment. The remainder of the sections shall be effective from the date of enactment.

## SECTION 9

The provisions in Public Law 266, which now govern many of the subjects contem-plated by this act, are repealed effective the date of enactment of this act. Previously the provision had been in both bills that it would be repealed August 24, 1949.

JOHN E. RANKIN, A. LEONARD ALLEN, OLIN E. TEAGUE, BERNARD W. KEARNEY, GLENN R. DAVIS, Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House instead of the report be dispensed with.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to take some time to explain some of the provisions of the conference report?

Mr. RANKIN. It is a unanimous report

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, it may be, but it does deal with subjects which came up in connection with appropriations for the Independent Offices Appropriation bill, and I think there should be a matter of record as to some of the things this does before consent is given. I have no objection to dispensing with the further reading of the statement, but I would like to have the chairman answer a couple of questions as to what the report does.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there will be objection unless the chairman answers some questions.

Mr. RANKIN. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], to answer the questions of the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. What does the conference report do with respect to the absentee problem which was so flagrant that it appeared in the testimony given before the Committee on Appropriations, that the Government would be called upon to pay a great deal of subsistence and tuition for enrollees who actually did not appear in school, and even when they did make a first appearance they subsequently were seldom to be found in the class rooms or in attendance.

Mr. TEAGUE. The Senate accepted the House amendment that schools be held responsible for such payment as the gentleman has mentioned. I will quote from the bill:

(b) In any case where it is found that an overpayment to a veteran of subsistence allowance (which overpayment has not been recovered or waived) is proved in a hearing before the Committee on Waivers of the appropriate Veterans' Administration regional office to be the result of willful or negligent failure of the school to report, as required by applicable regulation or contract, to the Veterans' Administration unauthorized or excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the veteran, the amount of such overpayment shall, at the discretion of the Administrator, constitute a liability of the school for such failure to report, and may be recovered by an off-set from amounts otherwise due the school or in other appropriate action: Provided, That any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is received from the veteran. This amendment shall be construed as applying only to matters arising after the effective date of this amendment, and shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal action under any other

It is in almost exactly the same form the President recommended. We did give a school the right of appeal to the committee on waivers of the appropriate Veterans' Administration regional office.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it does require the schools to report attendance?

Mr. TEAGUE. It does.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And it permits the Government to deduct where the schooling was not actually given?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; provided the committee on waivers of the Veterans' Administration regional office approves.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is aware, of course, that in some instances absenteeism ran to 30 percent of the alleged enrollees?

Mr. TEAGUE. I am aware of that. I am also aware of the fact that if the student drops out of school on the second day of the month the Veterans' Administration does pay him in some cases for the full month, regardless of when it is reported.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the conference report then protect the Government?

Mr. TEAGUE. I think the report protects the Government amply.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. does the report do with reference to the recognizing of schools as to standards? Does it have any protection for the Gov-ernment there? Does the State agency or the Veterans' Administration in any way check the qualifications?

Mr. TEAGUE. The State agency must approve the standards of the school before the school is recognized to accept GI

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman perfectly satisfied with the conference report?

Mr. TEAGUE. It is almost the same as it passed the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted. I voted for it when it was before the House.

Mr. TEAGUE. I know you did, and I sincerely appreciate the help you gave all the way through.

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

There was no objection. Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the

EXTENSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3776) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2354)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3776) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent

Act, as amended, 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 section 1 (b) of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 45-1601 (b)), is hereby amended by striking out 'June 30, 1950' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 31, 1951, unless the Congress shall by joint resolution insert a later date'.

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the

following new subsection:

"'(5) (a) After June 30, 1950, the provisions of this Act shall not apply to, and no maximum rent ceiling or minimum service standards shall be prescribed for, any furnished nonhousekeeping housing accommodations which are rented as rooms without kitchen privileges or facilities for cooking (but not in a suite of two or more rooms), and when and for such period as any of the housing accommodations in any building used as a rooming house are decontrolled un-der this paragraph (a) the provisions of this Act shall not apply to, and no maximum rent ceilings or minimum service standards shall be prescribed for, such building.

"'(b) After June 30, 1950, self-contained family units (as defined by regulations issued by the Administrator) located in hotels shall continue to be housing accommodations subject to maximum rent ceilings and minimum service standards unless the Administrator issues an order decontrolling them, or any of them, which he shall issue if he finds that such hotel is primarily engaged in furnishing accommodations for transients.'

"SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided further, That the Administrator may by order adjust the maximum rent ceiling or minimum service standard hereunder although the landlord fails to produce evidence of facts occurring in the period from January 1, 1941, to December 31, 1945, if the landlord proves circumstances which in the opinion of the Administrator excuse the failure to produce evidence of such facts'

And the House agree to the same. JOHN L. MCMILLAN. T. G. ABERNETHY, Jos. P. O'Hara, Managers on the Part of the House.

ESTES KEFAUVER. EDWARD L. LEAHY, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Managers on the Part of the Senate.

## STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3776) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The conferees have agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for clerical changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference.

The Senate bill added a new subsection (5) (a) to section 2 of the District of Co-lumbia Emergency Rent Act, decontrolling furnished nonhousekeeping housing accom-

modations which are rented as rooms without kitchen privileges or facilities for cooking (but not in a suite of two or more rooms). and decontrolling any building in which all of the housing accommodations consist of rooms so decontrolled. The House amendment contained a similar provision and also provided that where rooms or accommodations are decontrolled under the new subsection (5) (a), the building in which the rooms or accommodations are located should also be decontrolled. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the House amendment in principle, rewriting the provisions relating to decontrol of buildings under subsection (5) (a) to make it clear that where any housing accommodations in a building used as a rooming house are decontrolled under subsection (5) (a) the building should also be decontrolled.

The House amendment amended the provision of section 5 (b) (2) of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act which places certain limitations on evictions by cooperatives, so as to remove those limitations in the case of housing accommodations renting for more than \$85 per month. No similar provision was contained in the Senate provision.

The provision of the House amendment terminating rent control at the close of January 31, 1951, unless Congress by joint resolution fixes a later date, was retained in the conference substitute.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN, T. G. ABERNETHY, Jos. P. O'HARA, Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain what difference there may be between the provisions of the conference report and the bill as passed by the House?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina, The only difference is that the House, as the gentleman will remember, passed the bill terminating rent control on January 31, 1951, and the other body terminated rent control on the same date as the national bill, namely December 31; also with the provision that the individual States might continue rent control for 6 months longer; in the discretion of the governor. The House made it necessary for the Congress itself to continue rent control in the District of Columbia after January 31. If in its discretion it feels that rent control is necessary.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the power of the Congress as provided in the House bill, to extend or to allow it to terminate in the District of Columbia remain in the Congress?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is clear that the Congress is the governing body in the District of Columbia?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## KOREA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's firm stand on Korea has been almost unanimously applauded in Congress. The use of American planes and ships in support of a United Nations resolution was a bold step that will hearten the small non-Communist nations of the world and will weaken Russia's prestige, even among her own satellites.

It is my opinion that Russia would not dare risk war now. It is clear that Russia encouraged the northern Koreans to make the attack. They have been arming them and supplying them just for such an attack. But the Russians did not want to provoke a war, they just wanted to find out how far they could go without stirring up firm resistance.

Now they know. They know that the United States will resist any direct act of aggression made by a Communist state against its neighbors.

Russia will be forced to back down. just as she backed down in Berlin, in Greece, in Turkey and in Iran.

All in all, the northern Korean attack on southern Korea may turn out to be a set-back for the Communists and a victory for us.

For one thing, it may unify the people of America in support of our foreign policy. It is amazing now to remember that a few short months ago a bill for aid to Korea was defeated in the House of Representatives, and was finally passed only after a strong fight by those who saw the danger in abandoning our friends to the tender mercies of the Communists.

I was one of those who fought for aid to Korea on the floor of the House both times it was up for consideration. I believe that what I said then is as true today as when I said it. Let me repeat a couple of paragraphs:

The issue of Korea is not a distant issue. Korea may be thousands of miles away, but it is close to the interests of every American. It is close to our interests because it is one of the many complicated situations which affect the peace of the world, and whether we are to have peace in our time, or war in our time, is a question that no American can treat with indifference.

The question is not one of altruism and idealism; it is a question of vital concern to every one of us. Our own interests are at stake, for it is in our interest to see that free, peace-loving nations can maintain their independence in the face of internal Communist terrorism and external Communist threats. If such nations can remain free, our position in the world will be much more secure and the chances for peace will be much brighter.

That is what I said February 7 on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I still believe that it is true.

I said a while ago that Russia probably would not go to war now, and that the Korean attack might turn out to be a set-back for the Communists. I believe these statements are true, but at the same time let us not overlook a few other facts that are not so pleasant.

Let us bear in mind that Russia has 147 divisions under arms. That is over two and a half million men-many, many times the strength of our own Army. And that figure does not include her air force and her vastly expanded navy.

Russia has opened 10 new nava! bases

in the Baltic area, 10 in Poland, and

several in the Far East.

If Russia would enter the war now she would have an immediate advantage in Europe and Asia. What Russia lacks is the industrial capacity to sustain a long war. I do not believe she will risk war until she builds up her production to a safe point. But I do not rule out the possibility that she might decide to gamble on a quick victory.

Even if Russia does not openly enter the war on the side of North Korea, our

task still will not be easy.

We will continue to have several other

parts of the world to worry about.

Indochina is one of the worst spots. There Ho Chi Minh, Communist leader, is disputing the authority of the independent native government recently recognized by the French and American Governments. He is fighting both the French and Bao Dai, the leader of the government we recognized.

I was one of the five Congressmen from the United States who first met with Bao Dai's cabinet to talk over arrangements for settling the conflict in that war-torn country. We were interested in backing a true independence movement that would force communism out of Indochina. The Communist newspapers called us the five tentacles of imperialism that were stretching into Asia.

The Communists threw two hand grenades into a building across the street from us when we were standing on the sidewalk. They wounded some Frenchmen. Here in Indochina is where quite a bit of the money has been going that we gave to France.

Reliable reports say that Bao Dai's opponent-Ho Chi Minh-is receiving aid from Communist China, just across

the border.

If Ho Chi Minh should receive enough aid to take over all of Indochina, the Communists would be in possession of one of the key areas of southeast Asia, and would be in a position to threaten the nearby Philippines, Malaya, Indonesia, Burma, and India.

Eight hundred million people would be

close to their grasp.

If we can stabilize these two areas-Indochina and Korea—we would be rid of two of the most disturbing situations

threatening world peace.

As I said before, the President's decision on Korea has been almost uni-versally applauded. But mixed with that applause were a few questions. For one thing, some people wondered why we did not use the same tactics in Greecewhere we finally won-or in Chinawhere we finally lost.

I think you can see the answer to that one without much difficulty. The situation in Korea is entirely different from

the others we were faced with.

The northern Korean attack on South Korea was a clear case of external aggression—the armed forces of one state invaded the territory of another state. It was clearly an illegal act calling for action under the United Nations Charter, and no amount of Russian interpretating could make it anything else. As a matter of fact when the question came up in the Security Council Russia was not around, which made it much more convenient for us. If Russia had not gone away mad a few months ago, she would have vetoed any action the Council tried to take against Communist North Korea.

But the affair was so obviously a case of aggression that, even if Russia had been around to use her veto, our military action would have been perfectly

legal and proper.

In the case of Greece and China, the Communists were revolutionists within the nations concerned, even though they received aid and encouragement from Russia. We could send supplies and other aid—as the Russians were doing-but we could not give direct military aid to the governments we backed without interfering in the internal affairs of another countrysomething that is illegal and would be setting a dangerous precedent. If we did such a thing, it would give Russia a legal right to give direct aid to Red insurgents in any of her neighbors. did work through the United Nations in Greece, however.

Many of the superficial critics of our foreign policy completely overlook that factor. It is not a factor to be ignored.

In China, we had an additional complication. The Nationalists' government was simply too corrupt and too weak to use the aid we gave them. We made repeated efforts to persuade the Nationalist leaders to institute reforms, but they would not be reformed. They continued to enhance their personal fortunes at the expense of American military and economic aid, while the Communists continued to advance against their poorly equipped and demoralized troops.

There was nothing the United States could do. Nationalist China was dying from internal decay. We had to concentrate our efforts elsewhere, in areas where there was some hope of success.

China has been lost, with the exception of Formosa. But now a definite line has been drawn. The Communists have been warned; this far, and no farther. In no other region of the worldwith the possible exception of Indochina-can the Communists acquire more territory and pretend that they are doing so because of internal unrest. From now on, any Communist expansion will be considered an act of aggression, and will be treated as such by the United States.

Other nations have adopted the same attitude. Britain, France, and Australia have followed the American example and have committed themselves to use force against Communist aggression. They have already dispatched some of their forces to the trouble spots.

If the same attitude had been taken against the Axis powers in the 1930's, World War II might have been avoided.

The situation is grave. It is full of danger. But I am confident that we are doing what is necessary to increase our chances of peace.

If you are in the path of a forest fire you might be safer—temporarily—if you would curl up in a hollow log and go to sleep. But in the long run you would run a good risk of being barbecued. In the long run, you would be far better off if you would get to work and build a firebreak.

Our foreign policy has a similar objective. We want to build a firebreak against Communist aggression.

I think we are going about it in the right way, and I think President Truman is to be congratulated on his firm and courageous stand.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY NURSERIES

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3258) to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2374)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3258) to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia, 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 section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize and direct the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of schoolage and under-school-age children, and for other purposes', approved July 16, 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out 'until June 30, 1950, and no longer' and inserting in lieu thereof 'until June 30, 1953, and no

"Sec. 2. Section 3 of such Act is amended

to read as follows:
"'SEC. 3. The Board is authorized to make and enforce rules and regulations governing admission to and use and enjoyment of said nurseries and nursery schools, including the fixing of fees to be charged parents for care and maintenance therein of their children; which fees shall, as near as practicable, equal the expenditures of the District of Columbia for personal services, labor, food, and supplies in the operation and maintenance of such nurseries and nursery schools or to enter into contracts with any private or pub-lic agency or agencies for such care and maintenance: Provided, That the Board may, in cases where parents are unable to pay for such care waive all or part of such fees. All fees collected under the provisions of this Act shall be paid to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia and deposited into the Treasury of the United States to

the credit of an account to be known as "Miscellaneous trust-fund deposits, District of Columbia—Day Care Nurseries", said fund to be available, in addition to appropriations made pursuant to section 4 of this Act, for expenditure for the purposes of this Act: Provided further, That such fund shall be audited and disbursed in the same manner as other trust funds are audited and disbursed by the District of Columbia: And provided further, That any balance remaining in such trust-fund account after June 30, 1953, shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts of the District of Columbia.'

"SEC. 3. Section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, not exceeding \$100,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.'

"SEC. 4. Section 2 of this Act shall take effect upon enactment."

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN L. McMILLAN, W. K. GRANGER,

Managers on the Part of the House. LESTER C. HUNT, ESTES KEFAUVER, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Managers on the Part of the Senate.

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3258) to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The conferees have agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for clerical changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House amendment and the sub-

stitute agreed to in conference.

The Senate bill would have continued the present system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia on a permanent basis. The House amendment would have continued such system until June 30, 1951, and no longer. The substitute agreed upon in conference continues such system until June 30, 1953.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN, W. K. GRANGER, Managers on the Part of the House.

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

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. I

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I understand it, this program is still on a temporary basis and is to run for 3 years.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. That is correct, with the understanding that the Commissioners will place this program on a self-sustaining basis within the next 3 years.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, the gentleman will remember that this was a wartime measure originally.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And it was not expected to last beyond the duration of the war.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And here we are, 5 years after the war, extending it for another 3 years. I doubt the wisdom of that extension. I had hoped the extension would be for only one more year.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. We held out as long as we could for a 1-year extension, but we had to compromise somewhere, so we compromised on 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the

### RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5002, an act to incorporate the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amend-

ment as follows:

Page 4, line 8, strike out "assist in" and insert "promote."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SECTION 14 (B) OF THE FED-ERAL RESERVE ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3527) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right, may I ask the gentleman from Kentucky to briefly explain

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill continues in effect a power now possessed by the Federal Reserve to purchase directly from the Treasury obligations of the Government. It will prevent the Treasury from maintaining large balances, and will afford an available source of funds for emergent needs.

This power has been very sparingly used. The last time this power was continued it was continued for 3 years. This bill continues it for an additional 2 years. I think it was used only once this year. It was used twice last year, and for 3 or 4 years before that it was not used at all. It is only used to make up deficiencies in the Treasury before tax time, and the securities which they purchase are often for 1 day or 2 days-short-time securities that it would be very advantageous to have a market for. Otherwise, there would have to be a flotation of securities in the market.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will

the gentleman yield? Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The present law expires when, unless this is extended?

Mr. SPENCE. It expires June 30. Mr. McCORMACK. At least in a few

Mr. SPENCE. Yes. It expires tomorrow, and it would then be exhausted.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield. Mr. RABAUT. Does this come from the committee with a unanimous report? Mr. SPENCE. This is the unanimous

report from the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 12, sec. 355), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1952" and by striking out "June 30, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1952."

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

House Resolution 684 was laid on the

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Samuel F. Pryor, vice president of Pan-American Airways.

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

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an address by Mrs. St. George.

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

include extraneous matter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a quotation by famous Americans on liberty.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given perm'ssion to extend his remarks and in-

clude extraneous matter.

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

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

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

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

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

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an address by the President of the United States.

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

Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a speech.

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

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

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Secretary of Defense

Mr. GORSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a speech by James A. Farley.

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

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

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous ma-

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from an address by the Canadian Minister of Fi-

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

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution from the American

Cotton Shippers' Association. Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

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

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

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include appropriate mate-

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

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Herald-Tribune

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$205.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include an address by Hon. Frank FELLOWS.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he made on the Town Meeting of the Air program on Tuesday

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include several short addresses.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Harry H. Schlacht.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks. PARTICIPATION OF FOREIGN NATIONS IN FIRST UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR AT CHICAGO

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 681 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved. That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 453) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the First United States International Trade Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill., August 7 through 20, 1950. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 681 makes in order House Joint Resolution 453 authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the First United States International Trade Fair to be held in the city of Chicago, Ill., August 7 through August 20, 1950.

Last Saturday the great Chicago fair of 1950 was opened. It will continue during the months of July, August, and September. In August another great fair will open its doors—the First United States International Trade Fair. It will be the first of its kind ever held in the United States. Although this is a trade fair for the nations of the world, the United States will have more participating business firms than any other one nation. For these 2 weeks Chicago becomes the world's market place, as 40 nations will be displaying their wares and competing for sales. While this international trade fair is designed primarily as a trade show for commercial purposes, its exhibits will be of interest to all. The city of Chicago, as the market, transportation, commercial, geographical, and cultural center of the United States gives to you an opportunity you cannot afford to miss.

In behalf of the mayor of Chicago, Hon. Martin H. Kennelly—yes, in behalf of all the people of Chicago-I extend an invitation to all of you and to the people of our country to be with us during the summer to witness these two great fairs. I hope that you will accept and that you will attend. You are assured of hospitality that will surpass even the famed southern brand of which we have heard so much.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for the invitation. I expect to attend the fair. I want to congratulate the business people of Chicago for financing this fair without any aid from the Federal Government.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. Chicago never asks any contribution.

The official invitation will reach you shortly and I hope that all of you will avail yourselves of same and visit our wonderful city during the summer. When you come, do not limit yourselves to a few days or a week, because I know such a short visit will not allow you sufficient time to see all of the extraordinary exhibits and the many things of interest which will be on display for your enjoyment and edification and to see the real Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great city on the delightful shores of Lake Michigan, composed as it is of people from every nation in the world-people who believe in progress-people who through their understanding and foresight, their industry, thrift, and ability have made Chicago the great metropolis that it is.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield. Mr. FELLOWS. Is Chicago known as the Windy City?

Mr. SABATH. I may say to the gentleman from Maine, yes; not because of the vagaries of the weather but because from the founding of the city our leaders have called attention to the opportunities Chicago offered. Because of the slightly jealous nature of some New Yorkers in those days, they started to use the phrase "the Windy City" in referring to its budding rival of the West. But we have always said about Chicago has been true.

The motto of Chicago-which is "I will"-typifies the spirit of its citizens and leaders. Chicago, the great airport, lake port, river port and above all, railroad terminal, is surrounded by the richest area of nature's bounty and man's unbelievable handiwork. It is the capital of an incalculable empire-the great Midwest. It is the trading, industrial, manufacturing, and financial center for millions of our inhabitants. To its trade marts, stockyards, rolling mills, and manufacturing plants come the raw products of the land, and from the ingenuity, industry, and activity of its people the finished products go forth to all the reaches of the globe.

In addition to the interesting exhibits at the fair, I know you will be thrilled with our great skyline along Lake Michigan's shores, with its imposing business structures, our wonderful boulevards and outer drive, our park system unsurpassed

for its beauty.

One hundred years ago Chicago numbered about 9,000 people. It grew steadily with the expanding West when it was almost wiped out by the great fire of 1871. Undaunted by this catastrophe. its citizens set about immediately to build a new and greater Chicago, and each succeeding generation carried on this pioneer spirit, determined to make this central western community one of the truly great cities of our growing Nation until today it is the second largest city in these United States and the fourth largest in the world. We have a population in the city alone of 3,670,000. In addition we have adjoining cities and towns, such as Evanston, Oak Park, Austin, Berwyn, Cicero, Riverside, to mention only a few, which are actually a part and parcel of Chicago. If we were to do as New York or Los Angeles does, by including them in our population, we would have about 5,000,000 people.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. While I am at a loss to understand why Chicago is such a great city, and Chicago is a great city, why is it necessary to promote this fair or to otherwise advertise the city of Chicago? I have asked for this time, however, to say that I do not believe there is any disagreement between the gentleman from Illinois and myself as to the fact that Chicago does have representing it in the Congress of the United States one of the greatest and most illustrious legislators this Nation has ever had, the dean of the House, the gentleman who is now addressing us.

Mr. SABATH. I am indeed grateful to the gentleman from Ohio, with whom I frequently disagree, but today I cannot disagree with him. I must concede everything he said to be true and I hope I will be able to agree with him on many other things.

We in Chicago are proud of our major institutions of learning, the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, Loyola University and the rapidly-expanding Roosevelt College. From these halls of knowledge have come many of the great leaders in our political, governmental, social and economic life throughout the years. These halls of learning have become world famous.

Our \$300,000,000 medical center surpasses any in the world. Many of the outstanding new developments in the medical field are the result of years of labor therein.

Chicago also boasts of the greatest art institute in the world. The Adler Planetarium on the lake front has attracted visitors from all points of the compass. A visit to Chicago is not complete without passing through this marvelous structure.

In the Merchandise Mart we have the largest commercial building ever built. It is a city almost in itself. The Chicago Board of Trade is the largest grain mart in the world.

Our great outdoor stadium, Soldier Field, holds more people than any other similar structure. Within its walls have been held many of the great spectacles of all time. Our indoor Chicago Stadium, seating some 30,000, has served as the meeting place for many large conventions and gatherings of national and international origin, as well as serving the community in its many sports, civic, and business activities.

A very interesting sight is our Navy Pier, extending three-quarters of a mile out into Lake Michigan, greater even than the well-known Atlantic City Pier. In normal times this pier is dedicated to amusement, with pleasure craft of all sizes and descriptions utilizing its facilities. In wartime it has been a tower of strength to our Armed Forces in the training of naval personnel and in the transportation of vital war matériel.

Without fear of successful contradiction I believe we have the finest bathing beaches of any city. Extending for miles along our lake shore, from one end of the city to the other, the cooling waters of Lake Michigan are teeming with bathers and pleasure seekers on the warm days of our pleasant summers.

We even have the great Chicago stockyards which in years gone by we always looked upon with pride. It includes the massive stockyards pavilion where the largest stock shows are held each year. Within its enclosure each year we honor the farming youth of America, lending encouragement and spirit to the development of our future farmers by giving prizes to those who excel in the raising of fine livestock, and for outstanding accomplishment in other necessary detail of farm life.

We have within our borders some of the largest manufacturing plants in the country, such as the International Harvester Co., Stewart Warner, and Hart Schaffner & Marx, and a great many others. In fact, to you in doubt, Chicago is the greatest manufacturing city in the world. Its products reach every port and nation on the globe. You name the manufactured product you need and Chicago will furnish it. Yes, when we talk about the great progress Chicago made following the disastrous fire of 1871, through the unbounded energy and zeal of such men as Marshall Field, the Potter Palmers, Pullmans, Leiters, Swifts, Armours, and others, we are really proud of our accomplishment.

In the early days when the West was rapidly expanding, Chicago became the railroad center of the Nation, and it still retains that position. Twenty-two of the outstanding trunk-line railroads radiate from our city. In addition it is

served by 17 belt-line railroads. It is the hub of rail, air, water, and bus transportation as I mentioned earlier. Yes, Chicago built at its own expense a canal connecting the Great Lakes with the Mississippi and the Gulf, at a cost of over \$250,000,000.

Being in the heart of the finest agricultural section of our country, known as the bread basket of the world, coupled with our huge manufacturing output, our varied transportation facilities expedite the shipment of all products to their far-flung destinations. I presume that is the reason my good friend and colleague from Minnesota [Mr. August H. Andresen] expresses his interest in visiting our city and fair-because he and other leaders in the productive surrounding areas appreciate the facility with which their bounteous farm products are transported to the waiting markets by these efficient transportation arteries. Our vast fruit and vegetable markets, receiving hundreds upon hundreds of carloads of fruits and vegetables daily, adds to the tremendous volume of business transacted daily in this bustling

Then too, Mr. Speaker, our post office handles a greater volume of mail than any other city. It was in our progressive city that the system of delivering mail by helicopter to substations was inaugurated. This has served to speed up mail deliveries considerably. Because of all the up-to-date facilities made available, Chicago became the great mail order center of the Nation, with these giant institutions serving people from every State in our Union as well as in foreign lands. Our stores along State Street are looked upon with bewilderment by visitors to our fair city. Our retail stores have no equal-establishments such as Marshall Fields, Carson Pirie Scotts, Mendel Bros., Goldblatt's, The Fair, and many others.

Our newspapers have long been leaders in the field of news dissemination.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr.

Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not true that Chicago has the greatest newspaper in the world?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; Chicago has great newspapers. It is true I have disagreed with some of them but unfortunately, they have not always concurred in my beliefs; but aside from this they have been a powerful influence in the continued progress of this gateway to the West.

Our local government has been extremely active and alert in improving our roadways, boulevards, and parkways. We have broadened many of our main streets. Under construction at the present time is the great Congress Street superhighway, in addition to our passenger and freight subway and the extension of our elevated railways. Our boulevards extend from the Indiana State line to the Wisconsin State line, connecting with the Lincoln, Jefferson, Washington, Jackson, Garfield, Columbus, McKinley, Douglas, Humboldt Parks and Parkways, and many others. All these I hope you will see and visit.

I almost forgot to mention that our Chicago women have been recognized and are known to be the most beautiful and charming to be found anywhere.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Chicago did suffer as a result of the great fire of 1871, and again for 8 years during the Republican administration of Mayor Bill Thompson, during which time we received some unpleasant publicity.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentle-

man from North Carolina.

Mr. REDDEN. The gentleman has dwelt on the great accomplishments of the city of Chicago, and I heartily agree with him. Surely the gentleman will concede that a greater portion of these accomplishments were under Democratic rule. The gentleman omitted say-

Mr. SABATH. Well, I have not concluded. Since then, under succeeding Democratic administrations, I am proud to say, the record shows it is the healthiest and most law-abiding city in our land-its women and men liberty-loving and progressive. Chicago is a great place to visit and I am pleased that all of the

Members realize this fact.

So I hope you will all avail yourselves of the invitation to enjoy with us these two great fairs during the pleasant summer days ahead with the refreshing Lake Michigan breezes to add to your comfort and pleasure even on the warmest of days.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker,

will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Naturally, after the great compliment paid me by the distinguished Member from Ohio earlier in my remarks, I cannot help but yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, I do not desire to involve the gentleman from Illinois in any possible violation of the Anti-Lobbying Act or to have him appear before our committee. But would the gentleman state on the floor of the House whether or not, if this resolution should be enacted, the Members of the House who may have an opportunity to visit Chicago and attend this fair, can look forward to being guests of the gentleman now addressing the House for at least one evening of their visit?

Mr. SABATH. I assure my colleague that it will give me a great deal of pleasure to be the guest-I mean to act as host, to any Member; if you will make it known to me when you arrive I will endeavor to the best of my ability to see that you are properly received and properly treated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who also

comes from a large city.

Mr. McCORMACK. We all recognize that the gentleman is making a great speech for the passage of this resolution. Before the gentleman took the floor the resolution would have had extreme difficulty in being adopted, but I am satisfied now that our distinguished friend from Chicago, Ill., has dissipated all opposition. I am confident that as a result of

his logic and eloquence the resolution will now be adopted by unanimous consent.

The gentleman has spoken of some of the fine things Chicago has. It is a great city. One of its finest possessions is one of the most lovable characters any one of us has ever met, the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. I thank my friend for that extraordinary compliment, but I

accept it, naturally.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The last part of the gentleman's remarks was rather of a political character.

Mr. SABATH. No; I do not think so. Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is this to be a nonpolitical fair or just a Democratic fair?

Mr. SABATH. No; this will be a fair for all the people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Repub-

licans, too?

Mr. SABATH. Yes. They have contributed their share in many ways in years gone by, and I extend due credit to them, as I mentioned before. Such men as Marshall Field, Mr. Leiter, Mr. Potter Palmer, Mr. Swift, Mr. Armour, Mr. Higginbotham, and others were not Democrats. They, too, helped build Chicago. I am not trying to deprive the Republicans of any credit which is due them. However, in view of the fact that someone asked whether this was a Democratic or Republican fair, I had to answer the question. I always try to answer any questions that are asked me whenever I am able to do so. Sometimes I cannot.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The Republicans will not be taxed for going to the fair, will they?

Mr. SABATH. I assure the gentleman that they will not be taxed any more than others that come to our city day in and day out, by the thousands. Prices will be reasonable, the treatment will be right. and no one will regret visiting Chicago to participate in these two great fairs.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman will remember that the Republicans

helped to get this legislation.

Mr. SABATH. I appreciate that. always appreciate whatever good Republicans do. There is no question about that. I hesitate to say more, because I do not want to start an argument.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I can assure one and all that adequate accommodations will be available, as we have some of the most spacious and finest hotels ever built right on the lake front. Our restaurants are noted for their good foods the world over and will satisfy the most particular epicure, and at moderate prices. And for amusement we offer you the finest of golf courses, horse racing, baseball, and every other summer sport. And speaking of baseball, our White Sox and Cubs are doing very nicely. I am sure your visit to Chicago will be more interesting, pleasant, and satisfying than any trip you can possibly plan for this summer to any other section of our country or to foreign lands. In Chicago you can see everything that is to be seen.

You will be welcomed with open arms. Chicago's hospitality will be yours.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] the former lieutenant governor of the State of Ohio and one of the most active Republicans in the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with and at the suggestion of the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], who somehow or other also seems to be just a bit prejudiced in favor of the State of Illinois and the great city of Chicago, in view of the nonpartisan approach that has been made to this great problem in the address delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and as a tribute to the great city of Chicago and to the gentleman from Illinois, who is the dean of the House and a great legislator, as well as a great wit and a great Democrat, the minority yields back the balance of its time. I do so in the hope this resolution will be adopted unanimously so we may all soon repair to Chicago to become the guests of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

#### PAUL LEACH

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having served as a Member of this body for more consecutive years than any other Member in the history of the House, 44 years, to be exact. I feel it fitting and proper to call attention to the fact that another Chicagoan has established a similar record in the Fourth Estate, namely, our good friend Paul Leach, chief of the Washington bureau of the Chicago Daily News. Paul Leach this month is celebrating his fortieth anniversary with the Chicago Daily News, coming to Washington only 4 years after me.

Although the Chicago Daily News has changed hands several times during this twoscore years, Paul Leach has been retained by each new owner because of his personal ability, foresight, and faithful service to the traditions and ethics of

the reporting service.

When I was just beginning to know my way around as a Member of the Sixty-first Congress, Paul Leach was a young fellow back in Chicago, starting out on his first job as a cub reporter for the real-honest-to-goodness-factual Chicago News, belonging to Victor Lawson. Since the Harding and Cox conventions in 1920 he has covered every national convention of both major political parties, and since 1934, a period of 16 years, he has worked with us in Washington, representing the Chicago Daily News. Yes, Mr. Speaker, for twoscore years, four decades, Paul Leach has gained the respect and love of everyone in this body, and, indeed, all of official Washington.

It is a privilege and a pleasure to congratulate him, and the Chicago Daily News as well, on the occasion of his fortieth year with the same newspaper. Paul Leach is an honor to his profession and to the city of Chicago.

I know that all of you who know Paul Leach must agree with me that he is a gentleman of high ability and fair-mindedness, and that, further, you will concur in all that I have, with deference, said

about him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a newspaper publisher and as a lifelong friend of Paul Leach, I am happy to join in the tribute being paid him by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Sabath]. Paul Leach is an exceptionally able newspaperman and a great American.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, whenever I have occasion to refer to the occupants of the Press Gallery, a certain stanza of verse invariably comes to my mind, the author of which I do not presently recall:

Some day I'll pass by the Great Gates of Gold,

And see a man pass through unquestioned and bold.

"A Saint?" I'll ask, and old Peter'll reply:
"No, he carries a pass—he's a newspaper
guy."

Paul Leach, who is celebrating this month his fortieth year with the Chicago Daily News, is one of the ablest, finest and best "newspaper guys" it has been my privilege to know. Knowing him as I do, he does not need a pass to get him anywhere he may wish. I have never known him to take an unfair advantage of anyone or any situation. As a newspaper correspondent, Paul has always reported the news accurately and objectively.

In the fullest sense, Paul Leach has upheld the highest traditions of the fourth estate. The mere fact that he began with the Chicago Daily News 40 years ago as a sports reporter and has continued with that same great newspaper to be today its chief correspondent speaks more eloquently than any words of mine the merit of the man.

In his newspaper career, Paul has filed copy from every State in the Union. Since 1920 he has covered every national election as correspondent for the Chi-

cago Daily News.

With this broad experience and inexhaustible knowledge of governmental affairs, Paul writes a weekly news analysis column for the four Knight newspapers—the Detroit Free Press, the Chicago Daily News, the Akron Beacon Journal and the Miami Herald.

And I think Paul has another accomplishment that ought to be mentioned. Shortly after he began his newspaper career he acquired a helpmate, who has been a constant source of inspiration to him. Their son and daughter have brought four grandchildren to the family circle. The boy served with distinction as an infantry captain in the Pacific during the last war, and the daughter's husband was a Navy officer in the submarine service.

In more ways than one, the Paul Leach family has made a real contribution to this great country of ours. I pay my respects to all of them. I congratulate the Chicago Daily News. To Paul, I would say, as Emerson at one time said: "The reward of a thing well done, is to have done it." And Paul has accomplished what is accomplished by few men. I am proud to claim him as a personal friend.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to address the House in support of House Joint Resolution 453. As a Chicagoan I, of course, take considerable pride in the initiative Chicago is taking in organizing the First United States International Trade Fair. But as an American who is vitally interested in seeing every possible step taken to encourage a sound foreign trade, I feel that every possible encouragement should be given to the First United States International Trade Fair.

It was my honor and pleasure to sponsor this resolution in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. A special subcommittee consisting of myself as chairman, my colleagues, Mr. Mansfield, of Montana, and Mr. Javits, of New York, considered this resolution and unanimously recommended that the resolution be reported favorably. The full committee concurred in the subcommittee's recommendation and also reported the resolution unanimously.

The House should understand fully the scope of this resolution. A fair like the one in Chicago usually requires legal authorization to permit exhibitors to bring in their exhibits and dispose of them by proper procedures outside the customary operations of the customs laws. This authority was given by the Congress on May 18, 1950, in Public Law 517.

The resolution now before the House authorizes the President to invite foreign nations and States of the Union to participate. It involves no financial obligation to the Government. What the resolution proposes is to lend the prestige of the United States to the fair by authorizing the President to issue invitations.

Although the purpose of the resolution is simple, the principle involved is of great importance. The expressed aim of the fair is to bring buyers and sellers together so as to encourage commercial relationships, the sale of goods, and the business contacts so necessary to good trade relations.

The passage of this resolution would give the President an opportunity to apprise the world of the importance of the fair and its part in those actions for which this Government stands. Good trade relationships are the lifeblood of commerce, and the encouragement of a healthy foreign trade is essential to this country and the nations of the world.

The trade fair emphasizes this point in encouraging buyers and sellers primarily, and governments as well.

It should be noted that the fair in Chicago is the "First United States International Trade Fair." Others will be held in years to come. It is most important, therefore, that the first one have the full support of the Government and people

of the United States. The passage of this resolution will give that necessary support. I urge its adoption.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. August H. Andresen) there were—ayes 389, noes 0.

So the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, since it seems there is no opposition to the joint resolution, and since no money is involved, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 453) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the First United States International Trade Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill., August 7 through 20, 1950, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation or otherwise, or in such maner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and all foreign countries to participate in the First United States International Trade Fair, to be held at Chicago, Ill., from August 7 to 20, 1950, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting industrial products; machinery, equipment, supplies, and engineering; and the exhibiting of the newest developments in metals, plastics, chemicals, oils, textiles, and other manufactured products; and bringing together buyers and sellers for promotion of foreign and domestic trade and commerce in such products.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "all foreign countries" and insert "foreign nations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS AND RICE AND RICE PRODUCTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 680 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3550) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), and rice and rice products. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and

Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the con-clusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill S. 3550, and it has been agreed by the Committee on Banking and Currency that S. 3550 will be offered as a substitute for H. R. 8737, so that the same could be passed without any delay. The Committee on Banking and Currency has agreed to that so that the bill will not have to go to conference. The only question that has arisen was the question of coconutoil and coconut exemptions.

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

Mr. SABATH. I yield. Mr. SPENCE. I do not think we agreed to the provisions of the bill. We agreed that it would be advisable to adopt the rule in order that the matter might be considered by the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This is not a substitute or anything of that sort. We simply gave a rule permitting the Senate bill to be brought up at this time rather than the House bill. The difference between the House bill and the Senate bill is that the Senate bill excludes from the provisions certain coconut oil, which the House bill included. The agreement was made to go ahead with the Senate bill. Mr. SPENCE. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. So this is an original resolution.

Mr. SPENCE. It is an open rule and the bill is subject to amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it is to expedite action that you are taking up the Senate bill because the dead line is tomorrow night at midnight.

Mr. SPENCE. That is right.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3550) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils-including butter-and rice and rice products.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3550, with Mr. GRANGER in the chair,

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 30 minutes. and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield

myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency reported out the bill H. R. 8737 and went before the Rules Committee to obtain a rule and made our argument in behalf of the rule on that bill. The Rules Committee, however, with peculiar generosity, gave us a rule on a Senate bill. The question that then presented itself was whether or not we would accept the rule. We have accepted the rule because it is absolutely essential if these controls on fats and oils are to continue that some affirmative action be taken before tomorrow night

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Under what stretch of the imagination does rice come under fats and oils?

Mr. SPENCE. It comes under the bill; whether it comes under a strict definition of "fats and oils" is immaterial. Rice is expressly mentioned in the bill. and the question as to whether it is a fat or an oil or neither would not make much difference. The only difference between these bills is that the Senate excluded coconut oil from the quantitative controls which the President may exercise; the House bill included it.

This power is given to stabilize our economy, balance our international trade, and to protect these agricultural commodities, and incidentally to protect the stocks of these commodities which have been obtained by the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to support their prices. I think it is very essential that these controls continue. The last time we continued them for 3 years. This bill continues the controls by the President for one additional year.

The question is whether you want coconut oil controlled or decontrolled. I will admit that there are some advantages in accepting the Senate bill, because if there is a delay and this matter goes to conference and no decision is rendered by tomorrow night, which would be impossible, all of these controls are lifted. It is a matter of a good deal of importance to those sections that produce cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and peanut oil. When I gamble I like to gamble with my own property-not the other fellow's. I do feel I should not gamble with his interest in this legislation, and I am willing to be guided largely by the opinion of my colleagues who represent the producers of these products. I think there is a real peril if you do not pass the Senate bill because there will necessarily be a conference and there may be a delay; and the President cannot control the importation of these commodities if there is a delay, for the power to control them will expire tomorrow

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. man, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The Senate bill just extends the present law? Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The only difference is with regard to the one item, coconut oil, one commodity.

Mr. SPENCE. That is true.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Is coconut oil controlled or decontrolled at the present

Mr. SPENCE. I understand that no controls have been exercised over coconut oil for the last 3 years.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. What was the reason for the elimination of coconut oil in the Senate bill, allowing its importation, allowing it to stay decontrolled?

Mr. SPENCE. That is a question that must be answered by the President.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. It has been delayed up to this time so that we are now in the position of either having to swallow the fly or get no soup.

Mr. SPENCE. We are between the devil and the deep blue sea right now, and the question is whether you want to take a chance on having all controls lifted by prolonging the discussion, or whether you will accept the Senate bill which will continue these controls; and you may be assured that they will continue for 2 years.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield. Mr. GROSS. What assurance does the gentleman have that if we pass the bill the Senate will take action on it before tomorrow night?

Mr. SPENCE. This is a Senate bill and if passed will go to the President for his approval.

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

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. understood the gentleman to say that the Senate bill provided for an extension of the present law for 2 years.

Mr. SPENCE. Yes. Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I read this bill, it runs to July 1, 1951.

Mr. SPENCE. I made a mistake. is 1 year. I confused this with the last bill we passed here today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I introduced a bill to extend it for 2 years and I had hoped that is what it would be; but under the circumstances I do not see how we can do anything about it.

Mr. SPENCE. This is an extension for 1 year. I would like to correct that.

Mr. Chairman, the Members are familiar with the operation of these controls and what they have done. The matter is submitted to the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. anything should happen to this bill, under section 22 of the AAA Act the President has the same powers that he has under this act?

Mr. SPENCE. I am not too familiar with that, but he has some powers of control. How far they go I do not know.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Under section 22 he would have to do it by is-

suing an executive order, which would be public information to everybody, but under these provisions it is done through the back door and other countries and other peoples do not know about it.

Mr. SPENCE. I think probably he has some powers of that kind, but how far

they go I do not know.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it the existing law which we are continuing by this bill gives the President discretionary authority and is not a mandatory proposition?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think the Congress ever issues any mandate to the President. He is head of a coordinate branch of the Government and the powers we grant him are always discretionary

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But the gentleman and I have seen much legislation here that requires the doing of certain things; instead of saying "may do certain things" it is provided that "he shall do certain things," but this bill gives the President discretion?

Mr. SPENCE. It gives the President discretionary authority, yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He can

put on an embargo?

Mr. SPENCE. It is quantitative control. It can be done by embargo or by any method he wants to pursue as long as it is quantitative control.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Murray].
Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin.

Chairman, this bill is just one of the regular merry-go-rounds that takes place between the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Banking and Currency Committee and so forth and so

In the first place, under section 22 of the AAA Act the President has this power now. In the second place, it does not make much sense to pass this bill yet turn around and let coconut oil come in, because that is the biggest import. looks to me as if in presenting this bill all we are trying to do is to deceive ourselves or deceive somebody else because without the coconut oil provision in there there is not much use passing this bill. Coconut oil, it so happens, is recognized as the best vegetable oil there is so far as oleomargarine is concerned and so far as these other edible foods are concerned. In this bill provision is made that it is exempted.

Having been here as many years as I have and having watched the peanut oil people and the cotton people always looking after their own interests as they have been all these years, I cannot understand their submitting to a piece of legislation like this that allows coconut oil to be exempted. Coconut is the origin of the coconut cow. The dairy industry is already faced with catastrophe.

We are faced with another problem and that is the matter of the coconut cow. They can skim milk and coconut oil and sell it in competition with evaporated natural milk. As near as I can find out there was at least 10 times as much of that made last year as was made 10 years ago. It is just one more step

downward for the dairy industry. I figure that the Eighty-first Congress has done enough to the dairy industry of this country for one session without being a party to ruining the evaporated milk industry of this Nation, which is a very important part of the dairy industry in many parts of our country.

Still, regardless of whether it is going to take a day or two longer, as far as I am concerned, I do not want to vote for this bill and give special privileges, if you please, to the coconut oil people, and I am sorry to see the soy bean people and the cottonseed people take the position that they want to have these coconut oil interests have the advantage over them because this kind of legislation is not based on fairness or equity or justice. I am not going to spend any time on the rice business at all: it has nothing to do with fats and oils. Rice has a tariff, it has good protection, and it could come under section 22. I am personally getting tired of having people come on the floor and telling about the wonderful features of reciprocal trade treaties, and every chance they get come in and ask for special privilege legislation which they ask for in connection with rice and other special privilege crops. I represent a district that tries to farm their farms and not the United States Treasury. In all the years I have been here. I have never asked for one thing for the farmers of my district that I did not want every other farmer in the United States to have, and it gets rather discouraging to see this double talk and this hypocrisy, of people going around and talking for reciprocal trade treaties and what a wonderful thing it is, and then talk about gadgets or legislation that sets it up for the few at the expense of the many. This rice gadget is another one of them.

So, the first thing we should do is to take out that provision for coconut oil. I am willing to pass up the rice, because it is an insignificant crop anyway. I realize that under this program, sure, we will stop the importation of butter. but you are not stopping the importation of butterfat. Millions and millions of pounds of batterfat are coming in here in other forms, in the form of cheese. which is a good deal more important than the rice industry of this country. We brought in 32,000,000 pounds of butterfat last year, and it caused just as much trouble as far as disturbing our domestic economy is concerned as if it came in in the form of a pound of butter.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was going to mention the cheese proposition. If this bill should be amended at all, it should be amended to include cheese, and exclude cheese from coming in.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It should have cheese included. As far as that is concerned, under section 22, how do you think we got the embargo on cotton coming into this country? By executive order. How about the embargo on wheat? That was done by executive order. There is no reason why this whole situation

cannot be handled the same way if and when they want to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Cali-

fornia [Mr. McKinnon].

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to oppose this bill, although there are certain things about the inequity of the situation that I think should be borne in mind. I think all of us subscribe academically to the principle of free trade, but we all realize from a realistic standpoint that it cannot be flung open and operated completely without undermining our own economy. A number of us from the West sit here and watch certain commodities that are politically strong come in and get exemptions on certain articles they are interested in. I have no particular quarrel with that. It is only natural that we represent our commodities to the best of our ability, but I think this should be borne in mind, too, that complete free trade can hurt the little commodities just as much as it can hurt the big commodities. When you start making exceptions on the big powerful commodities, even though you do have the political strength to do it, we must realize that if we are going to have free trade we should not ask the little commodities to bear the complete brunt of a freetrade policy.

Out in our section of the country we have such items as lemons that are suffering pretty heavily now from imports from Italy. Our producers of canned fish are suffering from imports from South America. They are particularly threatened in the future by imports from Japan. The imports of Japanese canned tuna practically ruined our industry on the west coast in the thirties.

We have almonds and walnuts and fruits, and they are greatly damaged by the completely free-trade policy. Yet we do not have the political strength to protect ourselves. In passing this sort of a bill we are going to give an exception to certain items. I simply ask the other Members of the House to give consideration also to the little commodities that are likewise being hurt by this sort of policy. If it is right to make an exception on certain of the more politically powerful commodities, then I think we should also take into consideration some of the smaller commodities that are being damaged by a free-trade policy.

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

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gen-

tleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I concur in the gentleman's argument, and mention one or two products that affect my people very vitally in this reciprocal-trade program. One is the almond industry. A large part of it is in my home county. They are all individual, rather small farmers, and they are in continual jeopardy because of this agitation to modify the schedules. Another is wine. We have hundreds of wineries out in my area. Whenever you hurt the wine industry it percolates right down to the grape crop, and many of these producers have very small ranches, as the gentleman knows. It seems to me when we go before these reciprocal trade committees we do not get any comfort whatever in presenting our arguments. They are just cold to our appeal. Once you wreck the wine industry you have wrecked the whole grape industry of California. We raise 3,000,000 tons of grapes a year, and it goes into thousands and thousands of families.

I want to compliment the gentleman on the argument he is making.

Mr. McKINNON. I thank the gentleman. I might also point out that when it comes to the almond grower, the walnut grower, and the citrus grower, these men are in the position that it takes several years to bring an orchard into bearing. If in one or two particular years the crop does not bear out they take the loss. They cannot transfer over into another crop. They are stuck with their groves. The same thing applies all through the West, and I think it applies to the citrus industry in Florida. cannot make a quick transfer. Those things should be borne in mind as we write these reciprocal trade treaties. They should protect the little man, the little farmer who invests. It means everything to him, although his investment may be small compared to the national economy.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is making an excellent statement. I think it is a good thing to have attention focused on the problem of the special commodities he has mentioned. At the same time, I am pleased that he is not going to oppose the bill; that is, the plight of some commodities should not restrain the Congress in its effort to protect those that apparently this legislation is logically designed to protect.

With reference to some of the basic crops, I might add that the purpose of this bill is not limited to protection of American producers. I am thinking of rice, for example. I am not an expert in this field, but my district is close enough to the rice area that I think I can speak authentically on this point. Without these controls there might be a movement of rice to some local markets away from countries that need it. It is in consideration to some extent of the dietary and other standards rather than price considerations that the controls on rice should be extended.

I am glad that the gentleman developed the points on trade problems. He knows that many of us on the Committee on Banking and Currency are concerned on this score. I agree with him that we have not reached a solution. Free trade is an ideal that must be pursued, but it must be pursued, but it must be pursued with consideration for the little producers.

Mr. McKINNON. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. Since he is a good Baptist deacon, naturally I would expect him to agree with the principle of the Golden Rule.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Hull].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, unless this bill is amended by striking out "and coconuts" on page 1 and on page 2, as well, as "and coconut products," I shall feel constrained to vote against it regardless of the consequences. This House cannot be held responsible for this unwarranted situation.

There is no more dangerous element introduced into our economy than this matter of foreign oils in competition with the oils produced in our own country and in great competition with our dairy industry. The bill, if it is passed in its present form, will remove all import controls over coconut oils. It will allow large volumes, possibly millions of tons, to be imported into this country.

We know that because of the recent war there have not been so many new coconut plantations brought to bearing. But they will be, and there will be millions of tons of this coconut oil brought to this country to displace the cottonseed oil, peanut oil, soybean oil, and other oils produced in this country. I have a copy of a letter from the American Soybean Association addressed to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which reads as follows:

HUDSON, IOWA, June 10, 1950. Hon. Brent Spence,

Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SPENCE: It is our understanding that your committee will start consideration of a bill adopted by the Senate last week, basic purpose of which was to extend the import controls on fats and oils for an additional period of time. We also understand that this bill includes an amendment adopted in the Senate specifically exempting coconut oil from these controls.

The American Sovbean Association favors the continuation of import controls on fats and oils, but we violently oppose the Senate bill, which specifically exempts coconut oil. With this exemption the bill becomes meaningless. The exemption defeats the very purpose for which the bill was written. It gives advantage to the major oil import, discriminating against all others. It is our contention that this exemption should be removed from the bill, and that it should then be passed and become law. Representing the major source of edible vegetable oil in the United States, soybean growers have more at stake than any one other group of producers. We would prefer nonpassage of import controls to passage of a bill containing specialprivilege controls, legislation of the type sent to your committee by the Senate after adoption of the Bricker amendment.

We urge your committee to take immediate action to remove from the bill this exceedingly preferential and damaging provision. We further urge you to give immediate impetus to passage of the bill after removal of this exemption for coconut oil, thus continuing authority for import controls on all fats and oils on their present basis.

We further ask that this letter be presented to your committee and that it be placed in the record of testimony on this subject.

Respectfully yours, AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION, By Geo. M. STRAYER,

Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Chairman, that, in brief, is the sentiment of the farmers engaged in the business of raising soybeans in the Northwest and millions of other farmers as well. Many of you will remember that in the last few years and throughout the recent war the Government has paid

subsidies to get the farmers to raise soybeans. That was done during the war and the acreage was increased in certain States, including Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin, to some extent Minnesota, and in some other States. The soybean acreage was increased accordingly.

Now we are in competition with other vegetable oil interests. At this time a large part of the coconut oils imported into our country is made into soap. The soap monopoly which controls about 80 to 85 percent of all the soaps made and sold in this country is in control of the coconut oil trade of the world, one of those European cartels that we hear so much about. It is one of those corporations that apparently reaches out farther and farther as time goes on in order to compete with the American vegetable oil products.

Very recently, in the past year or so, \$600,000,000 of American money has gone to Britain and Africa to develop many millions of acres of plantations which will produce vegetable oils and be in competition with soybean and cotton-seed oils and all the other oils of our country. Of course, the idea is to extend the power of the cartel which manufactures such a large part of the products from vegetable oils, including probably two-thirds the oleomargarine made in our own country.

I shall offer an amendment at the proper time to strike out "and coconuts," in line 10 on page 1, and "coconut products," in line 1, page 2, from this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Hull] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the Committee on Banking and Currency and its chairman, I am obliged to state that they did appear before the Committee on Rules and did desire a rule on their bill H. R. 8737 before the law expires tomorrow. We felt that if we should grant a rule on the House bill it would be a different bill than the bill which the Senate already passed. The Senate passed a bill excluding coconuts and coconut products and petroleum and petroleum products. In the hope that we would eliminate the appointment of conferees and perhaps delay the consideration of this legislation, the majority of the Committee on Rules felt a rule should be granted on the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill.

I do not wish you to understand that originally Chairman Spence of the Committee on Banking and Currency was willing to agree to it, but he was in this position, namely, that he must take the Senate bill or no bill at all, because, if we had granted a rule on the House bill, the chances are there would have been no legislation because of serious disagreement and the law would have expired. So the Committee on Rules felt that the only thing to do was to grant a rule and let the Banking and Currency Committee agree to take the Senate bill instead of no bill at all.

As to the complaints that have been made by my neighbors and friends from Wisconsin, I want to say this: You gentlemen have not been injured or hurt, as you maintain. Of course, I appreciate your efforts in behalf of the people of your district and the great State of Wisconsin, but Wisconsin, the farmers, and the dairy people of that State have been more prosperous, notwithstanding the legislation you complain of, than ever before in the history of our country. I hope they will continue to be prosperous, but I hope too that they will reduce their high prices on milk, cheese, and cream which we the public are obliged to pay.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Hull] complains about soya beans. May I call attention to the fact that in Illinois we grow large quantities of soya beans, more than the farmers in the State of Wisconsin. In the western section and the northern section of Illinois we have the finest farms and the finest dairies, and raise a great deal of soya beans; I have not heard a single soyabean grower complain, because soya beans today are selling at \$3 and as high as \$3.15. Consequently, they cannot complain that they are suffering due to legislation when they can get \$3, \$3,10, or \$3.15 for soya beans, as I said before, I realize the farmers themselves do not get it all. I know that this high price that has been brought about by speculation will not inure to the benefit of the farmers, but still they will have their portion of the high price, and that they are entitled to.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I think it is for the best interest of our country that this law be extended; and the only way it can be extended, because we are going to adjourn today, is to adopt the bill as passed by the Senate. I know there are men in the Senate who are interested in our country and in the farmer; not perhaps to the extent that the gentleman from Wisconsin is, but there are some men over there who at times are interested in the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If 85 percent of the vegetable oil which came into the United States this last year was coconut oil, would the gentleman still be in favor of this legislation or not?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know the percentage of coconut oil that comes into this country.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Of the

total oil, I mean.

Mr. SABATH. But I understand that the bakers and the candy makers are very much interested in obtaining some of these coconuts and coconut oil at a price which will permit them to remain in business. Because of the protests from these two industries that came to the Committee on Rules and to the members of that committee we felt that we would safeguard their future and also bring about legislation that would extend this law which is about to expire tomorrow.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to express keen regret at the fact that the Committee on Rules did not see fit to grant a rule on the House bill, because in the House bill there are no words that would have aroused the controversy we are spending our time on now. I think it was a mistake, and I shall point out why.

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

Mr. TALLE. Yes; briefly. My time is very short.

Mr. GROSS. Would the world come to an end if we failed to pass this bill today and the law expired for a few days, a week or so?

Mr. TALLE. I will deal with that in a moment. I thank the gentleman.

What may occur in the event that we leave the gates wide open as far as coconuts and coconut oil are concerned? Let me call attention to the statement of a distinguished scientist, Dr. John L. Coulter, in connection with the hearings on the House bill the 12th of June. He pointed out the following:

The fact is that imports during the past 3 years, 1947 to 1949, have averaged more than during any other 3-year period in our historv.

So you see the imports are increasing. In 1947 the imports amounted to 877,-000,000 pounds.

I inquired about the conditions of production and I found that they are much improved in the areas where coconuts and coconut products are produced. War damages have been repaired, and revolutionary forces are not so active as formerly. Production is going ahead at a

rate higher than prewar.

The next question is: Who are the Some of the testimony given to the Banking and Currency Committee was sweetened because it came from the confectionery industry, but if you will examine the hearings you will discover that as of 1947, 70 percent of the coconuts and coconut oil imported into the United States was used not by the candy people, not by the bakery people, but by the soap industry. The controversial words in this bill—S, 3550—relate principally to the interest of the soap industry in a foreign product which competes with products produced by our own people. American producers should have first claim on the home market.

What is the difficult position we are in? We are on a spot? Here is the situation: Suppose we pass the Senate bill and the gates are opened wide. Oil will flow in to compete with our domestic producers. Suppose we amend the bill. Then there must be a conference of the two Chambers, and, as you know, the parliamentary situation in the two bodies is such that a conference cannot be held prior to midnight tomorrow.

As has been pointed out, existing safeguards relating to fats and oils will die tomorrow at midnight. Suppose we kill the bill? Then the safeguards will die. too.

In the last two situations, what difference does it make? Suppose we let the current law expire tomorrow and take our time about further legislation. This is what will happen: The big users,

and they are the soap people, suspecting that controls might be put on imports would immediately proceed to make large contracts for supplies. All right. After those contracts were made, whatever law we might pass on the 12th of July or the 15th or 30th of July would be nullified because the contracts had already been made. So in order to protect ourselves in this awkward situation I suspect we will be better off if we pass the bill,

Finally, Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has pointed out that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture were granted certain powers relating to imports under the Commodity Credit Corporation Act which became law just a few days ago. The gentleman referred to section 22. It is my opinion, and I believe it is the gentleman's opinion, that if the provisions of that section are properly administered, whenever imports endanger the price of lard, butter, and so forth, or fats and oils generally, the President and the Secretary of Agriculture can stop further importation.

As I stated at the outset, I regret this sort of legislation, but I am not going to take the responsibility of removing all safeguards on the ground that the Senate bill contains a provision with which I disagree.

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

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I believe we will be better off if we pass this bill. There is not sufficient time for a conference with Members of the less numerous branch of the Congress.

Inasmuch as the administration leadership is responsible for this awkward and unfortunate situation I feel that the administration should take a look at section 22 in the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, and then resolve to bolster up the weakness that is very apparent in the pending bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Did Dr. Coulter's figures show the percentage of coconut oil being imported? Nearly all of the imports are coconut oil percentagewise?

Mr. TALLE. That may be true. Dr. Coulter testified in behalf of seven national organizations. His complete statement is in the hearings on the House bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Therefore, if the bill is not passed it is not going to do much harm because there is not much cottonseed oil, peanut oil, or any other vegetable oil coming into the United States, is there?

Mr. TALLE. Up-to-date figures are not available to me but production, and importation are increasing. I want to protect our domestic producers of fats and oils.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vir-

ginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to address my remarks particularly to the comment made by the two gentle-men from Wisconsin. In my opinion, their point is well taken. There is a defect in this legislation in the exemption provided for coconut oil. However, under the circumstances that confront us, I sincerely hope we will pass this legislation as it is and without amendment; otherwise we will wake up tomorrow night and we will not have any controls over these oil-bearing crops. The situation, as I understand it, is that if we do not extend this authority by passing this legislation today on July 1 we will have foreign-produced peanutsperhaps foreign-produced soybeansmoving freely into competition with our domestic production.

On yesterday I had a telephone call from one of my constituents who is in the peanut business. He said, "I would like to know what is going to happen to this extension of the authority to control these imports. There are now in Mexico oriental peanuts which I can buy for delivery on July 1. There are also in certain foreign-trade zones, in storage, peanuts ready for immediate movement." He said he was further informed that there were orientally produced soybeans ready for immediate unloading in west coast ports. I was also informed that there are large quantities of flaxseed in Soviet-controlled ports ready for immediate shipment to this

country.

Now we are faced with a problem. Unless we pass this legislation as it is, we are going to have no controls and we are going to immediately feel the effect of the elimination of these controls, and we will feel it on the following day. I think we should eliminate or find some way to eliminate this coconut-oil proposition, and I would suggest that the Committee on Banking and Currency give consideration toward further legislation which will be more equitable and might even take into account some other commodities that are involved.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentle-

man from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Just to keep the record straight, the facts are that pretty nearly all the imports are coconut oil at the present time.

Mr. HARDY. I understand that that is true, but the imports of peanuts would show up immediately. There was an intensive effort made only a few months back to have this restriction lifted on peanuts, and peanuts are now waiting to come in.

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

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. August H. Andresen].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this type of legislation really has the Members over a barrel. We are really forced to take it, and if we do not, then our country will be flooded with imports of foreign fats and oils and the

competitive products covered by this bill. Now, it is apparent that Congress during the past, and even the Eighty-first Congress, has delegated authority to the President to say what should happen on imports and exports; in fact, we learned here only this week that the President possesses the power to declare war, or get the country into a state of war, or send our troops into war and bypassing Congress. This legislation is about on a par with that. We do not know today, if we pass this bill, whether the President will continue embargoes and quotas which have been in effect or will be in effect up until tomorrow night. He may or he may not; it is in accordance with his discretion. We will find ourselves in the situation which we are in where we are really forced to take this bill or take nothing and then trust to the President that he will try to protect the American producers of this country.

Now, what has happened in the case of butter? Well, the President under discretionary authority given him by Congress—I did not vote for it—reduced the duty on butter from 14 cents a pound to 7 cents a pound. He did that in January of this year under agreements made over in France when they had a trade conference. So the duty on butter has been

cut in half.

Last year in August and September the President urged all these countries like France and Denmark and other countries who are getting our grants and gifts to devalue their currencies, and most of them did, by 30 percent. It really knocked out the 7-cent duty we have on butter, and the other tariff duties that have been cut by the President under his discretionary authority. Butter today can be laid down in New York from any country in the world, duty and transportation paid, at less than 50 cents a pound, and here we have a support price of 60 cents a pound, with the Government buying a great deal of the butter produced in the surplus-producing areas of the country, like the States of Iowa and Minnesota.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The fact is that butter is coming into this country by the mil-

lions of pounds.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is not coming in yet, because we still have this law that is in effect and will remain in effect until 12 o'clock tomorrow

in effect until 12 o'clock tomorrow night. When the President cut the duty on butter he fixed a quota on imports of 60,000,000 pounds a year that can come in under the 7-cent duty, which is about two times as much butter as we have imported at any time in the history of our country during the past 25 years.

Mr. JENSEN. That is what I said; it is coming in.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; it will come in, unless we pass this bill and continue the law for another year. I am satisfied that the Fresident will not exercise the authority he has under section 22. He did not do so on potatoes. Our market will be flooded with butter. This means that the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to step into the market

and buy more and more American butter, that will go into storage in this country, to provide a market for the butter that is shipped here from foreign countries. So we are facing a reality here when we deal with this legislation.

Mr. JENSEN. In addition to the smack that we took on the oleo bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.
Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Granting
at least that the gentleman is right on
his approach to butter, and all that they
want to control is the butterfat that is in
the butter, would the gentleman be agreeable to an amendment that would include
cheese, because cheese has pretty nearly
half as much butterfat in it as butter
does?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I recognize that. I will say to the gentleman we should also include all kinds of cheese. We should also include potatoes. should include eggs that are shipped in here from Communist China, and we should include hams that are shipped in here from behind the iron curtain. There are many other items that should be included in this legislation because of the authority that has been conferred by this and other Congresses on the President to use his discretionary power. So that this legislation really does not solve anything. It temporarily tries to correct an evil. I hope the day is not far distant when we can have a Congress here that will try to protect the American market for the American producers in all lines of agriculture and industry.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Is it not possible to have some kind of peril clause here such as we tried to have in the reciprocal trade agreements bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am for the peril clause. We had that in law passed by the Eightieth Congress, but that was knocked out when they passed the Reciprocal Treaty Act last year. The peril clause would have given protection to American producers.

But I would go further than that, because when you have a peril point in tariff legislation, immediately you are up against the political situation where there is a discretionary power lodged in the President or the Commission which is to pass on it, and if the policy is continued on a free-trade basis, as we have been doing since 1934, it will not do much good. What we must have here is mandatory legislation enacted by the Congress under the power provided in the Constitution, and then the Auministration will know just exactly what should be done without any question whatsoever.

I do not like to see coconuts in this bill. What are we going to do? I feel like the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Talle]. We are just behind the eightball. Unless we pass this legislation we probably will not have any legislation whatsoever, and then these imports will

be coming into this country, 60,000,000 pounds of butter, which will knock the bottom out of the dairy market. The Government has 150,000,000 pounds of butter now and they probably will have two hundred and twenty-five or two hundred and fifty million pounds of butter. They do not know what to do with it now. In fact, they are not doing anything to find a place for that butter, but probably with the war on, and our forces being engaged in hostilities in the Pacific, perhaps they may find some use for these surplus foods, like butter, cheese, and other products which have been accumulated under the supportprice program.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.
Mr. HARDY. Then the gentleman has
arrived at the same conclusion I have,
that the only thing we can do is to pass
this bill in its present form, otherwise

we will have no controls?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right. I am glad to hear the gentleman mention that. Several Members have spoken today who voted for the reciprocal-trade program, and now they are pleading for protection. I feel, however, that we should keep the record straight and therefore I have given certain pertinent facts in regard to the reciprocal-trade program and the manner in which the Truman administration is administering the law.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Larcade]

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this legislation should have been presented to the House before this time, however, the fact remains that a rule was only obtained on June 16, and while the House bill would protect some of the industries that obtain in my district, as explained by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Spencel, since the existing law expires on tomorrow, June 30, it was found advisable to present the Senate bill S. 3550 rather than consider the House bill, for if any amendments were made to the House bill the bill would have to be referred to a conference between the House and Senate which would have required probably some time, and in the meantime, the existing controls on the items covered would lapse, and as a result there would be great harm to some of the commodities and industries covered under the existing law.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate bill covers all of the commodities included in the House bill. However, the Senate has added a provision to make the same applicable to coconuts and coconut products, and while some of the Members have the opinion that this item should not have been included, and others that additional commodities should also be included, and have announced that they will offer such amendments, while I am sympathetic to some of the amendments, I join the chairman of our committee in asking that the bill, in order to be effective at the expiration of the present law, that is, June 30, be passed so that

there will be no interim in the protection to those commodities covered in the bill. I am greatly interested in the protection provided in the bill under consideration as my district produces cottonseed oil, fats, and rice. I represent one of the largest rice-producing dist.icts in the United States, and as an example of what may happen in the event that we do not pass the bill under consideration, and if the controls on rice should expire tomorrow-I am informed that Siam is ready to start shipping 200,000,000 pounds of rice to the United States at a price 2 cents per pound below the prevailing price of American rice. The United States consumption of rice is about 50 percent of the amount of rice produced in the United States, and since the rice to be shipped by Siam is of the lower grade, used principally by breweries, the American producers would be deprived of this market for nearly one-fourth of the American crop at one swoop.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MUR-RAY] referred lightly to the rice industry in the United States as not being of much importance. While it is true that only four States in the United States produce rice, this is one of the most important industries in my State and the other States named, and I wish to say to my friend that I consider the rice industry most important, and unless we continue these import restrictions on rice, as well as the other commodities included under the bill, my district and State and the other States will be very adversely affected from an economic standpoint. I trust the Members of the House will approve this emergent legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, as it has already been pointed out, because of the parliamentary situation, and the fact that the control powers now existing on the importation of fats and oils will expire tomorrow, it is necessary that some action be taken today. I can understand that the bill does not meet the approval of all of the Membership. Possibly it does not cover some commodities which should be covered. Again, from my own point of view, it does not go far enough. I would like to see some affirmative or mandatory instructions to the administrative authorities provided in the bill, and not leave the matter entirely discretionary. The trouble is that the discretionary powers provided are not exercised often enough.

With your permission I would like to illustrate briefly what I have in mind: There is an infant industry in this country, largely in my particular area, the tung oil industry. Tung oil is primarily a Chinese product; but, due to the fact that it is a strategic war material, the industry was begun in this country following World War I. Tung oil is now one of the commodities, the importation of which can be controlled under existing law; but the fact remains that those in charge of the administration thereof have not seen fit to do anything toward

stopping the importation of this cheap, inferior grade of tung oil on the domestic market in competition with the oil produced in this country.

We have, as I pointed out the other day on the commodity credit bill, an unusual situation, in fact, an almost unbelievable one. This Congress last year passed legislation making it mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to support domestically produced tung oil at approximately 24 cents per pound. support price is in effect today, and yet, we are permitting the shipment of more than 50 percent of the tung oil used in this country largely from Communistdominated China, free of duty. It is unthinkable that we should permit these oil brokers to bring this Communist oil from China into this country at opportune moments so as to run the market down below the support price that Congress provided for domestic oil. It simply does not make sense that one agency of the Government should reach into the taxpayer's pocket to pay the support price on domestically produced oil and at the same time another agency of the Government should permit this foreign oil, produced by Communist-dominated coolie labor, to be imported and dumped upon the market so as to run the price of the domestic oil down.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that those in charge of the administration of this law will understand from the action of the Congress today and from this debate thereon that this action is a mandate to them to do something about this intolerable and nonsensical situation.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the distinguished lady.

Mrs. BOSONE. I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi, along with the tung oil and soybeans and peanuts, would mix up a little lead and zinc and copper. We from the West would appreciate that because it would help us a great deal.

Mr. COLMER. I am sure I get the full import of the lady's remarks. Unfortunately, in 3 minutes I had to confine myself to one commodity. What I am trying to say is that I hope the Administration will use the authority that is granted it to protect this and other similarly situated industries and commodities, and thus save the taxpayers some money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer] has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it has been very refreshing this afternoon to hear my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle argue for some good old-fashioned American doctrine, namely, some protection for American agriculture and American business. This is sound Republican doctrine also.

I am going to offer an amendment to the bill to add cheese. When we are considering the question of placing an embargo on the control of imports on fats and oils, we must not forget cheese which contains 30 percent fat or oils covered by this bill. My farmers are entitled to this protection. The only protection as the bill is written is for the soybean farmers, the peanut farmers and the big business firms that are importing eccount oils.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman,

will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield. Mr. NICHOLSON. Do we get cheese from coconut oil?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Not yet. Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, that is all there is in this bill—coconut oil.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman has apparently not read this bill. There is plenty of oil in cheese, and it ought to be included in this bill. I call attention to the fact that at the present time the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand 63,000,000 pounds of cheese. I talked to a man in the Department, and he said, "We do not know what to do with it." In 1949 we imported 32,000,000 pounds of cheese, and in May of this year one of the large cheese distributing firms in this country imported from Australia 5,000,000 pounds of Cheddar cheese at 21 cents a pound. The Commodity Credit Corporation is paying a support price of 31 cents. Now, how long are we going to continue with that situation? Our farmers must have more protection than they are getting and I intend to fight for their interests, Mr. Chairman

So at the proper time, Mr. Chairman, I will offer an amendment to insert the word "cheese" on line 9, after the word "butter."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time, 3 minutes, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, America produces annually in the neighborhood of 10,000,000,000 pounds of fats and oils, yet in the past few years fats and oils have been coming into this country by the hundreds of millions of pounds.

It is noteworthy that up until about a year ago this Government had an embargo against the exportation of fats and oils, both edible and inedible. Fats and oils were piling up in this country no end, bringing the price of all of our fats and oils away down to about 50 percent of their actual value. Lard was brought down to a point of about 15 cents below the price at which it should actually sell. Hence, it was necessary for the packer to charge more for the pork chops in order to make up the great loss which he sustained on lard. About a year ago a number of Congressmen, including myself, took this matter up with the Commerce Department; and I am happy to say that a short time afterward inedible fats were decontrolled; that is, the administration permitted the exportation of inedible fats, and a short time after that edible fats were placed on the exportable list.

Now, Mr. Chairman; I have been told that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, is married into the Procter and Gamble soap family. If that be the case,

It is, of course, mighty nice and profitable to have very cheap fats and oils, for his folks, but mighty tough on our producers of fats and oils. If Mr. Sawyer and his family are profiting in this manner, then I think Mr. Sawyer should be investigated.

It is necessary to have coconut oil to make fine candies? The answer is "No," because many of the finest candies are made of good pure hog lard; and coconut oil is a substitute for good pure hog lard; lard is not a substitute for coconut oil. A short time ago our dairymen took a terrific jolt from the oleo combine, now our hog raisers are about to take a like jolt, from foreign producers. I ask what next?

producers. I ask; what next?
Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the amendments to existing law made by such title shall continue in effect until July 1, 1951, for the purpose of authorizing and exercising, administering, and enforcing of import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products) and rice and rice products, upon a determination by the President that such controls are (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government: Provided, however, That such controls shall be removed as soon as the conditions giving rise to them have ceased.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 1, line 9, after the word "butter", insert the word "cheese."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment, and I do not believe it ought to be objected to by the committee. Neither should it cause the calling of a conference, for it merely includes an item which should be included when we are considering the question of import controls on fats and oils. Cheese should be in this bill. I am offering the amendment in the hope that the committee will not object.

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

Mr. Chairman, without going into the merits of this amendment, the amendment will simply send the bill to conference which will take time, and inasmuch as the controls expire tomorrow night, delay will destroy the very purpose for which we have accepted the Senate bill. Should you vote for this amendment you are taking a chance of having all the controls that are in the bill lifted.

I am sorry that this condition exists, but it does exist, and we must take that fact into consideration when the amendments are offered.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Smith of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 31, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected. Mr. HULL, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hull: On page 1, line 10, and on page 2, line 1, after the word "products", strike out "and coconuts and coconut products."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I well realize that what the Chairman says as to the situation is probably correct, but I do not think the House of Representatives should take the responsibility of passing a bad bill because the Senate has forwarded this measure over here at this time in the shape it is in. It does seem to me that it is rather wicked to ruin the marketing facilities for products of millions of farmers in their surplus period with the idea of catering to the demand of some big corporation lobbyist who may be back of this whole proposition. I realize if we vote for the amendment we may not cure the situation, but it is our responsibility, and I shall vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Hull].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hull) there were—ayes 36, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Chairman I offer a

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Guill: On page 1, line 10, strike out "petroleum and petroleum products and."

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why line 10, excluding petroleum and petroleum products, was placed in this bill unless it was so that we could continue importing oil from Saudi Arabia, South America, or any other foreign country. But I would like to make this statement that, notwithstanding what pictures appear in Life magazine and other publications, everyone in Texas is not a millionaire, and all the oil and gas wells in Texas do not produce and spray oil all over the countryside. We have many little wells down in Texas producing four and five barrels a day or less. We have thousands of people working in the oil industry, and some of them are being laid off today because of the fact that we are importing so much oil from foreign lands. We do not mind letting them import some oil, but let them import only as much as we export. We are not only being hurt in Texas, but you are being hurt in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and many other States. I think it is time we gave these small, independent oil people some protection. I do not mean the big boys; I am not worrying about them. They can look after themselves. They operate over a period of many years, but the little man who operates today pays his stuff out in 5, 6, 7, or 8 years.

As I said, I am not certain of the reason behind the specific omission in line 10, but I suggest we consider striking it out. I respectfully ask this House to give this amendment some thought,

I personally think our own small producers deserve more consideration from this House than producers in distant places beyond the seven seas.

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

Mr. Chairman, petroleum and petroleum products have been excluded from controls for the last 3 years, and we left the law as we found it in that respect.

TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to use this time just to ask the chairman or some member of the committee some questions. I asked some of them a while ago on the floor and off the floor about whether or not petroleum and petroleum products were excluded from import controls, and I was assured that this bill did not have anything in the world to do with petroleum and petroleum products, even though this language in line 10 is there. It does seem that it has got something to do with it; is that right?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is right. It is excluded from controls now.

Mr. TACKETT. And this bill just

keeps it excluded?

Mr. SPENCE. It is excluded from controls now. The law remains as it now exists.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania. Mr. GAVIN. If it is excluded now, why is it in here? Why is it necessary

to write it into this legislation?

Mr. TACKETT. I understood that the President was authorized to make agreements with various nations and countries concerning the importation of oil and gasoline, but under this bill he has no authority to deal with anyone, and I think the President of the United States ought to have some authority to deal with these countries that are exporting gasoline and oil into the United States and putting these small oil people out of business.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to my col-

league from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I believe the gentleman understands the situation. If he wishes to support the gentleman from Texas, of course, that is his privilege, but as the chairman has indicated, for 3 years Presidential controls under the War Powers Act have been nonexistent, and this bill is to continue the controls over the other commodities. It does not affect petroleum or petroleum products. It neither takes from or adds to existing powers. These agreements that the gentleman refers to are being made, as I understand, under other executive powers. I hope the committee will not disturb this legislation because no testimony was offered along the line suggested by the gentleman from Texas, and it would certainly complicate our situation. It would undo all of the accomplishments of the committee so far in the consideration of the basic idea.

Mr. TACKETT. I may say to my colleague from Arkansas that the House bill did not have this provision in it, and for that reason no one came before his committee to testify. This is something the gentleman's committee did not know anything about this morning. If it is in the House bill, I cannot find it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If the gentleman will look in that portion of the report, on page 3, that complies with the Ramseyer rule he will find the answer. I want to answer the gentleman's question as intelligently as I can. I am simply trying to emphasize the fact that this is an extension of existing law.

Mr. TACKETT. I think the gentleman is right. I do not doubt that, but I do not want any provision going in here that will preclude the President under some other authority from dealing and making agreements with other countries.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is right, and he can have every assurance on that point, that this will not impair other laws with reference to the importation of petroleum. I assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Assuming the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas was adopted, what would be the effect of it?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am not sure. I want to be very careful here. I do not know that it would affect the President's powers. The point I wish to make is this, that since we are forced in view of the fact these controls end tomorrow to adopt legislation in the form adopted by the Senate then of course we can make no predictions at all regarding the continuation of these controls if amendments are added.

Mr. TACKETT. What I would like to find out is this. Petroleum is not under control now.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TACKETT. If this is adopted will it bring it back under control?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. No. I believe I answered the question when I said that it leaves it to the President's discretion. The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would be to leave it to the President's discretion. I do not intend to enter into a discussion of the merits of the controls over petroleum or the wisdom of any executive orders and policies with reference to it. I have simply pointed out that if we are to accomplish what we desire to do here with reference to the other commodities that were considered by the committee we will simply have to avoid a conference with the Senate, by rejecting the gentleman's amendment, whatever its merits, independently considered.

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

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. I want to be sure that petroleum would be regulated. That is the main thing I am after. Knowing that this bill is so important, is there any reason why we waited until the day before the law is to go out of existence, and then have to rush in here and pass this bill, and then say we have to take this or take nothing? Is there any particular reason for that?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I could say with reference to that, if the gentleman implies that the Committee on Banking has been derelict, that this report was filed on June 16, and we did not get a rule until yesterday.

Mr. TACKETT. Did the candy companies and the soap companies have anything to do with his coming in here with this Senate bill rather than the House bill?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think, of course, the answer to that would have to be given by members of the Committee on Rules, but, in all fairness, of course, it is a matter of public information that the confectioners are favorable to the Senate action.

Mr. TACKETT. To the Senate bill; that is right.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I do not see anything to be gained by entering into a discussion on that point. But the users of coconut oil, of course, are largely the confectioners and the candy manufacturers and the baking interests. They have presented their case vigorously. I am not questioning that.

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. Those of us who are concerned over the importation of these tremendous quantities of oil, amounting to some 821,000 barrels a day, feel that if we could strike out the word "excluding" in line 10, and insert the words "including petroleum and petroleum products", we would be giving protection to the independent producer and the small operator against this tremendous influx of foreign oil.

Mr. TACKETT. I agree with the gentleman except for one thing. They say if we do not pass the bill today it will not do any good if it is passed tomorrow. I want to ask just one more question with reference to that. If the bill is passed today with some amendments and it is necessary to go to conference, would it hurt anything if the bill became law 2 or 3 days later?

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

Mr. GAVIN. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield. Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I come from an oil-producing State and that I am certainly not indifferent to the interests of the oil producers. I know of course that the getnleman's district is an oil-producing district. But the question cannot be resolved on the basis of the merits or demerits of any Presidential controls over the imports of petroleum or petroleum products as far as this legislation is concerned. I give the gentleman that assurance.

With reference to the specific question the gentleman asked me, and speaking as one member of the committee-if any amendments are added to this legislation, I could not make any predictions regarding the action of the other body. It is obvious, in view of the history of this legislation that if any amendments are added a conference is inevitable and the future of this legislation is entirely unpredictable. It would be impossible for us to give the House any assurance that the controls which the vast majority of us understand are necessary in the case of these other oil products, would be continued. Since this legislation does expire tomorrow, it seems to me on that basis we are justified in voting down these amendments. That was my only purpose in making

that point.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. GUILL. I would like to ask the gentleman one question along the line of the question asked by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whether striking out the word "excluding" and inserting the word "including" would give protection to the independent producers and the small operators in the oil industry.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. No, in my opinion it would not. And may I point out to the gentleman that insofar as the prevention of importation of petroleum products is concerned, and the prevention of the disruption of the American market, in which the gentleman is interested, the powers of the President are exercised under other laws which are not involved here.

I believe, if I may say so, and I know the gentleman from Texas is seeking to protect the interests of his people, that his recourse would be with executive agencies and with other committees now investigating the oil import situation not the Committee on Banking and Currency and not by typing his proposal onto this bill.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I point out to the gentleman from Arkansas that there is nothing in this bill which has anything to do with petroleum products. All this bill concerns is fats and oils, and that is vegetable oils and fats. It has nothing to do with petroleum. I agree with the gentleman from Texas as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am an old Yankee protectionist. I do not believe in free trade or anything. But there is nothing about that in this bill. All that this bill involves is vegetable oils. They have never used that discretion which they had to set up a quota on coconut oil imports. We do not have any in this country. We do not raise any and we are not in competition with them. But it came from the Senate that way. As has been pointed out by the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Hays] nothing is going to be hurt if we put this through, because it has never been used anyway. If we have to go to conference, it will never be passed.

Mr. GUILL. We have been told that these things are not going to be used, time and again; that this had to be crammed down our throats by the veto of the Kerr bill. I think it is time we had some laws where we knew what was going to happen, instead of saying, "We will never use it."

Mr. NICHOLSON. In reply to the gentleman, because it has never been done we think it never will be, has not anything to do with the bill before us. We are asked to vote for a Senate bill that has been sent in by the Rules Committee, and that is all we can vote for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Nicholson] has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words in order that I may get the floor in support of the amendment so ably presented by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Guill].

I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas for bringing this important matter to the attention of the Membership of this House, this question of importation of oil and oil products.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gull] has made every effort he could during the short period he has been in Congress in an attempt to secure legislation that would help curb this ever increasing importation of oil.

I have had considerable experience also in trying to secure legislation on this subject matter, but up to this time, I regret to say, have met with little success. Why the administration should oppose the curbing of importation of oil and oil products to the detriment of the independent oil producer, is difficult to understand. I believe if his amendment were adopted some effort would be made on the part of administrative officials to curb the ever increasing importation of oil and oil products. This House ought to give attention to the problem that has been so well portrayed by the gentleman from Texas. This is a problem that not only concerns the State of Texas, a great producer of oil, but it also affects other States in the Union who have a similar problem.

I say to you that unless action is taken with regard to this matter, a good many independent oil producers will go out of business and many workers will go on the unemployed list, all because this country has allowed an over importation of oil and oil products into the United States, from foreign countries.

I trust the membership of this Committee will give its support to the amendment that has been so ably presented by the distinguished Member from Texas [Mr. Guill].

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman who has manifested great interest in this problem. Mr. GAVIN. I cannot see any reason why this would not be proper in this bill. Here is an opportunity for the Representatives of the oil States who have been suffering from these tremendous imports of foreign oils to control the imports.

Mr. kEES. And the gentleman knows the little attention we have received from the committees in this Congress where we have appeared requesting legislation on this subject matter.

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

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania realize that this is the way the administration gets over all their program? They wait until the last minute and then come in and use the stock answer, "We have got to put it over or it will expire."

over or it will expire."

Mr. REES. That is indeed, very unfortunate, because undoubtedly those in charge must have known that this act was going to expire. Surely, they should have brought it here in sufficient time so that it could have the proper consideration to which it is entitled.

The production of crude oil is not only one of the basic industries in the State of Kansas and Texas but it is one of the important and basic industries of this country. I feel that this Congress should provide legislation that would protect the domestic oil producing industry against the ever increasing imports of crude petroleum presently playing havoc with the oil producing industry in this country.

While the market at home is shrinking, imports of crude petroleum are increasing every month and every year. I call your attention to some facts that I think are of extreme importance to this committee and to this Congress.

During the period from 1936 to 1940, the average importation of crude oil and refined products was 153,000 barrels per day. During the war the average imports amounted to approximately 200,000 barrels daily. In 1946 imports were 370,000 barrels. In 1947, 437,000 barrels. In 1948 513,000 barrels per day, and at the end of 1949 importations reached the high of 580,000 barrels. I do not know what the imports are for 1950, but I understand they are now running at the rate of 750,000 barrels per day.

Now let me call your attention to the manner in which these importations have affected the production of oil in the State of Kansas. It is estimated by those engaged in the production of crude oil that in the year 1949 there was a decline in the State's daily production of approximately 25 percent. The decline was from 300,000 barrels of oil daily to a low of 245,000 barrels, or a loss of 65,000 barrels of oil per day of the market demand for Kansas produced oil.

The situation is similar to that of Texas and other oil-producing States. It is estimated that the loss to the economy of the State of Kansas alone amounted to approximately \$30,000,000 last year. Think what it amounts to in the great State of Texas. I would remind you that this loss is not sustained by big oil companies, because 70 percent

of the oil produced in the State of Kansas is by independent producers, and the loss is distributed not only among the producers themselves but among land owners, where oil is produced, and especially among employees who produced the oil.

It is estimated that the reduction in the sale of oil in the State of Kansas alone represents the employment of approximately 5,000 people engaged in various phases of oil production.

I would like to call your further attention to the fact that although 2,500 new oil wells were completed in Kansas in 1949, the output is less than it was in 1948. I think you understand that our oil production is held down on a pro rata basis. In other words, under proration agreement all oil production is given a chance for the market on an allocated basis so that the oil production in our State, as well as in other States, is extremely small compared with the potential production of these wells.

Mr. Chairman, this is an economic problem. The hundreds of thousands of persons who earn their living by drilling and operating oil wells, who operate pipelines and refineries, have a direct and vital interest in the production of crude oil. It affects the farmers who share in the proceeds of the sale of oil. It affects the merchants in the hundreds of oil-producing communities throughout the

It does not make sense that the economic benefits of the domestic oil industry of the State and Nation should be transferred to foreign lands and foreign dictators and to a small group of powerful companies, which, though domiciled in the United States, give the appearance of willingness to sacrifice domestic welfare and increase their foreign position. It cannot be right that our own independent producers should be required to further cut their allocations or go out of businesswhile our Government sanctions increases in imports of oil from foreign countries.

We should have legislation that will curb the importation of crude oil and its products. These importations should be on a quantitative restriction basis, and should be limited to not more than the amount needed to supplement domestic production.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gull].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. August H. An-DRESEN: Page 2, line 1, after "rice products", insert "potatoes, cheese, hams."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman-

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he starts?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. HARDY. I just wanted to call attention to the gentleman's consistency. He admitted a while ago that an amendment would kill the bill and that the bill ought to be passed.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, if the Chair please.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order because I think the amendment is germane. Furthermore, I want to keep some of these products out. That ought to make it germane. I call the Chair's particular attention to the fact that on page 2, line 1, rice and rice products are included. All that I am doing is to add additional products. Certainly rice and rice products are food; and the commodities I mentioned, potatoes, cheese, Polish hams, eggs from Com-munist China, are all food products and are in line with rice and rice products. Even butter is mentioned in the bill. I think the chairman should find that the amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GRANGER). The

Chair is prepared to rule.

The body of the bill as well as the title enumerates commodities in addition to fats and oils. Rice is mentioned. It would be in order to add other commodities.

The Chair overrules the point of order.
The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the Chair for that wise ruling.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I have offered this amendment is to have the RECORD show that large imports of potatoes, cheese, eggs, and hams are coming into this country. Approximately 32,-000,000 pounds of cheese have been imported into the United States at a time when we have a support price program for cheese in this country. The Commodity Credit Corporation now owns 63,000,000 pounds of cheese. We imported 32,000,000 pounds in the last year. For every pound of cheese that comes into this country as long as we have the support price program you will find that the Commodity Credit Corporation has to buy 2 pounds of American cheese.

We have heard a great deal about potatoes during the past 2 years and particularly now, since April 7, 1949, when the famous utopian Brannan plan was presented to the Congress. During the past year approximately 10,000,000 to 12,000,-000 bushels of potatoes have come in here from Canada. Canadian growers of potatoes have been encouraged to increase their production by 30 percent so they could ship potatoes into the United States while we have a support price on potatoes in this country. Nothing has been done either under this law or under section 22 to stop these imports. The consequence is that the Government has had to buy 2 bushels of American potatoes for every bushel of potatoes imported into this country to carry out the support program.

Then we have had hundreds and hundreds of thousands of pounds of eggs which have come into this country from Communist China that are flooding this market at a time when we have a support price program for eggs. In fact, we are encouraging the Communists in China to produce more eggs to ship into the United States in competition with the eggs produced by American producers.

Oh, yes; they all come from behind the iron curtain. They send Polish hams into this country, sell them for dollars, take the dollars out of the United States, which go into the coffers of Russia with which to buy implements of war to be used against us. They may be using them against us even now over in Korea this very minute, as the gentleman from

Iowa suggests.

I think something ought to be done about this matter, especially at a time when we have a support-price program. There certainly is no reason in the world why we should permit the importation of eggs, hams, and other commodities from behind the iron curtain in order to furnish Russia with a market in this country, using the money that we give them for their products sold in competition with American-produced products to buy war materials to be used against our soldiers and our sailors over in the Far East or in any other part of the world.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman's amendment is agreed to will it lessen the support-price program to the taxpayers

of the country?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Ch, yes. I think it would materially cut the cost of our support programs. The farmers throughout Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are getting from 20 to 26 cents a dozen for their eggs. Of course, we are paying from 50 to 60 cents a dozen for them in Washington. If we are going to have a support program why, then, we should be consistent about it in supporting prices only in this country. They are not doing that now. They are supporting the price of eggs and potatoes for the entire world. So it goes.

I do not suppose this amendment will

pass.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, yes; it will.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will it? I am glad to hear the gentleman say he will support it because we ought to protect our American producers in the United States as well as the Treasury.

I hope the gentleman from Maine will support my amendment because he represents one of the biggest and finest potato-growing areas in this country next to Minnesota, and he knows what it is to have this kind of competition coming at a time when we need this protection. In the 1948 crop his State sold millions of bushels of potatoes to the Government, at the same time the Canadians were shipping them in here and taking the market away from American producers.

I am offering this amendment to keep the record straight and ask for a vote. Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

XCVI-598

Mr. Chairman, the Maine potato gets the publicity, and cotton, corn, and peanuts get the cash. I am very glad to say a word on behalf of Maine potatoes. We do raise some sixty to seventy-five million bushels, and, strange as it may sound, the Canadians are permitted each year to import some eleven to fifteen thousand carloads into the United States. They want to give us the Brannan plan: a scheme by which the producer gets the top price, the consumer pays the bottom price, and they make up the difference to each other in taxes. That is the New Deal scheme. So I am going to support this amendment because if we are going to have support prices and at the same time destroy the support program by bringing in some 15,000,000 bushels of foreign potatoes, we will in the end destroy ourselves.

I think it would be a very good thing to put this amending language in here so that we can read it, and it will not be left to some agency to use its own judgment. The amendment offered by the gentle-man from Minnesota [Mr. August H. ANDRESEN] is an excellent thought, and

I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. August H. ANDRESEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Fellows and Mr. GAVIN) there were-ayes 32, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected. Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gavin: Page 1, line 9, strike out "but", and in line 10 strike out the word "excluding" and insert the word "including."

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I make the point of order that the amendmenent offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. It is the same proposition on which the Chair ruled previously. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPENCE. I make the point of order that the question has been decided. An identical amendment has been voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that this is a different amendment entirely. It has not been determined by the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the Chair state how many amendments are at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the gentleman, this is the only amendment on the desk.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. We have heard a great deal lately about the tremendous imports of foreign oils which have now reached the gigantic figure of 821.000 barrels a day. This has had a terrific impact on the small independent producer of oil who is making the very fight of his life for his existence against this tremendous flood of imported oil. This amendment just simply changes the word "excluding" to "including", so that it will read: "for the purpose of authorizing and exercising, administering, and enforcing the import controls with respect to fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials), fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, including petroleum

and petroleum products."

So now those who have been clamoring for the administration to effect some curb on imports of petroleum or some tariff medium to protect the small independent producer, here is an opportunity to express their thinking and their opinion so as to give that protection which is so necessary and essential to the small producers throughout the Nation, if he is to stay in business. If we fail to curb these oil imports, and dampen the ambition of these men who are seeking oil to build up our reserves, and we suddenly find ourselves catapulted into a war, with these imports from Saudi Arabia, Asiatic countries, and the South American countries cut off, and we have not built up our reserves in this country to meet the needs and demands of fighting a war, we will find ourselves in a very critical position. The Pennsylvania crude oil industry, in my opinion, will have a difficult time if these heavy imports of crude are permitted to come into this country. It is a stripper field and the average production is less than one half barrel a day and is unable to compete with cheap South American or Saudi-Arabian crude.

The Pennsylvania grade crude industry has existed since 1859 and has contributed greatly to the economic growth and prosperity of the Nation. However, with steadily mounting imports, it is a question how long it can survive against this severe competition. And this goes for all the small independent producers all over the United States. Legislation must be enacted to curb importation of foreign

Nobody would object to a reasonable amount of crude being imported, but if the big operators can get away with 800,-000 barrels a day, in 2 or 3 years I presume they will be up to 2 or 3 million barrels a day which would wreck the oil industry of this Nation, and the coal industry as well.

This is a splendid opportunity to enact legislation to enforce controls on the importation of oil. The representatives from the oil States certainly ought to be pleased to vote for this amendment. My amendment is simple, it is understandable, it is clear and concise. It is an excellent opportunity for those representatives to express their thinking on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were-ayes 22, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected. Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a recent publication, issued by the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, entitled "New England, Its Economic Importance and Prospects," that has just come to my attention, carries a message that sustains the conviction I hold in common with many other New Englanders, that this great industrial and commercial area of the country is looking forward to a very bright future.

The part that New England has played as the pioneer industrial area of the United States is well-known to every American and recognized all over the world. What is not generally appreciated, is that New England today has a remarkable record of outstanding leadership in a great variety of important types of manufacture and there is little evidence that we are losing our dominant position in any number of these well-known products.

There is conclusive proof that New England's economic importance is increasing, not declining, and the census proves that it is growing in population and labor force. Personal income and bank deposits of New England citizens are sharply increasing and this is reflected in a substantial advance in the volume of retail sales, particularly in

the last 10 years.

The predominance of industrial New England is indicated by the following facts, recently published by the Federal Reserve Bank. Of the total volume of the United States, New England manufactures 85 percent of wool scouring and combing; 80 percent of packaged fish; 62 percent of silverware; 61 percent of woolen and worsted fabrics; 61 percent of thread; 59 percent of newsprint paper; 57 percent of textile machinery; 56 percent of footwear cut stock; 52 percent of felt hat bodies; 50 percent of wrapper and binder cigar tobacco; 49 percent of nails and spikes; 45 percent of cutlery; 45 percent of typewriters; 44 percent of cardboard; 42 percent of hand saws and blades; 41 percent of maple sirup and sugar; 38 percent of narrow fabrics; 37 percent of ophthalmic goods; 37 percent of needles, pins, and fasterners; 37 percent of ball and roller bearings; 37 percent of jewelry: 34 percent of copper rolling and drawing; 33 percent of footwear; 32 percent of leather tanning and finishing; 30 percent of glue and gelatine; 30 percent of abrasive products; 30 percent of insulated wire and cable; 28 percent of children's vehicles; 27 percent of fine papers; 27 percent of machine tools; 26 percent of rayon and nylon broad woven fabrics; 25 percent of cut stone products.

While agriculture in New England is naturally limited by the relatively small area of the region, nevertheless, 62 percent of the cranberries and 48 percent of the blueberries raised in the United States, come from New England; and I am sure that everyone is familiar with our potato and apple crops, which have such a world-wide market.

Here are a few more pertinent facts from the same source that throws further light on New England's position at the present time. With 2.1 percent of the Nation's land area and only 6.3 percent of the Nation's population, we have 3,189,000 persons steadily employed in nonagricultural jobs, and of this number 1,337,000 workers are engaged in manufacturing, and 1,852,000 in service establishments or similar occupations.

May I also point out that the average annual income of New England citizens is \$1,500 as compared with a national average of \$1,180. The thrift of the New England people is shown by the fact that the average liquid savings for the entire area is \$1,780 per person, compared with a national average of \$1,180.

We are very proud of the good labormanagement relations that have prevailed in New England for many years. We have 7.3 percent of the Nation's nonagricultural workers and yet the time lost through strikes by these workers is only 4.2 percent of the national total.

New England is growing and let these facts from official sources prove the case. According to the Bureau of the Census and other Federal agencies, in 1930 our population was 8,166,000; in 1949 it was 9,298,000; in 1930 our labor force was 3,431,000; in 1950 it is 4,239,000. This is typical of New England's growth through the years, a steady, constant growth. Lacking the spectacular percentage increases of newer sections of the country, this has largely escaped the attention of the American people, in the light of more startling increases elsewhere.

New England's industrial economy is in a state of transition, in common with other nearby industrial States, stimulated by new revolutionary technological and scientific advancements, developed since the war, and a host of new and improved products that are rapidly reaching the markets.

Old New England industries, for which we are famous all over the world, are rapidly changing their processes of production and readjusting themselves to the new order. Many new factories are being established to make new products, and while during these vital changes we are suffering a considerable volume of temporary industrial unemployment, there is every good reason to expect an unprecedented increase in production and wealth in the near future.

There is plenty of vitality in New England's industrial life and while we do not often shout our own praises from the rooftops, we do adjust ourselves to the ever-changing conditions of modern life quietly and after due deliberation and study. If economic changes reduce production and employment in any given field, this decline is almost always quickly absorbed by industrial growth in other

directions, thus we react to the immutable laws of growth. A large, well-known company moves its headquarters from Boston to California. Immediately there is raised a hue and cry claiming New England is slipping. Magazine and newspaper articles spread the tidings all over the country, but while this company was moving part of its plant away from New England, another much larger company moved into the same area, creating several times the number of jobs that were lost, with no publicity.

This is change, the symbol of growth, and we of New England and for that matter all of the great industrial areas of the eastern seaboard expect it, and eventually profit by it.

New England fights against the handicap of not being a great raw material producing area, but this disadvantage is more than overcome by the skill, stability, and intelligence of our working people, the efficiency of the servicing establishments that surround our industrial life, and the great advantage, that our cities and towns have grown up as industrial centers.

New England is attacking the problems of scarcity that restrict our growth, vigorously, whole-heartedly, and intelligently. The governments of the six New England States, aided by the New England congressional delegations, representative of both parties, are all working in the same direction to formulate plans that will take full advantage of the new sources of iron ore from Labrador. Plans are under way to bring natural gas to New England within the next year and surveys are to be undertaken at once to make full use of our water power for hydroelectric development.

When we have iron ore coming to our ports, natural gas providing inexpensive heat, and hydroelectric power stations providing us with low-cost power, and all of these advantages should be available in New England in the next few years, watch New England rapidly expand in production and wealth through its 350 research laboratories and its more than 20,000 industrial plants.

Massachusetts, which has more than half of these industrial plants, and is the most widely diversified manufacturing State in the country, is already leading the way in this movement to a greater usefulness and prosperity.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Granger, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3550) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils—including butter—and rice and rice products, pursuant to House Resolution 680, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill S. 3550 to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the recommendation that in line 10, page 1, and line 1, page 2, the words "coconuts and coconut products" be stricken out; and in line 9, page 1, after the word "butter", insert the word "cheese."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.
The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 72, nays 264, not voting 94, as follows:

# [Roll No. 190]

YEAS-72 Andresen, O'Hara, Minn. Gross August H. Guill O'Konski Potter Barrett, Wyo. Hagen Beall Hale Poulson Bennett, Mich. Reed, Ill. Biemiller Hoeven Reed, N. Y. Bishop Brown, Ohio Hoffman, Mich. Hope Rich Byrnes, Wis. Cannon Case, S. Dak. Horan St. George Scrivner Jackson, Wash. Scudder Chiperfield Short Jennings Simpson, Ill. Clevenger Cotton Crawford Jensen Kearns Smith, Kans. Smith, Wis. Curtis Lovre Stefan Dague Lyle Martin, Iowa Stockman Davis, Wis. Taber Fenton Merrow Velde Vursell Meyer Miller, Md. Miller, Nebr. Fisher Ford Weichel Gavin Withrow Moulder Murray, Wis. Norblad Woodruff Goodwin Graham Granger

## NAYS-264

Battle Abbitt Abernethy Beckworth Addonizio Bennett, Fla. Bentsen Albert Allen, Calif. Blackney Boggs, Del. Boggs, La. Allen, Ill. Anderson, Calif Bolling Bolton, Md. Bolton, Ohio Andrews Angell Aspinall Auchincloss Bonner Bosone Baring Barrett, Pa. Boykin Bramblett Bates, Mass.

Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Burke
Burleson
Eurnside
Burton
Camp
Canfield
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll

Case, N. J. Celler Jonas Jones, Ala. Jones, Mo. Jones, N. C. Chatham Chelf Karst Christopher Chudoff Karsten Keating Clemente Cole, Kans. Kelly, N. Y. Colmer Combs Kilburn Cooley Kilday Cooper King Kirwan Coudert Klein Crook Crosser Kruse Cunningham Kunkel Davenport Davies, N. Y. Lane Lanham Davis, Ga. Davis, Tenn. Latham Dawson LeCompte Deane LeFevre DeGraffenried Lichtenwalter Delaney Lind Linehan Denton D'Ewart Dollinger Lodge Lucas Lynch McConnell McCormack Dolliver Donohue Douglas Doyle McCulloch Durham McDonough Eberharter McKinnon Elliott McMillan, S. C. Elston McSweeney Mack, Ill. Mack, Wash. Engle, Calif. Evins Feighan Fellows Madden Magee Fernandez Mahon Mansfield Forand Marcantonio Frazier Marsalis Furcolo Marshall Gamble Martin, Mass. Gary Gathings Michener Miles Golden Miller, Calif. Gordon Mills Gore Gorski Monroney Morgan Granahan Morrison Grant Morton Gregory Murdock Gwinn Murray, Tenn. Hand Nelson Hardy Nicholson Hare Nixon Hart Noland Havenner Norrell Hays, Ark. Hays, Ohio Hedrick Norton O'Brien, Ill. O'Brien, Mich. O'Hara, Ill. Herlong Herter O'Neill Heselton Hoffman, Ill. O'Sullivan Pace Holifield Passman Holmes Patman Howell Patten Huber Jacobs Peterson Javits Pfeifer, Joseph L. Johnson

## NOT VOTING-

Allen, La. Fugate Kean Andersen, H. Carl Kearney Garmatz Keefe Arends Gillette Kelley, Pa. Kennedy Bailey Gilmer Barden Bates, Ky. Gossett Green Keogh Kerr McCarthy Blatnik Hall. Edwin Arthur McGrath Hall, McGregor Bryson Buckley, N. Y. Bulwinkle McMillen, Ill. Leonard W. Macy Halleck Burdick Byrne, N. Y. Mason Mitchell Harden Harris Cavalcante Harrison Morris Chesney Cole, N. Y. Harvey Hébert Multer Murphy Corbett Heffernan O'Toole Cox Dingell Patterson Hinshaw Phillips, Tenn. Plumley Dondero Doughton Hobbs Irving Quinn Jackson, Calif. Ellsworth Ramsav Engel, Mich. Jenison Jenkins Riehlman Fallon Rivers Roosevelt Judd Fogarty

Pfeiffer, William L. Philbin Phillips, Calif. Pickett Poage Polk Powell Preston Price Priest Rabaut Rains Rankin Redden Regan Rhodes Ribicoff Richards Robeson Rodino Rogers, Fla. Rogers, Mass. Rooney Sabath Sadlak Saylor Hugh D., Jr. Secrest Shelley Smith. Va. Staggers Stanley Sullivan Sutton Tackett Talle Tauriello Taylor Teague Thomas Thompson Thornberry Tollefson Towe Trimble Underwood Van Zandt Vorys Wadsworth Wagner Walsh Walter White, Calif. White, Idaho Whitten Whittington

Wickersham Widnall Wier Wigglesworth Williams Willis Wilson, Tex.

Winstead Wolcott Wolverton Woodhouse Yates Young Zablocki

Sims Smith, Ohio Sanborn Steed Stigler Sasscer Scott, Hardie Sheppard Vinson Simpson, Pa. Werdel

Whitaker Wilson, Ind. Wilson, Okla. Wood

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Macy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Arends. Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Heller with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Dondero. Mr. Irving with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall. Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cole of New York, Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Riehlman. Mr. Harris with Mr. Sanborn.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Gillette. Mr. Sims with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Barden with Mr. McGregor. Mr. Harrison with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Hinshaw. Mr. Stigler with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Breen with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Judd. Mr. Dingell with Mr. Kean.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Jenison. Mr. McGrath with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.

Mr. Wilson of Oklahoma with Mr. Plumley. Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Fugate with Mr. Burdick.

Messrs. Moulder, Cannon, Granger, GUILL, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HOFFMAN OF Michigan, BENNETT of Michigan, Cotton, STEFAN, HILL, and WOODRUFF changed their votes from "nay" to "yea".

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

The result of vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused. The question was taken; and the bill

was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the

table. The bill H. R. 8737 was laid on the

table. GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on

the bill just passed. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief announcement for the benefit of the Members.

It was hoped that we might be able to dispose of the program today, but it now appears that we will not be able to do so. Therefore, we will have to meet tomorrow

There is a conference report to be taken up next; then the Puerto Rican bill. Then there is Reorganization Plan No. 24, which expires next week. Of course that is a matter of high preference. Following the Puerto Rican bill, that will be taken up. Then, following that, the security bill.

There will be some opposition to the Puerto Rican bill, and it looks as though we might not be able to dispose of this program today, so I wanted to announce that we will be in session tomorrow

For next week, as I announced heretofore, there will be no program. Unless something of an emergency should happen, which is not expected, the Members can govern themselves with the knowledge that as of now there is no legislative program for next week.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it the plan of the majority leadership to finish the Puerto Rican bill today?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, not necessarily. If we can, we would like to do so; but if not, it will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You are going to take up the conference report first? Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield. Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman spoke about Reorganization Plan No. 24. Would it not be possible to bring that up before the Puerto Rican bill? It would not take more than 20 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I assumed we had made an arrangement. I thought I had suggested to the gentleman from Michigan that plan No. 24 would be called up after the Puerto Rican bill was out of the way, and I assumed that we had a meeting of the minds.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is immaterial to me. I thought possibly you could take that up and get through with it this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman has no objection, we will take up the Puerto Rican bill first.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. To be sure you finish the program tomorrow, has the gentleman considered meeting at 11 o'clock?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. That will not be necessary. I think we will meet at 12 o'clock.

MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

Mr. HART submitted the following. conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3571) to continue the authority of

the Secretary of Commerce under the Merchant Ships Sales Act of 1946, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2434)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3571) to continue the authority of the Secretary of Commerce under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, and for other purposes having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as

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

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

'SEC. 14. No contract of sale shall be made under this Act after January 15, 1951, and no contract of charter shall be made under this act after June 30, 1950, except as provided for charter under subsections (e) and (f) of section 5 hereof, as amended.'
"Sec. 2. The fourth sentence of section 11

(a) of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'A vessel placed in such reserve shall in no case be used for any purpose whatsoever except that any such vessel may be used for account of any agency or department of the United States during any period in which vessels may be requisitioned under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and that any such vessel may be used under a bareboat charter entered into pursuant to authority vested in the Secretary of Commerce on July 1, 1950, or granted to the Secretary of Commerce after such date.'

"SEC. 3. Section 5 of such Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof subsections to read as follows:

'(e) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 11 and 14 of this Act, as amended, war-built dry-cargo vessels owned by the United States on or after June 30, 1950, may be chartered pursuant to this act for bareboat use in any service which, in the opinion of the Federal Maritime Board, is required in the public interest and is not adequately served, and for which privately owned American-flag vessels are not available for charter by private operators on reasonable conditions and at reasonable rates for use in such service. No charters shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce under authority of this subsection until the Federal Maritime Board shall have given due notice to all interested parties and shall have afforded such parties an opportunity for a public hearing on such charters and shall have certified its findings to the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to include in such charters such restrictions and conditions as the Federal Maritime Board determines to be necessary or appropriate to protect the public interest in respect of such charters and to protect privately owned vessels against competition from vessels chartered under this section: Provided, however, That all such charters shall contain a provision that they will be reviewed annually by the Federal Maritime Board, with recommendations to the Secretary of Commerce, for the purpose of determining whether conditions exist justifying continuance of the charters under the provisions of this subsection.

"'(2) A charter existing on June 30, 1950, with respect to a war-built dry-cargo vessel

may be extended to October 31, 1950, if application is made within ten days after the enactment hereof for the charter of such vessel under subsection (e) of this section and if the Secretary of Commerce deems such extension is justified in accordance with the provisions of section 5 (e) (1): Provided, however, That a new voyage under such extended charter shall not be begun after October 31, 1950, unless it has been determined prior to such date, in accordance with the procedure set forth in this subsection, that the continued use of the vessel in the service is required. The Federal Maritime Board shall conduct all hearings on applications made under this paragraph immediately upon receipt thereof and shall promptly certify its findings to the Secretary of Commerce, provided that all such certifications shall be made not later than October 31, 1950.

"'(f) (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 11 and 14 of this Act, as amended, the Secretary of Commerce may charter any passenger vessel, whether or not war-built, owned by the United States on or after June 30, 1950, pursuant to title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

"'(2) Charters existing on June 30, 1950, with respect to passenger vessels may be continued until December 31, 1951, or until expiration thereof by the terms of their

"SEC. 4. Section 2 of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard,' approved March 31, 1947 (Public Law 27, Eightieth Congress), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. The authority granted by this resolution shall remain in force only until January 15, 1951: Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to grant a waiver permitting a vessel to sail with less than its specified comple-ment on board.'

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the Act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 999), as amended by Act of April 11, 1935 (49 Stat. 154), and by Act of July 2, 1935 (49 Stat. 442), or the provisions of any other Act or regulation, vessels of Canadian registry shall permitted to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes dur-ing the period from the date of enactment of this Act to December 31, 1950, or until such earlier time as the President by order may designate, and such vessels shall be per mitted during the period from the date of enactment of this Act to December 31, 1950, to transport coal to Ogdensburg, New York, from other points in the United States on the Great Lakes, or their connecting or tributary waters."

And the House agree to the same. EDWARD J. HART. HERBERT C. BONNER, ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Managers on the Part of the House. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Managers on the Part of the Senate.

## STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3571) to continue the authority of the Secretary of Commerce under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and

recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the bill strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The conferees agreed to the bill as amended by the House with the following amend-

In section 2 the conferees agreed that in lieu of the date "January 31, 1951," the date "January 15, 1951", should be inserted. Thus while sale authority will expire after the end of this Congress there will be some time during which the Congress may give further consideration to extension of the authority if circumstances warrant same after the convening of the Eighty-second Congress.

Section 3 of the bill was further amended by changing the date in paragraph 2 of section 5 (e) to read "October 31, 1950", in lieu of "September 30, 1950", in each case in which said date appeared in the House bill. This change is to provide additional time for hearings by the new Federal Maritime Board which is still in process of reorganization.

Section 4 of the bill regarding authority of the Commandant of the Coast Guard to waive compliance with navigation and vessel inspection laws was further amended to conform with said section as passed by the Senate with the exception that the authority will expire on January 15, 1951, in lieu of December 31, 1950, and with the exception that authority to grant a waiver for the employment of alien seamen will continue un-til said date. The change in date will give the new Congress an opportunity to consider further extension of authority if such extension should at that time be warranted. Moreover, as agreed by the conferees, the Commandant will not be authorized to grant a waiver permitting a vessel to sail with less than its specified complement aboard.

HERBERT C. BONNER, EDWARD J. HART,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 3571) to continue the authority of the Secretary of Commerce under the Merchant Ships Sales Act of 1946.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

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

Jersey?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk read the statement of the managers.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman briefly explain the report?

Mr. HART. There were only three changes in the House bill, and they are minor. For instance, with respect to the continuation of the authority to sell vessels the change is from January 31, 1951, to January 15, 1951.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And I understand from the ranking minority member of the conference committee that it was a unanimous report.

Mr. HART. It was the unanimous report of the managers on the part of both Houses.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection on this side.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT OF THE COM-MITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SYSTEMS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 88 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1515 of the Eighty-first Congress, second session, which is a report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 137, Eightieth Congress, first session, as amended, on the immigration and naturalization systems of the United States. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECRETARY TO THE SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the following House Resolution 494 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective March 1, 1950, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of a secretary to the Sergeant at Arms at the basic rate of \$3,800 per annum.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield. Mr. LECOMPTE. This resolution, as I understand, increases the salary of the secretary in the office of the Sergeant

Mrs. NORTON. Yes. Mr. LECOMPTE. The only objection to that resolution appears to be that it increases the salary of one employee. It was stated before the committee that there are a good many others asking for an increase at this time and that this bill will very probably create a very difficult situation. I merely submit that information for the benefit of the House, and I ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey if that is not correct.

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; the gentleman is quite correct. But I thought we had made an agreement that the would be considered at a future time.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I am not sure but what that is right.

Mrs. NORTON. This is rather important at this time.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I withdraw my obfection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 624 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 617, Eighty-first Congress, incurred by the Committee on Armed Services, not to exceed \$10,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 637 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of further conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 137, Eightyfirst Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed an additional \$45,-000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, special counsel, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amend-

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$25,000."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to get a copy of the resolution and I would like to know what it is all about.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey can probably explain the resolution. The committee amendment is to reduce the amount to \$25,-000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reduce it? It started out too high. Will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is there any way that the Members can learn how much is involved in these various resolutions and how many there are of them? I recall a time when there was put through a pension for Congressmen and we were criticized because we did not object. I do not like to see something go through that I do not know anything about and be criticized later

Mrs. NORTON. This matter has been fully considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are there any Republicans on that commit-

Mrs. NORTON. Oh, yes. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LeCompte] will explain it to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to know one thing. I was not here the other day. Someone said there was a resolution here to increase the compensation of Congressmen. Is that here, too?

Mrs. NORTON. No; that is not here. I am sorry to say it is not here at pres-

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am very happy it is not here.

Mrs. NORTON. I do not think the gentleman's view is shared by very many Members.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution, I think, providing money for the investigation of monopolies by the Committee on the Judicary, is it not? A previous resolution by the House provides for such investigation.

Mrs. NORTON. That is correct.
Mr. LeCOMPTE. It has been reduced \$20,000 by the committee?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PAINTINGS. THE GRAND CANYON OF THE YELLOWSTONE AND THE CHASM OF THE COLORADO

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 170.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the painting, The Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone and the painting, The Chasm of the Colorado, by Thomas Moran, now located in the United States Capitol Building, be, and the same are hereby transferred to the permanent custody of the United States Department of the Interior for display in the Department of the Interior Building, and the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to effect the actual transfer of such painting from the United States Capitol to the Department of the Interior.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLASTER CAST OF THE STATUE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the plaster cast of the statue of George Washington, now located in the rotunda of the United States Capitol, executed by William J. Hubard from the original statue in marble by Jean Antoine Houdon, be, and the same is hereby, transferred to the custody of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to effect the actual transfer of such statue from the United States Capitol to the Smithsonian Institu-

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

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPLICAS OF STATE SEALS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8112) 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.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Caiptol is authorized to transfer to each State the replica of the seal of such State which was removed from the Chamber of the House of Representatives of the United States during the renovation of such Chamber in 1949. Upon application of an agent of a State, the Architect of the Capitol shall prepare the seal of such State for shipment and, at the expense of such State or its agent, shall ship such seal in accordance with such application.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—
(1) the term "State" includes, in addition to a State of the Union, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands;

(2) the term "seal" includes, in addition to the seal of a State, a seal of a former Territory which has been admitted into the Union as a State and a former seal of a State; and

(3) the term "agent" means (A) the official who, under the law of a State, is charged with the care, custody, and control of the official seal of such State and furnishes the Architect of the Capitol with satisfactory evidence that he is so charged, or (B) in the event that there is no such official, the governor of the State.

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

## ABRAHAM LINCOLN DOCUMENTS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 484.

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

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to transmit to the Abraham Lincoln Association at Springfield, Ill., photostatic copies of certain Abraham Lincoln documents as described in a four-page list deposited with the Clerk, the cost of such photostatic copies to be paid by the Abraham Lincoln Association.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8958) relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from

New Jersey?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the title does not give us any information. May we know something about its contents? What is the purpose of the bill is what we are trying to ascertain.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a bill designed to give to the guards of the Library of Congress certain police authority that they do not now have and which they need, similar to that given to the Supreme Court guards recently.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And without extra cost to the Government.

Mr. ALBERT. That is right. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Librarian of Congress may designate employees of the Library of Congress as special policemen, without additional compensation, for duty in connection with the policing of the Library of Congress buildings and grounds and adjacent streets.

Sec. 2. Public travel in and occupancy of the Library of Congress grounds is hereby restricted to the sidewalks and other paved surfaces.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful to offer or expose any article for sale in the Library of Congress buildings or grounds; to display any sign, placard, or other form of advertisement therein; or to solicit fares, alms, subscriptions, or contributions therein.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful to step or climb upon, remove, or in any way injure any statue, seat, wall fountain, or other erection or architectural feature, or any tree, shrub, plant, or turf in the Library of Congress buildings or grounds.

SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful to discharge any firearm, firework, or explosive, set fire to any combustible, make any harangue or oration, or utter loud, threatening, or abusive language in the Library of Congress buildings or grounds.

Sec. 6. It shall be unlawful to parade, stand, or move in processions or assemblages in the Library of Congress buildings or grounds, or to display therein any flag, banner, or device designed or adapted to bring into public notice any party, organization, or movement.

SEC. 7. (a) In addition to the restrictions and requirements specified in sections 2 to 6, inclusive, of this act, the Librarian of Congress may prescribe such regulations as may be deemed necessary for the adequate protection of the Library of Congress buildings and grounds and of persons and property therein, and for the maintenance of suitable order and decorum within the Library of Congress buildings and grounds.

(b) All regulations promulgated under the authority of this section shall be printed in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia, and shall not become effective until the expiration of 10 days after the date of such publication.

SEC. 8. Whoever violates any provision of sections 2 to 6, inclusive, of this act, or of any regulation prescribed under section 7 of this act, shall be fined not more than \$100 or imprisoned not more than 60 days, or both, prosecution for such offenses to had in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, upon information by the United States attorney or any of his assistants: Provided, That in any case where, in the commission of any such offense, public property is damaged in an amount exceeding \$100, the period of imprisonment for the offense may be not more than 5 years.

SEC. 9. The special police provided for in section 1 of this act shall have the power, within the Library of Congress buildings and grounds and adjacent streets, to enforce and make arrests for violations of any provision of sections 2 to 6, inclusive, of this act, of any regulation prescribed under section 7 of this act, or of any law of the United States or of any State or any regulation promul-gated pursuant thereto: *Provided*, That the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to make arrests within the Library of Congress buildings and grounds for any violations of any such laws or regulations, but such authority shall not be construed as authorizing the Metropolitan Police force, except with the consent or upon the request of the Librarian of Congress or his assistants, to enter the Library of Congress buildings to make arrests in response to complaints or to serve warrants or to patrol the Library of Congress buildings or grounds.

SEC. 10. In order to permit the observance of authorized ceremonies within the Library of Congress buildings and grounds, the Librarian of Congress may suspend for such occasions so much of the prohibitions contained in sections 2 to 6, inclusive, of this act as may be necessary for the occasion, but only if responsible officers shall have been appointed, and arrangements determined which are adequate, in the judgment of the Librarian, for the maintenance of suitable order and decorum in the proceedings, and for the protection of the Library buildings and grounds and of persons and property

therein.

SEC. 11. For the purposes of this act the Library of Congress grounds shall be held to extend to the line of the face of the east curb of First Street Southeast, between B Street Southeast and East Capitol Street; to the line of the face of the south curb of East Capitol Street, between First Street Southeast and Second Street Southeast; to the line of the face of the west curb of Second Street Southeast, between East Capitol Street and B Street Southeast; to the line of the face of the north curb of B Street Southeast, between First Street Southeast and Second Street Southeast; and to the line of the face of the east curb of Second Street Southeast. between Pennsylvania Avenue Southeast and the north side of the alley separating the Library Annex Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library; to the line of the north side of the same alley, between Second Street Southeast and Third Street Southeast; to the line of the face of the west curb of Third Street Southeast, between the north side of the same alley and B Street Southeast; to the line of the face of the north curb of B Street Southeast, between Third Street Southeast and Pennsylvania Avenue Southeast; to the line of the face of the northeast curb of Pennsylvania Avenue Southeast, between B Street Southeast and Second Street Southeast.

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

OFFICIAL PAPERS RELATING TO THE TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2348) to increase the annual authorization for the appropriation of funds for collecting, editing, and publishing of official papers relating to the Territories of the United States.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentlewoman explain the bill?

Mrs. NORTON. I will yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] to explain it.

Mr. TRIMBLE. This is a bill increasing the appropriation for the publication of historical documents and is an extension of the program since 1925, when it was first instituted. It was unanimously reported by the committee and recommended by the Secretary of State and various Territorial and State officials. It is in accord with the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that this calls for an additional appropriation of something better than \$1.000.000.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The appropriation is

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a Senate bill. The printing of this material is a regular annual affair, and it increases the authorization from \$30,000 to \$50,000.

It is not \$50,000 additional, it is an increase in the authorization from \$30,000 to \$50,000, I believe.

Mr. TRIMBLE. That is correct.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Would not an appropriation have to be made later by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. TRIMBLE. That is right.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. This \$50,000 was provided for on the belief that additional copies of the histories of the Territories are to be printed, and the cost of printing is somewhat higher than it was 20 years ago when the law was enacted.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 510; 5 U.S. C. 168d), is hereby amended by deleting the amount of "\$30,000" contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50,000."

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

JEFFERSON NATIONAL EXPANSION ME-MORIAL, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8591) to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion

Memorial Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from

New Jersey?

Mr. Lecompte. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill, it occurs to me, ought to have a little bit of attention. I think it might be said the bill involves a good many million dollars.

A memorial at St. Louis has been proposed for 15 years. The city of St. Louis has deeded to the Federal Government land that is estimated to be worth approximately \$30,000,000. The bill before the House provides for the erection of a Jefferson Memorial, or a memorial to the Louisiana Purchase, and the Lewis and Clark expedition to be completed by 1953, which will be the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase by President Jefferson, at a cost of about \$8,000,000, of which the Government is to furnish \$3 to each dollar furnished by the city of St. Louis.

There is considerable to be said, however, in favor of this bill. The land for the memorial has been deeded to the Federal Government by the city of St. Louis. For some years the Federal Government has spent at the rate of \$10,000 a year for employing a guard or guards to police the ground, which is now vacant and not well taken care of.

There are a good many phases to the memorial proposition, but it occurs to me that in the interest of economy, and due to the fact that the cost of construction is at an all-time peak, this is a measure which could well go over to a later date.

I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Regan] knows more about this bill, perhaps, than anyone else in the House, I imagine he can straighten out some points that may be in doubt in the minds of some of the Members.

Mr. REGAN. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, about 1933 our Government authorized the establishment of the Jefferson Memorial on the banks of the Mississippi River in the heart of old St. Louis. This calls for \$3 of Federal money to \$1 of St. Louis money. St. Louis estimated the cost would be \$30,000,000 for the improvement of the property. They have prepared a bond issue of \$7,500,000, to be supplemented by \$22,500,000 of Federal money. On that program about \$8,000,000 has been spent.

They have cleared off all the buildings, residences, and business properties, and so on, on some 42 blocks of St. Louis property in the heart of town, consisting of more than 80 acres of land. In addition, the city of St. Louis deeded to the Federal Government two more blocks in the shape of a "T" there, on which the old courthouse at St. Louis is located.

They have improved the old courthouse in some respects by creating a museum park there, with some ploneer work depicting the St. Louis River and the old Mark Twain days on the Mississippi. The property has been there now for 15 years deeded to the Federal Government.

It is worth more than \$30,000,000. St Louis gets no taxes on that. Not even an automobile can be parked on the property. The Government has maintained a man at the courthouse there to look after the property and the courthouse at quite an expense for these 15 years. The entire delegation of officials from the city of St. Louis was here recently. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Sullivan] introduced the bill. They were here to ask us to do something about it. A few years ago they spent something like \$250,000 in a competition for various artists throughout the country to devise some means of appropriately establishing this memorial. A man by the name of Saarinen, won the award. Among his recommendations was a huge stainless steel arch a few feet higher than the Washington Monument. The idea was that they would have an elevator there. But they have not been able to get the mechanical end of the elevator to work.

We have spent about \$8,000,000. The property is deeded to the Government. They wanted about \$15,000,000 more to complete the program and we were assured that that would complete this stainless steel arch. The property abuts the St. Louis River and right between the property and St. Louis itself is the St. Louis terminal which has three sets of tracks and two elevated tracks which have to be removed or depressed in order to make the property reasonably attractive. The property is rough, a sort of a dump yard with weeds and so on. would cost about \$2,500,000 to depress the railroad tracks and get them out of the way; a million dollars to level it off to make it presentable; and about \$600,000 for landscaping and another \$1,250,000or something like that-for the restoration of the old courthouse.

Our committee asked the Park Service to give us an itemized statement of the requirements which totaled about \$15,-000,000 and they gave them in the order of their importance.

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

Mr. REGAN. If the gentleman will permit me to finish my presentation, I will be glad to take the bridle off.

The requirements for this park are contained in 10 items. The first five are things which seem necessary, and which would not quite cost \$5,000,000 of Federal money. That is the bill before us. It provides for an expenditure not to exceed \$5,000,000. But the authorization calls for \$4,905,000, and we believe the estimates are more than liberal.

Mr. Speaker, the Government owns this property. St. Louis is collecting no taxes from it. We have owned it for 15 years. During the war we could do nothing about it. They plan to have a sesquicentennial celebration there in 1953 celebrating the Louisiana Purchase. Nowhere in or near the immediate vicinity of St. Louis is there any national memorial of any sort, a park or otherwise. I think it is up to the Congress either to do something with the property or return it to the city of St. Louis. I believe this program is well justified and that this money should be author-

ized regardless of how soon they may get This is merely an authorization bill to be sent to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the gentleman from Texas meant when he spoke about taking off the bridle. There is no bridle on me and I do not know if he meant that he had a bridle on him. But if the gentleman from Texas says that this is a good thing, coming from Texas and knowing more about Missouri because there are so many Missourians who represent their State well, I do not find any fault with the bill; and I think, as I said before, you have a good proposition and I am going along with you.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact it is the customary rule when we are dealing with bills on the Consent Calendar that bills which involve a cost exceeding \$1,000,000 should be objected to, I object to the present consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1437. An act to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5368. An act to authorize the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to participate in the transfer of certain real property or interests therein, and for other purposes.

ORGANIZATION OF A CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 678, and ask for its immediate consideration,

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3336) to provide for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and sixteen Members are present; a quorum.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY ] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Herter] 30 minutes. I now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order S. 3336. This bill would authorize the people of Puerto Rico to adopt their own constitution and to organize a local government which, under the terms of S. 3336, would be required to be republican in form and contain the fundamental civil guaranties of a bill of rights. Specific provision is made for an islandwide referendum in which the people of Puerto Rico will be given the opportunity to accept or reject this legislative

A provision also is made in the bill for submission to, and ratification by Congress, of any proposed constitution before it becomes effective, and the bill specifically provides that it shall not become effective until it is approved by a majority of the voters participating in an island-wide referendum.

In 1917 the Congress established the framework of Puerto Rico's government by enacting the Organic Act of Puerto This act created a popularly elected legislature with broad powers in local legislative matters, and provides for an executive branch and judicial branch of the government.

The people of Puerto Rico were authorized to elect a Resident Commissioner, accredited to the Department of State and to be recognized as such Commissioner by all departments of the United States Government. Besides, he has been extended the privileges of membership in the House of Representatives. with power to serve on committees, to introduce legislation, and to be heard on the floor of the House.

The people of Puerto Rico and their representatives have expressed their overwhelming support in favor of legislation which would permit them to adopt a constitution. In the recent election in Puerto Rico the Popular Democratic Party which specifically campaigned in favor of such legislation received approximately 62 percent of the Puerto Rican votes cast in the election, thereby decisively defeating the opposition, including the party running on a platform for the independence of Puerto Rico, and the coalition running on a platform for statehood for Puerto Rico.

This bill has been passed by the Senate and was unanimously reported by House Committee on Public Lands. The Rules Committee has granted an open rule providing for 1 hour's general de-

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

Mr. DELANEY. I yield. Mr. ROONEY. Did the Resident Commissioner appear before the Rules Committee in favor of the bill?

Mr. DELANEY. He did. Mr. ROONEY. What position did he take with regard to this legislation?

Mr. DELANEY. He said that in his opinion there was an overwhelming majority of the people of Puerto Rico in favor of this bill.

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

Mr. DELANEY. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that even though we pass this legislation it would still be up to the people of Puerto Rico to decide whether they want it or not?

Mr. DELANEY. That is right.

Mr. KLEIN. So that what we are doing here today is simply to give them an opportunity of deciding this matter for themselves.

Mr. DELANEY. That is what we are doing, giving them this right.

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

Mr. DELANEY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. What government departments and agencies appeared and testified for it?

Mr. DELANEY. Of course, before the Rules Committee we heard only the Resident Commissioner and the Chairman of the Committee on Public Lands. Mr. Peterson. If the gentleman wants an answer to his question I will yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Peterson] for that purpose.

Mr. PETERSON. The Department of the Interior was heartily in favor of this. The Governor of Puerto Rico appeared before the committee and testified strongly in favor of it. The Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico was in favor of it, and 76 of the 77 mayors in Puerto Rico were in favor of it.

Mr. JAVITS. Was there any opposition?

Mr. PETERSON. There is some opposition to the bill. The opposition comes from those who want independence and some who want statehood. I may say that many safeguards have been thrown around the bill. Before this bill not before the constitution, but before this bill-takes effect it must be voted upon in an island-wide referendum, and in that island-wide referendum a majority of those participating must approve the bill; in other words, there is a referendum on the bill ahead of the constitution.

Mr. JAVITS. It is a fact, is it not, that under this bill only the constitution of a possession of the United States can be voted on; it cannot be a constitution for statehood or for independence, or for anything else.

Mr. PETERSON. No; it cannot be a constitution for statehood.

There is a provision in the bill that the constitution shall provide a republican form of government and shall include a bill of rights. Then it is submitted to the President, and if he finds that it conforms to our Constitution he submits it to the Congress and the Congress must aprove The Congress gets another bite at this too.

Mr. JAVITS. As I recall, there is a provision which says that it can be approved either by laying on the table or directly by Congress; and that is one feature of the bill I must say I think should be corrected.

Mr. PETERSON. The bill provides:

The said constitution shall provide a republican form of government and shall include a bill of rights.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of the constitution by the people of Puerto Rico, the President of the United States is authorized to transmit such constitution to the Congress of the United States if he finds that such constitution conforms with the applicable provisions of this act and of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no provision for having it lie on the table or approved as in the original draft?

Mr. PETERSON. No. It must be approved by the Congress.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 191]

Morris Allen, La. Granahan Anderson, Calif.Green Multer Andresen, August H. Murphy Hagen Noland Hall, Norblad Edwin Arthur O'Neill Angell Norblad Arends Hall, Leonard W. Barden O'Toole Barrett, Pa. Pace Bates, Ky. Blatnik Halleck Patman Harden Patterson Bolling Harris Phillips, Tenn. Bolton, Ohio Plumley Harrison Harvey Hays, Ohio Hébert Quinn Breen Ramsay Rich Brooks Bryson Heffernan Riehlman Buckley, N. Y. Bulwinkle Heller Hinshaw Rivers Roosevelt Burdick Byrne, N. Y. Sadowski Sanborn Hobbs Carroll Hoeven Sasscer Scott, Hardie Cavalcante Hoffman, Ill. Irving Celler Jackson, Calif. Chesney Chiperfield Scudder Jenison Shafer Christopher Chudoff Jenkins Sheppard Sikes Simpson, Pa. Jonas Judd Clevenger Cole, N. Y. Kean Kearney Sims Smathers Coudert Crosser Keefe Smith, Ohio Kelley, Pa. Spence Dingell Kennedy Steed Keogh Dondero Stigler Doughton Kerr Thompson Linehan McCarthy Eaton Engel, Mich. Tollefson Vinson McConnell McGrath Engle, Calif. Walsh Welch Fallon Fogarty Frazier McGregor Wheeler McMillen, Ill. Whitaker Fugate Macy Wier Wilson, Ind. Wilson, Okla. Fulton Magee Martin, Mass. Garmatz Mason Mitchell Gillette Wolcott Wood Gilmer

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 296 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Morgan

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with

ORGANIZATION OF A CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE OF PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Delaney] is recognized. Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

(Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a statement he made before the committee which had this bill under consideration.)

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker. this bill has been rushed through from the very beginning. The people of Puerto Rico have been deprived of an opportunity to express themselves on this ques-The indecent speed with which this bill has been rushed is evidence that the administration and the ruling clique in Puerto Rico seek to deny the people of Puerto Rico a hearing on this bill. Many have requested to be heard and have not been granted a hearing. The committee has refused the request of representative Puerto Ricans to be heard. Unfortunately, the whole Puerto Rican picture, as a result of restricted hearings, is not being presented here, nor has it been presented to the com-mittee that had this bill under consideration.

This bill is being heralded up and down the island of Puerto Rico by its Governor and in New York City by Democratic Party politicians as a bill that would give to the people of Puerto Rico a constitution. They convey the impression that the people of Puerto Rico are given the right to legislate for themselves. That is a fake. It is a snare. It is a delusion. All efforts to convey that impression, that we are giving home rule to the people of Puerto Rico, is part of a gigantic fraud that is being perpetrated upon 2,500,000 people of Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico are getting a bad enough deal as it is. The least we can do is to be honest with them.

Let us analyze what is being proposed here. We are told that the people are given the right to legislate for themselves; that they are going to have a constitution. This is a grotesque distortion of the truth.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Delaney] who read his statement here obviously has forgotten that the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress legislates for the Territories and that Congress cannot delegate that power to anyone. That alone unmasks this bill as a political fake.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not at this time. The gentleman promised me 5 minutes and then refused to keep his promise. I cannot yield.

Mr. DELANEY. By causing the roll call for the purpose of delay—

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

Mr. Speaker, I have a perfect right to make a point of no quorum when you call up this bill at this late hour when so little attention is given to something which is so important to 2,200,000 people. Since we are going to meet tomorrow, the leadership and the gentleman could have called it up tomorrow; he did not have to call it up at this late hour. This demonstrates the contempt in which the House leadership holds the people of Puerto Rico. Since when does the leadership bring up any important bill at this late hour? It does so because we are dealing with Puerto Rico. I had a perfect

right to make the point of order that a quorum was not present in order that the bill might have gone over to tomorrow to obtain for it proper attention from the membership. But I submit that the gentleman did not have a right to deny me the 5 minutes that he promised to me. I do not want to be discourteous to the gentleman, even though he refused to yield me 5 minutes. If he wants me to yield, I will yield. If the gentleman wants to ask me a question, I will yield to him now.

DELANEY. The gentleman Mr. caused this House to be inconvenienced to the extent of 40 minutes by calling the roll. We have this legislation to be considered. I have been waiting here since 12 o'clock to call this matter up. It is late now. It is obvious that the gentleman from New York has no intention. absolutely no intention of giving the Members of the House an opportunity to vote on this question. His tactics are Therefore, I have a right to dilatory. see that this legislation is presented to the Members so that they can exercise their right to vote on it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not think my tactics are dilatory; I am merely making an endeavor to have this bill called up at a time when the Membership of this House can give it the attention it merits. I think I was entirely within my rights, and I was acting in the interest of the Puerto Rican people and of orderly procedure in endeavoring to have this bill put over until tomorrow. By what reasoning do you insist on bringing this bill up now? I say that the leadership of this House wants this bill rushed through. This is wrong and not in the best interests of the people of Puerto Rico who are entitled to serious and careful consideration of their problem and not the indecent and hasty treatment they are being accorded here. On that basis I made the point of no quorum. The gentleman should have kept his word and should have given me the 5 minutes he promised me.

Now, as to the bill itself; as I was saying, the Constitution provides that Congress shall legislate for the Territories. How can you delegate that power to anybody else? No matter what kind of constitution you pretend you are giving to the people of Puerto Rico, can you delegate the power to legislate for the Territories to any other body? There are only two ways you can do it—one is by statehood, the other is by independence.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I think the gentleman is a little confused, after all.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The record will show who is confused.

What you are doing today is to amend the organic act, and that is something else. It is an empty gesture. This bill should be entitled "A bill to amend the organic act." Stop calling it a bill to set up a constitutional government. This is dishonest. You cannot by this bill give to the people of Puerto Rico any sovereignty over their own affairs. That is what should be stated to the people of Puerto Rico, not that you are projecting a constitution for the people of Puerto Rico. Stop trying to fool them. The word "constitution" in this bill is a mis-

nomer; it means nothing under this bill, for you cannot delegate to the people of Puerto Rico the right to legislate for themselves under our Constitution except by statehood or independence.

Further, its very proponents have admitted that this bill is neither a step toward statehood nor a step toward independence. It is a device by which the ruling clique in Puerto Rico escapes its responsibility of solving the colonial question and perpetuates the colonial status in Puerto Rico.

Pursuant to permission granted me, I include a statement presented by me before the House Committee on Public Lands in opposition to H. R. 7674, June 8, 1950:

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I appear here in opposition to H. R. 7674. I hereby ask that the speech I delivered on the floor of the House on March 16, 1950, in which I discussed the historical background of the Puerto Rican situation and the political motives behind H. R. 7674, be included in the records of these hearings as part of my testimony. Here is a copy of the said speech.

At the outset I strongly urge that hearings be held in Puerto Rico by this committee on this bill. There are many distinguished Puerto Ricans who hold a contrary view to the bill to the one expressed here by the official authors and supporters of the measure, but who cannot appear here because they cannot afford the expenses of coming to Washington. Only the bureaucrats are financially able to appear before this committee, here in Washington, in support of the measure. In a matter so vital to the well-being of 2,200,000 people, subjected since 1898 to a colonial status by us, a people which since then has been clamoring for their liberation, I cannot see how this committee can make any well advised recommendation to the Congress without holding hearings in Puerto Rico, where all the people, rich and poor, can participate.

This legislation affects primarily the people of Puerto Rico. The purpose of H. R. 7674, as expressed by the Secretary of State in a letter addressed on April 24, 1950, to the distinguished chairman of this committee, is to obtain "formal consent of the Puerto Ricans to their present relationship to the United States." If that is the case, the Puerto Rican masses should have an opportunity to express themselves, personally, on such an important matter. Furthermore. the Secretary of State said in his letter to the chairman of this committee that the approval of bill H. R. 7674 "would be in keeping with our obligations under the Charter of the United Nations to take due account of the political aspirations of the people in our Territories." How can we ascertain if this bill is in line with the political aspirations of the people of Puerto Rico if we hold hearings in a place 1,600 miles away from Puerto Rico and without giving opportunity to the impoverished Puerto Rican people to appear before you and communicate to you their hopes and their demands?

I am afraid that our State Department and our Interior Department are too anxious to have this bill passed hastily, without due consideration and without giving all Puerto Ricans, without distinction, an opportunity to express themselves on the propriety of this measure. Why is that? Isn't this bill for the Puerto Ricans? Isn't it intended to discharge in part our responsibility as a colonial power? If that is so, how can we discharge such responsibility without affording the Puerto Rican people an opportunity to be heard.

We certainly would not give serious consideration in the Congress to any bill affecting so profoundly any of our States without holding hearings in our constituencies, in addition to the hearings held here in Washington. Why give Puerto Rico this discriminatory treatment?

If this committee does not hold hearings in Puerto Rico on this measure, we will be in fact denying the people of Puerto Rico their right to express their views to the Congress on a matter so important to their lives and destiny. If we do not hold hearings in Fuerto Rico on this measure, we will be proclaiming to the world that we intend to continue treating Puerto Rico as a colony and that we intend to continue ignoring the wishes of the Puerto Ricans.

Serious consideration cannot be given to the measure without consulting the people of Puerto Rico. This committee must remember that we have held hearings in Puerto Rico on matters of less importance, the last of which I can remember were held last November, hearings held by a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee.

The argument has been made that this bill was approved by the Puerto Rican people in the 1948 elections. That is a gross misrepresentation. Here are the facts on that election.

In the 1948 elections 640,714 persons voted out of a total of 873,085 registered voters; that is, 73 percent of the registered voters participated in the elections and 27 percent, or 232,371 persons did not participate, some of them because they deliberately abstained from the polls and others for other reasons. This was 9 percent lower than in 1944, where 82 percent of the registered voters participated in the elections, or 591,978 voters out of 719,759. This decline in the number of voters took place even though in 1948 the Puerto Ricans were electing a governor for the first time.

In the 1948 elections the Popular Party cast 392,386 votes, which amounts to 44 percent of the total registered vote and 61 percent of those voting. The opposition parties cast 39 percent of those voting, amounting to 248,328 votes. In spite of this big vote carried by the opposition parties, and due to electoral gerrymandering and electoral tricks, there is a one-party government in Puerto Rico, the opposition having been allowed to elect only two Senators and one Representative and to carry only one municipality. This municipality was won by the old Liberal Party, called in 1948 the Reformista Party, cast only 29,140 votes and did not qualify as an official party. After the elec-tions the Reformista Party was dissolved.

The vote counted in Puerto Rico to give official status to the parties is that cast for the Resident Commissioner, which was as follows: Popular Democratic Party, 392,033; Statehood Party, 88,189; Independence Party, 66,141; the Socialist Party, 64,121; and the Reformist Party, 28,203. The figures I previously mentioned were for the election of the governor. It is well to point out that the Independence Party is a new party, organized on May 14, 1948 as an official party, 6 months before elections and 4 months after general registration time, when they had no representation in the registration polls. Since the last elections, the Independence Party has been very active.

In the 1944 elections the Popular Party cast 53 percent of the total registered votes, or 383,280 votes out of 719,759 registered voters, which was an absolute majority. In 1948 the proportion was 9 percent lower for the Popular Party. In 1944 the Popular Party cast 65 percent of those voting, or 383,280 out of 591,978, 4 percent more than in 1948. Besides, the opposition parties in 1944 had only 208,516 votes, or about 40,000 votes less than in 1948, distributed in the following way: Republican Party, 101,799; Socialist Party, 68,107; and Liberal Party, 38,630. In addition to that the Popular Party claimed in the 1944 elections 95 percent of 86,000 votes which were stricken out from the registration lists for technical reasons and were not allowed to vote, in

spite of the strenuous protest of the Popular Party, which took the case to the courts and lost. At that time the Popular Party was in control only of four districts out of seven in the island, and the Coalicion (coalition of the Republicans, Socialists, and Liberals) had three districts and the Resident Commissioner, Mr. Bolivar Pagan, president of the Socialist Party. The Popular Party cast 214,857 votes in the 1940 elections, and the Coalicion 222,423.

The above picture shows that the Popular Party is on the decline. And if we consider that the Popular Party made its campaign on the basis that the ultimate political status of Puerto Rico was not an issue on the elections and that this must be decided in a plebiscite to be held on a special election; and if we consider that the Popular Party was born as a result of the expulsion of the radical independence leaders of the old Liberal Party (those leaders headed by Gov. Luis Muñoz Marin, with the avowed promise that it—the Popular Party—was going to see to it that the colonial status of Puerto Rico be ended, then we must conclude that the people in charge of the government of Puerto Rico violate the pledges they made the Puerto Ricans when they come here and try to give the impression that the independence issue and the statehood issue are not fighting issues of the people of Puerto Rico. By the way, at the time of the expulsion of the actual leaders of the Popular Party from the Liberal Party, Resident Commissioner Fernós-Isern was un independentista radical (a radical pro independence man). He waged a campaign in El Mundo, one of the leading Puerto Rican newspapers, in 1936 and afterward, and in La Democracia, at that time a pro independence paper, in favor of independence. In 1940 he was nominated as candidate for Resident Commissioner by the Popular Party, backed by the independentistas. At that time, his speeches in favor of independence were very similar to the one I made in the House last March 16, and which I offered as part of this testimony. I have in my files clippings of many of those articles written by Commissioner Fernós. At that time, Senator Victor Gutierrez Fanqui, who has announced in the Puerto Rican press that he will answer my testimony today, was also an ardent independentista. He, Attorney Ernesto Ramos Antonini, the speaker of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico, were the attorneys for the members of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico who were indicted on charges of murder as a result of the Ponce massacre. They were innocent and were acquitted by the jury. and Ramos Antonini used their participation in the Ponce massacre and their attacks on ex-Governor Blanton Winship, as well as their attacks on the colonial regime to win votes for the Popular Party in the 1940 campaign. Now, after they are in power, they have changed. I think they were right then, and wrong now.

Let me add that before the expulsion of his group from the Liberal Party, Muñoz Marin founded the Accion Social Independentista (Social Independence Action) which was substituted in 1938 by the Popular Democratic Party, with an independence platform. In 1939 Muñoz changed his approach, saying that the status would not be an issue in the elections, but he, in the name of the Popular Party, made the promise to hold a plebiscite on independence and statehood a special election called for that purpose. The Popular Party in the general convention held in the Sixto Escobar Park in 1940 in the month of August officially approved a political plank where it said that the colonial regime of Puerto Rico had to be liquidated, that independence and statehood were the alternatives to end the colonial status, and that the Popular Party thought that independence was the best solution to the status of Puerto Rico, although the status question was not going to be an issue in the 1940 elections, but this was to be decided in a special election. Muñoz Marín wrote a Catecismo del Pueblo (People's Catechism) and published a newspaper, El Batey (The Front Yard)—the meeting place of the jibaros or peasants in the country-where he made a bitter attack on the colonial status and held correctly that the economic problems of Puerto Rico could not be solved under the colonial regime. He took the position that the status question should not be an issue in the elections, because they were primarily concerned with the organization of the colonial government, and that special elections should be held to allow the people to express their preference on independence and statehood. I think he was wrong, as the Philippine experience shows. His strategy allowed him to fool into his camp both the upholders of statehood and independence, so that later he could better be-tray them both, as he did.

In the 1944 elections the 1940 plank was ratified and the promise was made to the people, that in the event of victory, the Popular Party would hold a plebiscite not later than the time when the world peace would be negotiated on the question of independence and statehood. The people gave Muñoz an overwhelming majority, but he did not keep

his promise to the people.

In 1948, scared by the advent to the political battlefront of the Independence Party, Muñoz reiterated his promise that he was going to see to it that the colonial status be ended in Puerto Rico and that those in favor of independence or statehood would have an opportunity to vote on the status question in due time.

I reiterate that neither Governor Muñoz nor Commissioner Fernós have any mandate from the people of Puerto Rico to back

measures of colonial reforms.

The official position of the Government of Puerto Rico in this matter was expressed in a concurrent resolution passed by a unanimous vote by the Legislature of Puerto Rico in its ordinary session of 1943 condemning the colonial regime and demanding that the people of Puerto Rico be granted the right of self-determination. This policy was ratified by another concurrent resolution passed on February 20, 1945 by the Legislature of Puerto Rico. A permanent Commission to carry on the official policy of the legislature was set on 1943 and \$80,000 was appropriated, so that this Commission could come to Washington to ask for the final deter-mination of the ultimate political status of Puerto Rico. But Muñoz sabotaged the work of that Commission.

Puerto Rico has never consented to its present colonial status. On the contrary, from 1898 to this date, the people of Puerto Rico have been consistently asking for the ending of the colonial regime and the recognition of the right of self-determination.

It is not true that Puerto Rico is in a voluntary association with the United States, as the Secretary of State states in his letter and Muñoz Marin and his men The present regime was imposed say now. on Puerto Rico by force of arms as a result of the Spanish-American War, of which Puerto Rico was no part, and has been maintained without consulting with the people of Puerto Rico. Even American citizenship was imposed on the Puerto Rican people, in spite of the protest of the House of Delegates of Puerto Rico and Resident Commissioner Luis Muñoz Rivera, father of Governor Muñoz Marin, who asked the Congress in a speech made in the House in 1916, his last speech in the House-he died shortly afterward-not to impose American citizenship on the Puerto Rican people. He asked the Congress to allow Puerto Ricans to retain the Puerto Rican citizenship allowed to them by the Foraker Act, and make of Puerto Rico later a free and independent nation, as he said, in a prophetic mood,

"You will have to make later of the Philip-

That is the true history of Puerto Rico. as expressed by the Populares themselves to this Congress from 1943 to 1946. The attorney general of Puerto Rico, then floor leader of the senate, Attorney Vicente Geigel Polance, appeared before the Bell committee, the Chavez committee, and the Committee on Insular Affairs of the Senate, when it was presided over by Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, and there he expressed in the most vigorous terms everything I have said so far against the colonial system in Puerto Rico, against the imposition of the American citizenship on the Puerto Ricans and the imposition of the present system of government and in favor of the right of Puerto Rico to its independence.

Most of the members of the House and the Senate of Puerto Rico, and most of the mayors of Puerto Rico and most of the members of the municipal assemblies of the island were members of the Congreso Pro Independencia (Puerto Rico Congress for Independence) from 1943 to 1946 and sent, as you can see by an examination of the records of the hearings on the Tydings inde-pendence bill, cables and letters of support of the independence bill and of condemnation of the colonial regime. Senator Gutier-rez Franqui was not at that time a member of the legislature.

All of them sent messages expressing their vigorous opposition to the so-called dominion status, autonomy or any other form of colonial reform.

Will anyone dare to deny the above?

The new colonial position of Muñoz Marín has been officially and openly adopted since his inauguration as colonial Governor of Puerto Rico in January 1949. Since then he has been saying that Puerto Rico is not a colony, but "a new kind of State," in open violation of the program, history and tradition of his own party, the Popular Demo-cratic Party, whose members he has betrayed, and in open violation of the commitments he made before the 1948 elections.

What are the commitments made by Muñoz Marin in the 1948 elections? In this respect, the Secretary of State says in his letter to the Chairman of this committe that "in the elections held last November for the elected Governor of Puerto Rico, in which 73 percent of the registered voters participated, 63 percent elected the candidate who proposed that Puerto Rico defer at this time determination of its ultimate political status and seek a relationship with the United States which would permit of a constitution for Puerto Rico."

This is definitely a most grotesque distortion of the truth. The elected candidate, Muñoz Marin, promised the people, after a vigorous condemnation of the colonial status, to work for the approval of a law allowing Puerto Rico to draft a constitution of its own with complete self-government, the prohibition limiting the amount of sugar that Puerto Rico can refine having been eliminated by the Congress, and he promised also to ask Congress to include in the same law authorizing Puerto Rico to draft a constitution a provision authorizing the Legis-lature of Puerto Rico to submit to a vote, at any time the Legislature of Puerto Rico would think it feasible from the economic viewpoint, the alternatives of statehood of independence to solve the political status of Puerto Rico, on the promise on the part of the Congress, that it would approve the alternative selected by the people of Puerto Rico. This was the proposition submitted by Muñoz Marín to the people of Puerto Rico, on the basis of which he won the 1948 elections, aided, of course, with fraud and the use of huge amounts of money.

Let us see if I am right. The first time that Muñoz Marin mentioned the word "con-

stitution" in his political campaign, in fact the occasion when he made the commitment to the people was on July 4, 1948, when he delivered the Fourth of July address. He said at this time:

"All of us, absolutely all of us, wish that this obsolete system which we call colonial system be ended. \* \* The form of political relationship in which the United States holds Puerto Rico is not just. Neither is it intelligent. It is unjust and unintelli-

gent (torpe).

"I want to be able to say so, in the name of all of you, to the good confused friends of that government and that people. As it is unjust it must be corrected from their point of view and our point of view. And because it is unintelligent (torpe), it must be corrected from their point of view. The colonial system is obsolete and should disappear from Puerto Rico and from the whole world."

And then he made the following pledge: "In order to achieve this end I think that the people of Puerto Rico should authorize their votes the following commission (gestion) before the Congress of the United States: That the Congress of the United States approves a law completing self-government in Puerto Rico to the point this may be possible, without being a State, in the constitutional structure of the United States. In other words, that the Congress authorize the people of Puerto Rico to draft its own constitution, in the same way as new States are authorized to do so; that the economic relations between Puerto Rico and the United States should continue basically in the same way as they are now, correcting the only grave error now existing, which is the prohibition which does not allow Puerto Rico to produce all the sugar it produces.

In addition to that, in the same law Congress should authorize the Legislature of Puerto Rico to submit to the vote of the people in a plebiscite, in any moment that the legislature would decide that the economic development of Puerto Rico permits it, the consultation (consulta) on the following alternative: If the people want the establishment of independence without any special economic condition, with the pledge on the part of the Congress of effectuating the will of the people. Independence and statehood are the two principal solutions that historically have been endorsed in

Puerto Rico.

"If that law is passed by the Congress, Puerto Rico itself would be the sole judge of the time when it thought that by its own effort the economic conditions to make feasible either statehood or independence had been established. It would judge that, first, through its legislature, and immediately afterward, through a plebiscite. That would place the responsibility and the authority directly on the shoulders of the people of Puerto Rico, which is the place where they should be."

And he ended his speech with the follow-

ing:
"I am going to ask the people of Puerto Rico to authorize with their votes to work in this manner with their difficult problem of political status and of life, with their hard problem of political status and of complete liberty. I am going to ask the people of the United States, if the Puerto Ricans allow to do it with their votes, to establish this high precedent to finish in the world the liquidation of the colonial system which began to be liquidated the 4th of July of 1776."

Thus spoke Muñoz Marin. That is the commitment he made with the people of Puerto Rico. That is the proposition he submitted to a vote of the people. That is the pledge he made to 392,386 voters who, out of

873,085 registered voters, voted for him.

Let us analyze H. R. 7674 in the light of this commitment. Where is the provision allowing Puerto Rico to refine all the sugar it produces? The answer is: Nowhere.

Where is the provision allowing the legislature of Puerto Rico to call a plebiscite on independence or statehood any time it would deem that the economic conditions justify doing so and giving in advance the approval of the Congress to the preference expressed the people of Puerto Rico at the time that any such plebiscite would be held? The answer is: Nowhere.

Then it is clear that H. R. 7674 is not in line with the promise made to the people of Puerto Rico.

Then it is clear that neither Commissioner FERNÓS nor Governor Muñoz have any mandate to push forward H. R. 7674.

Then it is clear that both those gentlemen are acting in violation of what they promised the people.

Then it is clear that H. R. 7674 is a fraud

and a sham.

Then it is difinitely not true, as stated by the Secretary of State, that the people of Puerto Rico elected a candidate who proposed that Puerto Rico defer at this time determination of its political status.

But both Commissioner Fernós and Gov-

ernor Muñoz have been holding that, in spite of the above, they are authorized to push forward H. R. 7674 as the program of the Popular Party approved in its general assembly on August 15, 1948.

Let us see if that is so. The platform of the Popular Party adopted the 15th of August

1948, says to that respect:
"The Popular Democratic Party, with the authorization of the majority votes of the people of Puerto Rico, would submit to the Congress of the United States the proposition that the political problem of Puerto Rico be solved according to legislation which provides as follows:

1. That preserving the economic and fiscal relationship existing at the present time between Puerto Rico and the United States, the people of Puerto Rico, through action of the legislature, or through action of a constitutional convention called by the said legislature, be authorized to make its own constitution in accordance with the structure which it may judge more in consonance with the democratic administration of the public interests.

"2. That the Legislature of Puerto Rico be authorized to call the qualified voters of Puerto Rico, at any time that they deem to be in existence the necessary conditions, to a plebiscite, so that they may decide with their votes:

(a) If they would like Puerto Rico to establish itself as an independent republic under the most favored conditions that the United States now extends to independent countries; or

(b) If they want that Puerto Rico be admitted as a State of the American Union under the same conditions now covering the

other States of the Union; or "(c) If they are in disagreement with the legislature on the point that the existing conditions make it feasible for Puerto Rico to establish itself as an independent republic or to be admitted as a State of the Amer-

ican Union.
"3. That the Congress expresses its agreement to act in accord with the preference shown by the people of Puerto Rico in the

aforesaid plebiscite."

Commissioner Fernós holds that the above program is to be effectuated in two stages:

(1) In the first stage, he says, the people of Puerto Rico ask the Congress to allow it to draft its own constitution; and

(2) In the second stage, he adds, the people of Puerto Rico ask the Congress to authorize its legislature to put to the vote of the people of Puerto Rico in a plebiscite, whenever they deem it proper, the question of whether Puerto Rico wants to establish itself as an independent republic or be admitted as a State of the Union.

I think that interpretation is absurd. The text of the platform is in line with the speech delivered by Muñoz on the Fourth of July. It is clear that the program envisions the approval of a law to solve "the political problems of Puerto Rico," as it states in

the preamble, at the same time.

The political promises of a party are to be made good during the time of the incumbency of its elected officials; in this case, during the period 1948-52. If Commissioner FERNÓS is right, when is he supposed to fulfill the second part of the above-quoted program? What reasons, if any, do exist, to divide the fulfillment of the program in two different stages?

It is evident that the position taken by Governor Muñoz and Commissioner Fernós is the result of an afterthought. Because the is-the historic truth is-that Muñoz himself proposed the political platform of his party, in the general assembly of August 15, 1948, in line with his speech of the Fourth of July, more than that, in order to fulfill his promise made in that speech.

The said speech had been distributed house by house, in every county, village, barrio, town, and city of Puerto Rico, thou-sands of copies; it had been recorded, and thousands of records had been handed free to the people and played on the radio and in thousands of stores and through the streets.

Muñoz said at the time of proposing the plank that the political problem of Puerto Rico would be solved through the adoption by the Congress of the law referred to.

At no time during the political campaign did their Muñoz or any of his coworkers speak of two different tempos, two different stages to fulfill their promises. They spoke of one single law where the whole political problem would be considered and solved.

H. R. 7674 as it stands now is a colonial measure; means nothing to the Puerto Rican people: leaves without solution the Puerto Rican problem and is a violation of the mandate asked directly to the people of Puerto Rico by Muñoz Marín in the 1948 elections.

As Muñoz realizes that, he has dodged public discussion of H. R. 7674. So has Commissioner Fernós. So has every leader of the Popular Party in the Muñoz group. matter of fact the social science circle of the University of Puerto Rico organized a forum to discuss H. R. 7674. The forum could not be held because, notwithstanding the fact that representatives of the Statehood Party and the Independence Party agreed to participate in such forum, not a single man in the Popular Party dared to participate in the discussion. Attorney Jose Trias Monge, legal adviser to Muñoz Marin and coauthor of the bill, refused to participate. So did refuse Attorney General Geigel Polanco. And a public invitation to participate addressed to to Muñoz Marin and Commissioner Fernós went without answer.

Also the Political Science Section of the Ateneo Puertorriqueno, an organization devoted to the promotion of culture, has invited in vain a representative of the Popular Party to appear in their forum in defense of H. R. 7674. Dr. Juan B. Soto, leader of the Statehood Party delivered a lecture in opposition to the bill and the leaders of the Independence Party announced that they are ready to deliver another lec-ture in opposition to said bill, but the "populares" dodge public discussion of the measure. They simply refuse to discuss the

The people of Puerto Rico are against H. R. 7674. The Statehood Party and the Independence Party are militantly against the bill. Attorney Bolivar Pagan, president of the Socialist Party made a bitter attack on the measure on the floor of the Senate. After denouncing the bill as a fraud, he voted for it because he felt that if approved it amounted to the approval of two amendments to the Organic Act which he approved—the extension of power to the Governor of Puerto Rico to appoint the judges of the supreme court and the auditor. Yet he pleaded for the approval of an amendment to allow the Puerto Ricans to hold a plebiscite on the status question, which was defeated.

El Mundo and El Imparcial, the leading Puerto Rican newspapers, edited in San Juan, and El Dia, another important newspaper edited in Ponce, have written several important editorials condemning in the most vigorous and uncompromising terms, H. R.

On March 16, 1950, El Mundo wrote a brilliant editorial entitled "The Next Gen-eration," in which it commented and condemned the testimony offered by Gov. Muñoz Marin before this committee where he said that the problem of statehood is a problem for the next generation of Puerto Ricans and ignored completely the question of independence.

El Mundo said that H. R. 7674 amounted merely to an amendment to the Jones Act and was no constitution; that it solves nothing and does not change an fundamental situation of the relations of Puerto Rico with the United States and of the personality of Puerto Rico among the free countries of the world. El Mundo said Gov. Muñoz Marín left that problem "to the future generation."

El Mundo said:

"In the meanwhile, the Governor should make no reference to any previous election because at no time the status problem has been submitted openly to the people. It is confusion to try to interpret the last elections as if all those who voted for Mr. Muñoz Marin voted at the same time 'to postpone until the next generation' the case of the political status. The other considerations involved in the election-economic program, personal sympathies, disintegration of the old parties, were factors considered by the people to give their votes. It is a fact that the electorate did not divide itself on party lines, between defenders of statehood, defenders of independence and upholders of the status quo."

El Mundo ended saying:

"It is time to end the juggling and double play with the future of this country. If we want the Congress to treat us in a level of equality and to respect our dignity, let us talk to it like a mature country who knows what it wants and not as a vacillating kid who wants to eat his cake and have it."

The State Department concurs in the same confusionist attitude condemned by Mundo, when it affirms without any basis whatsoever in its letter to the Chairman of this committee, that the people of Puerto Rico voted in the last election to "defer at this time determination of its ultimate political status."

When Senator Bolívar Pagán asked the Senate to insert in its records the quoted editorial of El Mundo, Senator Gutierrez Franqui, characterized it as "a monstrosity," and opposed its insertion in the record on the unjust basis that "the minutes of the Senate should not be tainted with such edi-torials." The Senate refused to allow the The Senate refused to allow the editorial to go into the record.

In answer to that exabrupto of Senator Gutlerrez Franqui, El Mundo wrote another editorial the 18th of March entitled: Such finesse, Senator. This is a clear, vigorous and brilliant editorial where El Mundo says that what constitutes a blot is to go on passing the buck in the status question from generation to generation. El Mundo adds that

for 52 years the Puerto Ricans have been living under the same uncertainties, postponing the fundamental issues for unimportant things of the moment

On March 28, 1950, El Mundo wrote another editorial entitled "Clear Words" where it said:

"Clear words were those uttered by Secretary Oscar L. Chapman, Department of the Interior, in an interview broadcast recently.

"In his statement, Mr. Chapman has reaffirmed truths which we had pointed out in an editorial; truth which had not pleased those who love to play with words when dealing with one of the most serious things pertaining to a people: their political future.

"Chapman has reaffirmed that Alaska and Hawaii know they want statehood, and they have shown they want statehood.

"Chapman has reaffirmed that Puerto Rico does not know what it wants, since the Puerto Ricans have not even had a referendum on such a vital question.

"In Puerto Rico no referendum has been held on the political status. No election in the past can be taken as the vote of the people for independence, for statehood or the status quo.

"Yet there are people who insist on affirming that Puerto Rico has already decided herself for the status quo, at least until the coming generation.

"There is another statement made by Mr. Chapman which is of the utmost importance for the Puerto Ricans.

"The Secretary of the Interior says that the Puerto Ricans can have a referendum whenever they wish it themselves.

"Puerto Rico does not need an authorization from Congress to determine which is the path she wishes to follow.

"Puerto Rico has not decided to walk the path of Statehood, but she could so decide were the matter submitted to her in an independent election.

"Puerto Rico has not decided to walk the path of independence, but likewise she could so decide in an election made to solve such a vital issue.

"If the Island decided herself for statehood or for independence the administration and Congress would understand clearly which are the insular aspirations.

"To wish for statehood, the Island does not need to be in an optimal situation, nor is it necessary that Congress have previously decided to grant her statehood.

"Hawaii and Alaska know that their aspirations have to meet objections and in part of the American people. But this has not stopped their public figures and representatives from hammering on the idea. Sooner or later, Hawaii and Alaska will see themselves admitted as States of the Union.

"To wish for independence, Puerto Rico does not need to be in a situation which will allow her to assume her independence immediately. The Philippine Islands knew they wanted independence, and at last they had it, after a 20-year readjustment period fixed by Congress. And later, during the initial years of life as a republic, the Philippines have had the help and the advice of the American people.

"Once Puerto Rico knows, without speculation, which way she is going, then a period of preparation and readjustment can be very beneficial. But we cannot grow and advance toward a goal, until we have fixed that goal.

"This is light which Puerto Rico needs.

"This is light which Puerto Rico needs.
"We cannot walk toward statehood and

"We cannot walk toward statehood and toward independence at the same time within the limbo of the status quo.

"Puerto Rico will not know which way she is going as long as the politicians (yesterday's, today's, tomorrow's) continue to fish

for advantages in the troubled waters of the

uncertainties of the status quo.

"According to Muñoz' words in Washington, the Fernós bill does not lead to statehood. According to Fernós words at Fordham, the bill does not lead to independence. It is a pact, a consent of the Puerto Ricans to their union with the United States. It is a consecration of the status quo.

"It is about this we want more light.

"Upon supporting Fernos' bill before Congress, is the island pledging herself to continue the present relations with the United States? Is she pledging to continue to postpone ad infinitum the referendum about her future?

"If the people of Puerto Rico, under the provisions of the Fernós bill converted into law, should adopt what some have insisted in calling a constitution, would the final political aspirations of the Pureto Rican people be determined in this constitution?

'If the status issue were evaded, the Fernos bill will not be anything else but an amendment to the organic act, as we have maintained, and the so-called constitution, a political convenience, but not a political solution.

"And Puerto Rico will remain not knowing what she is or what she wants to be.

"Why not take advantage of the clear words of Secretary Chapman and accompany them with other clear words and clear deeds as well?"

El Mundo wrote several other editorials, among them one written on March 31, 1950, entitled "Muñoz Speaks More Clearly," where it says:

"Mr. Muñoz Marin said that for the time being we do not have to think either of statehood or of independence.

"He stated further that he imagines that the Puerto Rican people will tend towards a permanent union with the United States. He gave as an example the fact that our economy is completely integrated with that of the Union and that this relationship is mutually beneficial.

"In this way he discards independence.
"Later he adds that statehood is too expensive, pointing out that the island will have to pay Federal taxes in an amount almost as high as the present insular budget.

"These statements coincide in their orientation with former words of the Governor, but this time his position is more clearly stated.

"Now he does not speek of statehood for the coming generation.

"Now he says plainly that we must not think of statehood or independence. He states that Puerto Rico is right now practically a new kind of State, and that to put this fact into a law would be profitable for both Puerto Rico and the United States,

"This would solve the issue of the political status," the Governor says, "which now does not allow us to dedicate our energy to the very difficult and more essential task of solving our economic problems."

ing our economic problems.
"In other words, the consecration of the status quo, or the new State, is the Governor's formula for the solution of the political status problem.

"And when the voters of Puerto Rico vote for the constitution that Muñoz Marin proposes to the people, they will be accepting and confirming that Puerto Rico is content to maintain the present relations as an adequate political status.

"Independence and statehood are not postponed for the coming generations. They are postponed for eternity.

"It has been useless for the island to have been preoccupied all these years regarding the problem of her political status, when the problem had the simple solution of consecrating the status quo, a solution that is so evident and clear to Mr. Muñoz Marín and to Dr. Fernós.

"Is it equally so to all the Puerto Ricans?
"Is it equally so to the whole world?"

El Imparcial in its editorial of March 2, 1950, entitled "We do not want intermediate solutions," said in part:

"Since Gov. Muñoz Marin has so great an influence in the United States, why does he not try to liquidate the system of colonial government which prevails?

"The constitution which Muñoz upholds is no constitution at all, since the so-called constitution is no different from the Campbell bill and the free associated state bill, which caused so much political noise in Puerto Rico in the past.

"The constitution is only a new colonial modality.

"The people do not want a little more liberty. They want full liberty. They want the problem to be solved in its essence, either with complete independence or with statehood.

"They do not want colonialism in disguise, wearing the mask of a constitution."

In an editorial dated March 17, 1950, entitled "With a Different Collar," El Imparcial

"ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN and Luis Muñoz Marín have needed 2 years to write the 541 words of the bill which they have presented before Congress, and through which they confirm, consolidate, and consecrate in the uttermost expression of servitude, or colonial state.

"Does this bill presented to Congress fulfill the political pledge Muñoz and his party made to the voters? No. The bill ridiculously called constitution bill, does not do anything except allow the legislature to subscribe as hers, as if of her own making, the very same provisions of the present organic act, and for that we would have to go through the humiliating farce of a constitutional assembly that will not constitute anything, and which will only ratify the antidemocratic basis of our political relations with the United States, which will continue to be fundamentally the same as they are now.

"The so-called constitution only shows that Muñoz Marin has placed himself against the will of the people; he has deserted the independence ranks; he does not waste an opportunity to discredit statehood: the two great aspirations of political dignity shared by the Puerto Rican masses.

"His political mission seems to be that of assuring a penalty of 50 more years of colonialism for Puerto Rico.

"It is the same dog with a different collar."
El Dia has written many brilliant editorials against H. R. 7674 in the same vein as those written by El Mundo and El Imparcial and which I have quoted.

On the occasion of the refusal of the leaders of the Popular Party to discuss at the university, H. R. 7674, El Dia said in an editorial the following:

## "A MAN IS NEEDED

"Our colleague El Mundo reported yesterday that the Fernós constitution bill may not be discussed in an open forum at the university since a man was needed to undertake the defense of the constitution bill before Dr. Juan B. Soto, who would defend statehood, and before Prof. Rafael Soltero Peralta, who would defend independence.

"The Circule of Social Studies of the University of Puerto Rico, presided over by university student Sergio Pena, Jr., an organization which sponsors the said open forum, has endeavored to see the bill discussed before a university audience by three repre-

sentatives of the three named political aspirations with followers in this country:

"(1) Statehood; (2) independence; (3) semicolony with additional franchises, as proposed by the constitution bill of Resident Commissioner Fernós-Isern.

"Dr. Juan Bautista Soto and Dr. Rafael Soltero Peralta, both professors at the University of Puerto Rico, the first one affiliated to the Statehood Party, and the second affiliated to the Independence Party of Puerto Rico, accepted with pleasure the invitation to appear at the proposed forum to defend their respective political ideals.

"The third speaker was missing. The principal speaker, since without him there could be no public discussion of the Constitution. The Circle of Social Studies 'turned to a number of university teachers who are members of the Popular Party, hoping that one of them would accept to discuss the bill from the point of view of the Populares, but no one accepted,' so El Mundo informs.
"The university then turned to the attorney general, Vicente Geigel Polanco, one of

"The university then turned to the attorney general, Vicente Geigel Polanco, one of the outstanding leaders of the Popular Party, and to attorney Jose Trias Monge, known to be one of the coauthors of the constitution bill, but neither the former nor the latter accepted the invitation.

"So it is that 'a man is needed.' One who will defend the semicolony of Dr. Fernós' constitution bill. One who will say as did Senator Samuel R. Quinones: 'Why keep on talking about independence or about state-hood?'

"An intellectual is needed that face-to-face with the intellectuals Juan B. Soto and Rafael Soltero Peralta, repeat to the people—as Mr. Muñoz Marín and Dr. Fernós-Isern are saying that Betances and de Hostos, Barbosa and de Diego, Iglesias and Martinez Nadal were sadly mistaken in their pleas for the solution of the sovereignty issue: some asking for independence with international separation, others pleading for independence within the Federal Union.

"The professor members of the Popular Party do not wish to accept such a request. "Neither does Attorney General Geigel Polanco.

"Nor coauthor of the constitution bill Trias Monge.

"'A man is needed."

"But the university students are not discouraged. El Mundo also informed that they will possibly turn to Governor Muños Marín 'asking him to choose someone to accept the proposition and defend the point of view of the upholders of the bill.'

"'A man is needed.'

"Who will accept the task?

"Mr. Muñoz Marin and Dr. Fernós-Isern will surely be very grateful to the spirited 'popular' who undertakes to face two free men to defend the semi-colony, to defend a little more political power for whichever fellow countryman be at the head of the government of Puerto Rico.

"Professors Soto and Soltero Peralta will will surely show Christian understanding toward anyone having the courage to appear before the students at the University of Puerto Rico to maintain that there is no need of struggling for liberty and dignity; that the urgent thing is to get a safe hold on a dish of lentils.

"'A man is needed."

"The man needed will be sure to get any place of honor or a well paid position in the present Puerto Rican government if he does not have it already, because that man will be entitled to the deep gratitude of the regime for answering yes where popular-democratic professors Geigel Polanco and Trias Monge said 'no' with upset spirits."

The political writers of the most important magazines of the Island have also expressed themselves against H. R. 7674.

So have the students of Puerto Rico.

So have the General Confederation of Workers (Authentic), (Confederacion General de Trabajadores (Autentica), presided over by the respected labor leader, Attorney Francisco Colon Gordiany.

So has the General Union of Workers (UGT) presided over by Mr. Juan Saez Corales, cofounder with Mr. Colon Gordiany and others of the government-controlled General Confederation of Workers. The General Confederation of Workers had a split in 1945 and gave growth to two labor organizations, the one headed by Mr. Colon Gordiany and the government-controlled group. The leader of this group is Speaker Ernesto Ramos Antonini, at one time law partner of Senator Gutierrez Franqui.

Any observer of the political situation in Puerto Rico will come readily to the conclution that the opposition in the island to H. R. 7674 is profound and widespread, extending from San Juan (in the north) to Ponce (in the south), and from Luquillo (in the east) to Mayaguez (in the west).

In New York, where so many Puerto Ricans live, the sentiment is overwhelmingly against H. R. 7674. There have been public demonstrations organized against the bill. Various groups have requested permission to testify in opposition to this bill.

The Spanish press in New York has published the protests in the island and in the city against the bill, and the daily Spanish newspaper, Diario de Nueva York, has written several well-reasoned and documented editoriels against H. P. 7674

rials against H. R. 7674.

I do not think that the Congress of the United States should allow itself to be made part of the perpetuation of a fraud. H. R. 7674 is a fraud. I address myself to the lawyers in this committee, and ask them, Does H. R. 7674 authorize in fact the people of Puerto Rico to frame a constitution of their own?

What is a constitution? A constitution is the supreme law of the land. Who drafts a constitution? The people. On what authority? On the authority derived from its power of sovereignty. And what is sovereignty? Sovereignty is the supreme authority or ultimate power. The sovereignty comes from the Latin summa potestas, which

means supreme power.

The power of sovereignty is in our modern world the power of the people to draft its own constitution. This means that the people cannot draft a constitution if they do not have sovereignty.

not have sovereignty.

Is the Congress relinquishing its sovereignty over Puerto Rico in favor of the island if it approves H. R. 7674? The answer is no. Therefore, Congress is not giving ultimate power to Puerto Rico over its local affairs.

If H. R. 7674 does not give Puerto Rico

If H. R. 7674 does not give Puerto Rico the right to draft a constitution which cannot be revoked, amended, or suspended by the Congress of the United States or by any other power, then it is not giving the island the power to draft what is called a constitution in international law and in our constitutional law.

I think we all agree, gentlemen, in the proposition that if H. R. 7674 is passed, the Congress of the United States can exercise at any time the power to revoke, amend, or suspend the so-called constitution drafted by the people of Puerto Rico.

Any student of constitutional law will affirm that there are only two ways through which the Congress can recognize sovereignty to the people of Puerto Rico, to wit, either by admitting the island as a State of the Union or by recognizing their independence. Only through these two methods can the Congress authorize the people of Puerto Rico to draft a real constitution, one that cannot be revoked by the Congress of the United States nor by any other power.

States nor by any other power.
Under our constitutional system the Congress has power, inherent power, to legislate

for the Territories and to revoke, amend, or suspend any law passed by the said Territory. Usually the Congress inserts a reserve clause in the organic laws approved for the Territories. But our Supreme Court has held that the clause referred to is unnecessary as the Congress has the inherent power to do that.

If H. R. 7674 is passed, does the Congress relinquish its right of annulling, amending, or suspending any law approved by the Legislature of Puerto Rico? Certainly not.

And that is so because of the inherent power of the Congress over the Territories. Because of that inherent power, even though H. P. 7674 is passed, the Congress of the United States will retain the power to annul all legislation approved by the Legislature of Puerto Rico, even though H. R. 7674 in its section 5 (2) provides for the repeal of section 34 of the Jones Act, which reads as follows:

"All laws enacted by the Legislature of Puerto Rico shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, as provided in section 23 of this act, which hereby reserves the power and authority to annul the same."

Even though the above is the case, H. R. 7674 was drafted by a smart attorney to perpetrate a fraud.

Why do I say that? In the first place I say that because of the elimination from the Jones Act of the reserve clause contained in section 34 to give the impression to the people that the Congress is relinquishing the said power.

In the second place, I say that because section 2 of H. R. 7674 says that the law, if passed, will be in the nature of a compact between the Government and people of the United States and the government and people of Puerto Rico.

What is the meaning of that phrase, "in the nature of a compact"? Compacts are bilateral agreements which obligate both parties. Does the above phrase in the bill mean that once the law is passed, Congress will not have power to annul the laws approved by the legislature of Puerto Rico? Does it mean that once the bill is passed, the Congress will not be able to legislate for Puerto Rico except as agreed by both parties in the compact?

Of course, as an attorney, I know that the phrase "in the nature of a compact" in the bill means nothing, that it constitutes surplus language and imposes no additional obligation upon the Congress of the United States nor takes away any power it now has, but it is used to deceive the people of Puerto Rico.

The use of the word "constitution" is also deliberately employed to cheat the people of Puerto Rico. In international and constitutional law words have a precise meaning. That is why the smart authors of the bill used the word "constitution," inserted the word "compact," and repealed section 34 of the present organic act.

H. R. 7674 is a deliberate attempt to deceive the people of Puerto Rico.

In the debate which took place in the

In the debate which took place in the Puerto Rican senate on H. R. 7674 the president of the senate, Attorney Samuel R. Quinones said that once the bill is passed, the Congress would not have the power to annul the constitution because of the meaning of the word "compact," which imposes bilateral obligations on the parties involved.

Yet it is well known that this Congress has no power to make irrevocable any law approved by it, because of the well-known principle that no Congress can limit or abridge the power of another Congress to discharge its responsibilities.

If this Congress should approve H. R. 7674, a point which I do not concede, it would do it in the exercise of the power given it by article 3 of the fourth amendment of our Constitution, and in the exercise of that same power a future Congress could annul, amend, or suspend the same, as well as any so-called constitution drafted on the basis of the power granted by the approval of H. R. 7674.

H. R. 7674 has no other effect, if passed, than to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico to allow the Governor of Puerto Rico to appoint the judges of the supreme court and the auditor of the island. If that is the case, why not call things by their right name and not use a misnomer? Why try to give the impression that we are relinquishing our sovereignty in favor of the people of Puerto Rico? Why try to confuse the people and deceive them? Why make the people of Puerto Rico undergo the electoral process leading to a constitutional convention and make them meet in such a convention for such an innocuous purpose as the one contained in H. R. 7674?

Under H. R. 7674 Puerto Rico would continue to be a Territory of the United States. All the provisions of the present Organic Act which represent an exercise of sovereignty in any sense whatsoever are preserved in the statute as a so-called law of Federal relations of Puerto Rico. The Congress of the United States would retain its power to legislate for Puerto Rico and the Constitution of the United States would be paramount, the same as it is now, and would continue to be the supreme law of the land in Puerto Rico, not only in Federal matters but also in local affairs. The so-called constitution, once approved by the Congress, would be only a law enacted by Congress and subject to the will of this Congress and every future Congress. It is clear, as I said before, that H. R. 7674 does not give the people of Puerto Rico the power to draft a constitution in a real sense, nor does it give Puerto Rico any power of sovereignty.

The position of Commissioner Fernós is based on extravagant speculations which have no basis in our constitutional law, in our history, or our mores and traditions, and is against the best interests of the people of Puerto Rico.

Not a single economic power is given

Puerto Rico by H. R. 7674.

No additional jurisdiction is given Puerto Rico in the organization of its judicial sys-

No extension of the jurisdiction of the people of Puerto Rico over its territory, its air and waters, and the life and liberty of its people is given by the bill.

No representation is given the Puerto

Ricans in the Congress

In short, the colonial system remains intact in Puerto Rico.

It is a fact, as I demonstrated in my speech delivered before the House on March 16, 1950, and made a part of my testimony, that Puerto Rico is a colony of the United States.

In an article written in the March 1948 issue of the Newsletter of the Institute of Ethnic Affairs, Inc., published at 500 Otis Building, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Attorney Felix S. Cohen, former associate solicitor of the Department of the Interior, now in private law practice in Washington, and working as visiting lecturer at Yale Law School and at the College of the City of New York, shows that the colonial status is at the root of all the problems of Puerto Rico. Mr. Cohen entitles his excellent article, "Puerto Rico's Problem-Colonialism."

In the said article, Mr. Cohen says: "The problem of colonialism will continue so long as Puerto Rican workers are prohibited by the act of a Congress in which they have no vote, from refining the sugar they grow. The problem of colonialism would continue if Puerto Ricans should cease to love their wives, their children, and their country as passionately as they now do, and thus bring into being a stationary or even a declining population figure. . . . The wealth of Holland, like the wealth of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, sprang from its people, from their love of freedom, political, economic and spiritual, and from their willingness to make every sacrifice to achieve that freedom. These resources of Holland are also the resources of Puerto Rico.'

The government of Puerto Rico took that same position in the case against the continental sugar refineries. In the brief filed as intervenor in the United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, No. 9769, against the Secretary of Agriculture and Porto Rican American Sugar Refinery, Inc., and the American Sugar Refining Co., on 1949, the government of Puerto Rico said:
"The question presented here is simple

and clean-cut. Has the Congress the power to convert Puerto Rico into a plantation, to limit its industry to the production of raw materials, to exclude it from all processing and manufacture for mainland consumption? Has the Congress the power to abridge the rights and liberties of the citizens of the United States living and doing business in Puerto Rico in order that it may confer special privileges upon a favored group of citizens of the United States who live and do business on the mainland? Has the Congress the power to impose upon Puerto Rico, its economy and its citizens, the iron fetters of the old colonial system?

"Section 207 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1948 should be declared null and void as abridging the liberty of persons without due process of law, as running contrary to the intent and spirit of the Constitution, and as seeking to impose upon a group of citizens of the United States a permanent colonial

In the final plea before the conclusion, the government of Puerto Rico said, page 93 of the brief:

"The issue before this court is a matter of life and death to Puerto Rico. Its economy, its chance at industrial development, its capacity for advancing the standard of life of its people, hang on the decision presently to be made. The Government of Puerto Rico can say in all sincerity that here is as serious a matter as could come before a court of justice. For the issues reach far beyond the immediate question presented by the accused section of the act. They involve alike the political status of Puerto Rico, the position of that Territory in our Federal system, and the relation of the insular our national economy. For, if it should be held by this court that the Congress has the power to fix a maximum for the number of tons of direct-consumption sugar which refiners in Puerto Rico may market in the continental United States, it follows as of course that the Congress has the power completely to exclude sugar refined in Puerto Rico from the mainland market. If such an unrestricted power belongs to it, the Congress has adequate authority to decree the amounts of rum, plywood, textiles, chinaware, glass bottles, furniture, and soap of island fabrication which can be marketed upon the mainland. And if the Congress may fix maxima in respect to each of these and all other fabricated or processed goods, it possesses the power, at its pleasure, to exclude any or even all articles of merchandise produced in Puerto Rico from the mainland market. The rights and liberties at stake are not limited to the Puerto Rican refiners and their employees. The Government of Puerto Rico is under an obligation by encouraging manufacturers, to afford op-portunities for employment to masses of its citizens. The capacity of its agricultural resources to care for its population has been fully exploited. Its only chance at salvation lies in the fabrication of goods for mainland

markets. The threat of the new Colonial system hangs over it more heavily than the pressures of the old Colonial system upon the people of the North American Colonies. in 1776 the frontier beckoned, and a wide open continent was there to relieve the pressures of British policy. Its population density allows to the people of Puerto Rico no escape save through the development of processing industries. To find the power of the Congress in question to be lawful is to deliver the liberties of the people, their in-dustrial opportunties and the economy of Puerto Rico into the political control of the Congress.

"The peril is the more ominous, because there is no political avenue for the redress of grievances. Although its citizens are citizens of the United States, only local suffrage has been extended to Puerto Rico. Its people, their governor, their officials, the members of the two houses of their legislature. But the acts of its legislature are subject to Presidential veto and to the revision or the annulment of the Congress. The island is represented in the Congress by a single Resident Commissioner, who sits in the House of Representatives, participates in discussion, but has no vote. Against the doom of consignment to a colonial status, the people of Puerto Rico have no defense except to ask judicial pro-tection of the rights and liberties guaranteed to them by the Constitution. If this court fails them, there is no other way to salvation."

And the court failed them. Not only the district court of appeals but the Supreme Court as well. On February 1950, the Supreme Court recognized the right of the Congress to limit the amount of Puerto Rico's own sugar she can refine for sale in interstate commerce.

Commenting on the decision, the bulletin of the Office of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico, published every month at 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., here in Washington, official publication of the Government of Puerto Rico,

"Denying the insular government's appeal that such limitations be declared unconstitutional, the Supreme Court upheld the 1948 Sugar Act. Justice Felix Frankfurter, who read the decision, said in effect that Congress has the right to adjust insular sugar production, refining, and marketing to suit the national and local interest.

"The Court's decision means that Congress can continue to tell Puerto Rico that she can only refine 126,033 tons of the 910,000 tons of the raw sugar the Sugar Act allows her to sell on the mainland. This means an annual loss to the island of an estimated 4,000 jobs and \$20,000,000 in income."

The Puerto Rico Public Service Commission estimated the loss at \$30,000,000 and some economists estimate the loss at \$40,-000,000.

In view of what I have said, I submit the following amendments to H. R. 7674:

Section 7: Section 207 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1948 is hereby declared null and void. (This is in keeping with Muñoz Marin's promise to the people to see to it that the restriction limiting the refinement of Puerto Rican sugar be eliminated.)

Section 1: It should be rephrased in order to strike out the clause "in the nature of a compact."

Section 8: The Legislature of Puerto Rico is hereby authorized to call the people of Puerto Rico to a plebiscite at any time that the said legislature would deem it convenient. so that they may decide with their votes:

(a) If they would like Puerto Rico to establish herself as an Independent Republic under the most favored conditions that the United States now extends to independent countries: or

(b) If they want Puerto Rico to be admitted as a State of the United States under the same conditions now covering the other States of the Union; or

(c) If they are in disagreement with the legislature on the point that the existing conditions make it feasible for Puerto Rico to establish itself as an Independent Republic or to be admitted as a State of the United States of America

The Congress of the United States hereby agrees to act in accord with the preference shown by the people of Puerto Rico in the aforesaid plebiscite.

Section 9: Section 7 to be renumbered sec tion 9.

Further, there must be written guaranties against the use of public funds to influence any plebiscite or referendum.

Mr. Chairman, I feel most strongly that the enactment of this bill will be a direct disservice to the people of Puerto Rico. I have come here today to urge that H. R. 7674 be voted down in committee as legislation which can only hinder and not help the Puerto Rican people as they try to work out their economic and political problems in a democratic manner.

I will present to this committee what I know to be some of these problems and what I-and thousands of working men and women of Puerto Rico-believe to be the only realis-

tic solution to them.

I want to make clear at the outset that this is no simple bill merely permitting local self-government or a local constitution in Puerto Rico. It is in fact much more and the sponsors of the legislation have made this clear in their statements. It is these deeper implications of this legislation which I urge this committee to recognize and to reject as inimical to the best interests of the people of Puerto Rico.

Both the Resident Commissioner and the Governor, as I have heretofore stated, have had occasion to describe this bill simply as a legislative recognition of the existing political and economic ties between Puerto Rico

and the United States mainland.

It is that.

In fact, the Resident Commissioner stated quite explicitly, while discussing H. R. 7674: "We in Puerto Rico may be mindful of our basic economic and political relationships (with the mainland). We do not want to dissolve them; we do not want to disturb them," etc.

I would put it more explicitly and positively. This bill not only recognizes but it accepts and acclaims the present economic and political ties; and if enacted, this bill would further solidify these relationships which are essentially disastrous and humiliating to the Puerto Rican people.

This is my basis for opposition.

In this bill we can see an attempt to get the people of Puerto Rico to register their consent and agreement to the past 50 years of economic exploitation by mainland in-terests—and do this under the guise of enacting a local constitutional government.

Gentlemen, it is most edifying to read the statements supporting H. R. 7674 that have been made by the Resident Commissioner and the Governor. For both these gentle-men have been most anxious to state what the bill is not-what it does not aim to accomplish.

It is not a first step toward statehood; it is not a step in the direction of independence. It is something new altogether. In fact, to quote the sponsor of this legislation:

"We are developing a new pattern of federation, applicable to our circumstances, which do not permit us at the present, nor in the foreseeable future, to develop along the classical lines and the uniform pattern followed by former and present Territories in their ascent to statehood."

Under this so-called new pattern of federation, H. R. 7674 would permit the adoption of a local constitution, while leaving undisturbed the entire network of economic control that has spelled unspeakable poverty for the Puerto Rican people over the past 50 years. This is the crux of the problem.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that legislation which only formalizes the local self-government that now exists in Puerto Rico under the organic law-that in fact formalizes the facade of political democracy-while recognizing and leaving undisturbed the whole economic structure of this one-crop economy which is sucked dry by mainland financial and business interests is bad legislation. It is undesirable legisla-

It is undesirable from the point of view of the aspirations and needs of the people of Puerto Rico. It is undesirable from the point of view of the democratic tradition of the United States.

For the past 52 years, since United States troops landed in Puerto Rico, that country has been under the political and economic

control of the United States.

In this brief span a complete revolution has taken place in the economic and political life of the Island. What was once a fairly thriving, diversified, agricultural economy has become a sick-one-crop economy which brought uncounted millions to the absentee American owners of the sugar crops and privation, misery, and poverty to the Puerto Rican people. What was once a community taking its first bold steps in the direction of self-government and independence has become a colonial appendage of the United

This committee should have these facts in mind when it measures this bill in the balance of what has been and what is in Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico was not discovered when General Miles landed in Ponce in 1898.

For almost 450 years these people have been living in Puerto Rico, with a culture, a language, and a tradition completely their own. Under the Spanish Empire Puerto Rico was for many years a province with representation in the Parliament in Madrid. And in 1897, because the people of Puerto Rico were themselves on the move and reaching out for the kind of freedom and liberty they could see on the United States mainland, Spain was forced to concede dominion status and to permit the creation of a selfgovernment constitution.

In 1897 Puerto Rico was on the verge of achieving complete independence from Spain.

But by 1899 after the treaty of Paris had been ratified, Puerto Rico was placed under military government. It was an American military governor who suspended the selfgovernment constitution, and the United States War Department was the dominant voice in the affairs of Puerto Rico up to 1934. Since then the Interior Department has taken over.

I believe that an examination will show that the first organic act of 1900, the more liberalized act of 1917, and the subsequent amendments, even to including the right to election of the governor (passed in 1947) have not yet restored to the Puerto Rican people the level of independence they had already reached in 1897.

This may appear like ancient history to this committee-but it is not to the people of Puerto Rico.

Essentially a most profitable economic exploitation of the people and the resources of Puerto Rico has developed in the past 50 years. Profitable, but not for the people themselves. It is an economic exploitation which could only have taken where political freedom and political expression were circumscribed. Today vague gestures are being made in the direction of political democracy and political freedom. But the essence of the control, the economic domination of Puerto Rico by the United States, continues undisturbed.

And what is most shocking, the proponents of this legislation come here and try to curry support for their bill by proving that they have no intentions of disturbing the economic shackles that tie Puerto Rico. What a farce.

Sugar has spelled economic tragedy for Puerto Rico.

A steadily growing population, a bare subsistence standard of living, maldistribution of wealth, concentration of land holdings in the hands of a few, these are some of most pressing problems of Puerto Rico. And these problems are linked with the structure and operation of the sugar industry.

The sugar industry is the largest single employer of labor, it does more business each year than all the other industries of the island combined, it dominates the external

trade of the island.

Puerto Rico is sugar. And Puerto Rico is a sick island.

I will not burden the record of this committee with the statistics of the wealth and influence of the sugar industry. I think that no one would disagree with the statement that today the economic structure of the island is the sugar industry, and little

Nor will I repeat in detail the poverty and misery which is the lot of the common man and his family in Puerto Rico today. facts have been repeatedly recorded by congressional committee after congressional committee. Yet in all their detail and in all Yet in all their detail and in all their statistical dryness and accuracy, they give no inkling of the bitterness and emptiness-the hopelessness-of the lives of these people.

It was from this horror of unemployment and insecurity that 10,000 workers and their families are fleeing in unsafe, overloaded planes to work on farms on the mainland. The plane crash on Monday, June 5, with the loss of 28 lives, is not the first of such incidents. It happened because these unhappy, exploited people have no alternative but to accept seasonal work on the mainland. There is little prospect for them in Puerto Rico. And they are packed into planes and sent into the harvesting areas with a callousness that 's hard to imagine.

In the past 50 years, Puerto Rico has been changed into a sugar island. To the thousands of workers who earn their living in the sugar fields or in the sugar mills, the inindustry furnishes only spasmodic employment. From the height of the cutting period to the period of mill shut-down, thousands upon thousands move from intense hard labor to complete idleness. And this cycle, year in and year out, is reflected in every other part of the Puerto Rican economy.

Concentrating on the production of sugar, the island of course must import practically every major item of consumption and living.

Rice, beans, and dried codfish. A few othes. A shack. This is the life of the Puerto Rican worker. And it all comes from the mainland, with every article priced far above the mainland prices.

It does not take much thought to con-clude that only through industrialization and through diversification of agriculture, with higher wages all around, can the Puerto Rican people hope to raise their standard of

But I am convinced that a healthy industrialization and diversification of production and a real economic growth can never come about until after the present economic shackles and domination by the mainland are both destroyed.

So long as the sugar economy produces profits for a few selfish and greedy mainland interests, so long will the status of the island continue as it is—for these feed on each other—and a program for industrialization and diversification in the interest of the people will never come to life. Only industrialization which exploits these people as the sugar industry always has in the past will grow in Puerto Rico under these circumstances.

And the so-called operation bootstrap, the widely heralded program of industrialization, holds out about as much economic hope for the Puerto Rican people as H. R. 7674 holds out relifical hope.

out political hope.

Both are self-defeating because they accept the present economic and political status of Puerto Rico as fixed and healthy rather than as they truly are—the center of the

whole cancerous problem.

This identication of operation bootstrap with H. R. 7674 is not mine alone. The sponsor of this bill has himself described H. R. 7674 as "an expression of the same program of advancement which is embodied in operation bootstrap."

Let us look at this for a moment.

A subcommittee of the House Labor Committee recently held hearings in Puerto Rico on minimum wages and education in the Island. Runing over a week's time during the latter part of November, 1949, these hearings made clear how complete a failure this operation bootstrap has been.

"Operation Bootstrap" hopes to attract industrial operations by offering cheap, unskilled labor and substantial tax savings

to mainland businessmen.

The concern whose movement to Puerto Rico recently received most press notice has been, of course, the textile corporation known as Textron. Senate hearings were held on Textron's decision to shut down their Nashua, New Hampshire operation, and open up in Puerto Rico, and these, of course, are available to the committee. They should be read carefully.

be read carefully.

With the rate of pay approximately 60 percent of what workers on the mainland obtain for the same work, it is not surprising that a few American firms are beginning to move factories to Puerto Rico. But the net result to date of these attempts to picture Puerto Rico as the businessman's para-

dise have so far been slim.

In the House Labor Committee hearings to which I have already referred, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, Jr., president and general manager of the Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co. summed up the history of the operation.

The Industrial Development Co, was established by the Puerto Rican Legislature late in 1942. Up to June 30, 1949, \$22,000,000 had been appropriated for the use of this company in industrializing Puerto Rico.

During the 6 years of operation a total of 7,233 jobs were created by plants operated by businessmen attracted from the mainland by "Operation Bootstrap." And of this number 3,440 or almost half were home-work jobs.

That is some record in a country where each year for the past 3 years the labor force has increased by 22,000 men and women.

That is some record in an area in which out of a population of 2,200,000 over 300,000 are unemployed.

The problem of the worker in Puerto Rico is not to find a well-paying job, but to find any job whatsoever.

To read the statements of these gentlemen who are guiding the industrialization program is to be convinced of its ultimate failure. They, of course, put the blame for the failure upon the Puerto Rican people who, to believe these gentlemen, are slow, stupid, not mechanically minded and all the rest.

Mr. Moscoso, to whom I have already referred, made clear how low his sights are set, when he told Congressman Kelley:

"Well, in Puerto Rico proper we believe that a lot of jobs, from which people shy away in the States, might eventually come down here, and of course, it is not a too hopeful picture to think that these kinds of jobs are the ones that will eventually get here, but we have to start somewhere."

This from the director of "Operation Bootstrap." Puerto Rico is to become the source of labor for the jobs which employers cannot convince mainland workers to fill; the lowest paid, the drudgery jobs, these are to be for the Puerto Ricans.

I see no need to say more about "Operation Bootstrap." It should be clear to this committee that this is no program to industrialize Puerto Rico, to raise the standard of living and make fuller and happier lives for the Puerto Rican people. It is instead a program to peddle the Puerto Ricans to the highest bidder from the mainland.

It has not worked and it will not work.

Puerto Rico has arable land, it has some mineral resources, it has many people. With all these resources directed in a program clearly in their own interests, these people can begin to solve their own problems.

And these economic problems, like these political problems, can only be solved if the people of Puerto Rico can exercise their own sovereignty as an independent State.

I am not so naive as to think that independence would overnight end all the problems of the Puerto Rican people. But I know that independence would release the energy and the creativeness of these fine people to meet their problems and to solve them by their own efforts.

Without independence I see no solution. And since H. R. 7674 represents another obstacle in the road to independence, I oppose it completely and urge upon you that it be voted down in committee.

## CONCLUSION

Our country is a signatory to the Charter of the United Nations.

The President in his most recent report on the United Nations to Congress, dated May 22, 1950, described the Charter as "express(ing) our fundamental aims in the modern world."

Chapter XI of the Charter states that member nations recognize that the interests of non-self-governing territories are paramount and that the member nations pledge "to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, etc."

I submit that it is time some of this highsounding language be brought down to earth around home and a taste of the real meaning of these pledges given to the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is, as far as I know, the only Member of the House who is opposing this rule or the bill.

The bill is brought before you through the unanimous report of the Committee on Public Lands, and the unanimous report of the Committee of Rules.

From all the testimony that was given to the committee, the great majority of the people of Puerto Rico favor the bill, the only dissidents being the splinter parties who want either statehood or independence. Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HERTER. I shall be pleased to. Mr. MARCANTONIO. For the sake of correcting an impression which has been evident here, there are two leading newspapers in Puerto Rico, and they are conservative newspapers; nobody can charge them with being radical in any sense of the word. I refer to the newspapers El Imparcial and El Mundo. In my remarks that I make before the committee and which you will see in tomorrow morning's Congressional Record you will find that both of these leading newspapers are protesting almost daily editorially against the enactment of this bill and have given their reasons, reasons which I shall advance during general debate; so that it is not true there is no opposition to this bill. The leading public opinion as expressed by the press of Puerto Rico is against this measure.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I still maintain that the testimony that came before the Rules Committee contradicts the evidence that the gentleman has just

put before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Biemiller] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association is now holding its annual meeting in San Francisco. The AMA is the country's largest scientific organization. By its very nature, the AMA must play a major role in the advancement of the national health. The delegates to its convention carry a tremendous responsibility to the welfare not only of this country, but the world. Those delegates represent the finest health facilities and the greatest fund of technical knowledge in medical history.

It is only natural that a good many Americans should have looked to San Francisco this week for guidance in many matters. If they heard the inaugural address of Dr. Elmer Henderson, incoming president of the AMA, they must now be looking elsewhere.

Just this Tuesday, with the United States in the midst of crisis, facing the possibility of a major war, Dr. Henderson ignored the urgent need to shore up our national health defenses in the shortest possible time. Instead he delivered a cliche-packed, reactionary tirade against the elected Representatives of our Government.

He attempted to ally the doctors of America, many of whom oppose Dr. Henderson's personal political beliefs, with the most extreme elements of right-wing conservatism.

Standing directly under Sir Luke Fildes' famous picture of a physician and patient with the AMA motto "Keep polities out of this picture," Dr. Henderson not only put politics into the picture, but did it with an unseemly violence and a resort to political mudslinging unmatched in the ordinarily dignified behavior of medical meetings.

Dr. Henderson's address rang with the patent insincerity of the huckster slogans and phrases of the publicity team which now speaks for America's doctors in the name of the AMA. He attacked our Government as "sick with intellectual dishonesty, moral laxity, and with reckless excesses," and charged the administration with a campaign to gain control over all fields of human endeavor to make this a socialistic state. These wild charges and political mudslinging ill become the head of an organization whose objective should be scientific progress.

The rest of Dr. Henderson's talk bears out the fact that scientific truth is not the goal of the present leadership of organized medicine. An analysis of his remarks will show that he used the same misrepresentations and distortions that many doctors and other thoughtful Americans have unhappily come to associate with the AMA. Here are a few

examples:

First. In attacking national health insurance as socialized medicine, Dr. Henderson is merely repeating the same scare phrase that was used to characterize old-age and unemployment insurance, and other measures passed by the administration with the enthusiastic support of the American people. The American people know that national health insurance is in fact the best protection against state medicine.

Second. In extolling American health records as the best in the world-which they are-Dr. Henderson proudly cited declining death rates resulting from tuberculosis, diphtheria, and small-pox as an achievement of American medicine. He neglected to add that the AMA fought against reporting communicable diseases, compulsory vaccinations for smallpox, and public provision for immunization against diphtheria-measures that made the campaign against these diseases possible. The AMA also called these measures socialistic. The decline in infant mortality also cited is largely due, as Dr. Henderson ought to know, to local and State public health departments and to the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency.

Third. Dr. Henderson denies that there is a doctor shortage. Politicians, he says, are attempting to "create a crisis over an alleged shortage in this country; the ratio of doctors to population is higher than anywhere else in the world except Israel." But the AMA's own propaganda admits that there is a serious doctor shortage in many areas. Right now to bring every State up to the present standards of the 12 best equipped States, we need 20 percent more doctors—and that is just the basic minimum. The deans of the leading medical schools support Federal aid to enable their schools to enlarge their student

bodies. And our Armed Forces have never been able to get the necessary numbers of doctors to meet a real crisis.

Fourth. Dr. Henderson points to our growing hospital system, stating that there are 1,500,000 hospital beds in this country now serving 16,000,000 patients. Is it a mere oversight that he did not also say that over two-thirds of these beds are operated by Government—local, State, and Federal agencies—because private hospitals have never met our needs.

But what is even more important, certain areas of this country are woefully lacking in hospital facilities. Dr. Henderson must know that only 14 counties in every 100 meet the minimum accepted standard of 4½ general hospital beds per 1,000 population. Four out of 10 counties where 15,000,000 Americans live have no acceptable general hospital.

Fifth. Dr. Henderson states that voluntary health insurance is the way to take the economic shock out of illness. He predicts that in a few years the problem will be largely resolved. What problems? Why the problem whose existence he spends so much time denying. the problem of adequate medical care for all. Dr. Henderson did not mention that Blue Shield plans with their limited coverage protect only 9 percent of the population and provide little other than protection for some types of surgery. He failed also to point out that only 2 percent of the American people have complete insurance protection such as they would get under national health insurance-because only 2 percent can afford such protection at the high rates charged by existing voluntary and commercial insurance plans.

Millions of Americans know from bitter experience that high-priced voluntary plans automatically exclude those who need protection most, the aged, those with chronic diseases, and those who simply cannot afford the high cost and the low benefits which the volun-

tary plans offer.

Dr. Henderson did not mention the AMA's own shabby record of opposing any voluntary plans which it cannot control-consumer, farm and labor cooperatives. In 1943, the Supreme Court convicted the AMA of monopoly practices in fighting one health cooperative and two more cases are before the courts right now for the same reason. The AMA's real attitude toward voluntary health insurance was summed up when the voluntaries first began, when they were described in an editorial in the AMA Journal as socialism, communism, inciting to revolution. For 20 years, the AMA took this official stand despite pressure from its own members to change. The change took place only when the AMA officialdom saw they must offer some substitute for a good comprehensive national health plan.

The charges levelled by Dr. Henderson this week might carry more weight if organized medicine had shown any inclination to work out a sound, constructive program for solving our health problems. So long as organized medicine turns its energies away from scientific advancement and toward irresponting of the solution of the construction of the co

sible political attacks on our elected Government, so long will the AMA have to be regarded as a reactionary, self-seeking interest.

The oath of office which Dr. Henderson took Tuesday night over a Nationwide hook-up adjured him to "promote public health and welfare, to improve health standards of the American people, and to devote himself to the task of bringing improved medical care within the reach of the American people." How can Dr. Henderson live up to that solemn oath when he refuses even to admit that public health and welfare is a genuine concern, that health standards need improving, or that adequate health care is now beyond the reach and the pocket-books of millions of Americans?

Dr. Henderson might well read carefully the address of one of his fellow speakers at the AMA convention, that of Brig. Gen. James Stevens Simmons, dean of the Harvard School of Public Health.

In his talk as reported in the New York Times, General Simmons pointed out that in the present uncertain international situation "all problems of health assume a dominant role."

In addition to the general problems of public health, he warned, we must be prepared to meet the entirely new threat of unannounced atomic and biologic warfare.

General Simmons might have added that we badly need more doctors and more nurses to meet these new conditions. Yet, the AMA continues its stubborn opposition to legislation to help failing medical schools meet their growing obligations.

As the general concluded, and I quote:

I am also sure that the American physician now has his greatest opportunity to serve the Nation by giving his complete support not only to good medical care, but to preventive medicine and public health. The future security of the country will reflect the manner in which he fulfills this responsibility.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Furcolo] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. Furcolo asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a chart of figures from appropriation bills.)

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I am proceeding on the assumption that everyone in the Nation is interested in trying to economize wherever possible. I am basing my remarks on the assumption that, in our present financial condition, money should be spent on only the most essential items.

Assuming that every expenditure is for a good purpose—a highly debatable assumption but nevertheless assuming it for the sake of argument—at least one other qualification should also be met before there be any expenditure: namely, Is it also absolutely essential at this time? In other words, every expenditure should be not only for a good purpose but should also be so necessary at this time that men of good judgment and reason would not want to postpone it in preference to deficit spending.

#### WHO IS SPENDING THE MONEY?

Having in mind that people seeking economy usually impose those two qualifications for any expenditure—first, Is it for a good purpose? second, Is it essential right now?—I have made a study of all money appropriations voted by the Congress over the past 10 years. I think the figures are illuminating and should be brought to the attention of the people of the Nation, because the actual figures show very clearly that the people of the Nation have overlooked perhaps the most important point of all, namely, Who is spending the money?

If there be any lack of sound economy in appropriations, the people naturally want to exert their omnipetent influence against it. Before they can do so, they must know where to direct their efforts.

The figures I have studied do not reveal whether the expenditures that have been made were wise or unwise. They do not indicate whether too much or not enough has been spent for the benefit of the people of the Nation. They do not in themselves show whether the governmental servants of the people have practiced

economy or extravagance. They show none of those things because figures and statistics are notoriously ineffective to prove anything. It is a truism that figures and statistics can be interpreted to reach opposite conclusions.

#### THE FIGURES SHOW

However, the figures and statistics do establish something beyond any peradventure of doubt. They show who is spending the money—and that result is not inconclusive or subject to different interpretations. It is a cold, proven fact on which every person in this country can agree. Which is the reason for my talk today.

It is not my purpose to analyze the reasons for the figures or to determine whether the figures have been based on sound or unsound practices. My aim is merely to let the people of the Nation know who is spending the money. Then the people can praise or condemn those responsible for such expenditures.

I have one further purpose for the consideration of those who believe expenditures are too high and I shall outline it

in a few minutes. First I want to give the actual figures which will then speak for themselves.

I am listing them year by year for the past 10 years. The left-hand column, under each year, shows the purpose for which the expenditure was made. The column under "Passed House" shows the amount of money voted by the House of Representatives for such purpose. The column under "Passed Senate" shows the amount of money voted by the Senate for such purpose. The column under "Law" shows the final amount agreed to by both bodies of Congress, often after conference. Regular appropriations are given first, followed by deficiency and supplemental appropriations. Every expenditure that has been made is included in these first charts for the convenience of those who may wish to see the actual figures for each item. A little later I am inserting a very short over-all chart from 1940 to 1950 that merely gives the total amount expended each year.

The charts detailing all expenditures for every year are as follows:

Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1939-40	1939–40	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1939-40
\$835, 118, 613, 00 46, 915, 207, 00 1, 651, 087, 340, 00 159, 538, 815, 23 30, 535, 770, 00 21, 636, 278, 00 773, 420, 241, 00	\$1, 218, 666, 572, 00 49, 524, 985, 00 1, 668, 218, 340, 00 174, 975, 288, 33 30, 747, 780, 00 21, 985, 779, 00 773, 049, 151, 00	\$1, 194, 498, 633, 00 48, 002, 347, 00 1, 668, 218, 340, 00 172, 679, 765, 23 30, 536, 170, 00 21, 851, 779, 00 773, 049, 151, 00	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE- MENTAL ACTS  1. Emergency Relief, 1939 (fiscal year 1940). 2. Emergency Relief, 1939. 3. Emergency Relief, 1939.	\$1, 735, 600, 000, 00 725, 000, 000, 00 100, 000, 000, 00	\$1, 808, 900, 000. 00 725, 000, 000. 00 100, 000, 000. 00	\$1, 755, 600, 000, 00 725, 000, 000, 00 100, 000, 000, 00
121, 399, 120. 00	122, 624, 410. 00	122, 177, 220. 00	Total deficiency and supplemen- tal	2, 989, 549, 508. 51	3, 239, 892, 897. 16	3, 173, 651, 669, 98
499, 857, 936, 00	513, 188, 882, 00	508, 789, 834, 00	Grand total	9, 134, 838, 696, 74	9, 819, 331, 182, 39	9, 719, 258, 467. 21
6, 145, 289, 188. 23	6, 579, 438, 285. 23	6, 545, 606, 797. 23		Hally are a real	The state of the s	
Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1940-41	1940-41	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1940-41
\$713, 896, 084, 00 48, 291, 717, 00 1, 100, 187, 267, 00 118, 578, 187, 05 1, 021, 69, 700, 00 23, 907, 744, 00 965, 779, 438, 00 107, 225, 660, 00 1, 032, 154, 612, 00 784, 999, 094, 00 203, 472, 567, 00 6, 120, 132, 070, 05	\$022, 911, 213, 00 49, 697, 890, 00 1, 139, 783, 528, 00 137, 256, 834, 05 1, 025, 054, 670, 00 23, 707, 720, 00 1, 302, 014, 038, 00 107, 079, 000, 00 1, 032, 784, 115, 00 1, 500, 324, 988, 00 223, 636, 517, 00 7, 464, 250, £13, 05	\$918, 603, 918. 00 48, 765, 080. 00 1, 120, 243, 528. 00 135, 583, 330. 05 1, 023, 282, 690. 00 23, 671, 220. 00 1, 308, 171, 138. 00 107, 149, 000. 00 1, 032, 801, 095. 00 1, 499, 323, 322. 00 222, 718, 717. 00 7, 440, 113, 038. 05	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE-MENTAL ACTS  1. Emergency Supplemental 1940 2. Urgent Deficiency 1940 3. First Deficiency 1940 4. Emergency Relief 1941 5. First Supplemental National Defense 1941 6. Second Deficiency 1940 7. Second Supplemental National Defense 1941 8. First Supplemental Civil Function 1941 9. Third Supplemental National Defense 1941  Total deficiency and supplemental Civil Function 1941	\$264, 611, 252, 00 58, 502, 600, 00 90, 069, 139, 11 1, 111, 754, 916, 00 1, 381, 917, 147, 00 57, 909, 600, 00 2, 234, 191, 957, 00 207, 475, 727, 02 1, 311, 493, 636, 00 6, 717, 925, 974, 52 12, 838, 058, 044, 57	\$251, 822, 588, 00 57, 541, 300, 00 92, 777, 021, 52 1, 224, 791, 357, 00 1, 488, 353, 027, 00 95, 176, 257, 23 2, 374, 158, 277, 00 189, 178, 663, 35 1, 324, 193, 636, 00 7, 097, 992, 127, 10 14, 562, 242, 640, 15	\$252, 340, 776, 00 57, 541, 300, 00 92, 035, 408, 52 1, 157, 711, 367, 00 1, 479, 777, 147, 00 85, 891, 777, 23 2, 497, 016, 392, 00 228, 132, 013, 35 1, 324, 193, 636, 00 7, 174, 639, 807, 10 14, 614, 752, 845, 15
Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1941-42	1941-42	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1941-42
\$890, 824, 037.00 52, 547, 081.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 177, 027, 078.00 1, 191, 776, 000.00 24, 846, 047.00 3, 415, 457, 250.00 212, 087, 200.00 1, 146, 394, 496.00 9, 826, 509, 492.00 221, 272, 228.00	\$1, 340, 622, 744, 00 54, 785, 686, 00 1, 415, 991, 838, 00 185, 119, 813, 00 1, 200, 511, 100, 00 25, 087, 486, 00 3, 415, 521, 750, 00 279, 416, 547, 00 1, 151, 156, 632, 00 10, 384, 821, 624, 00 224, 805, 863, 00	\$1,060,500,063.00 54,183,100.00 1,414,628,838.00 188,325,923.00 1,195,861,940.00 25,002,256.00 3,415,521,750.00 279,142,477.00 1,147,624,384.00 10,384,821,624.00 228,601,828.00	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE-MENTAL ACTS  1. Urgent Deficiency 1946 2. Second Urgent Deficiency 1946 3. Second Deficiency 1946 4. Coast Guard 1947. 5. Third Urgent Deficiency 1946 6. Government Corps 1947. 7. Third Deficiency 1946 8. First Supplemental 1947.  Total deficiency and supplement	\$3, 524, 000. 00 129, 550, 000. 00 2233, 157, 293. 37 114, 216, 000. 00 661, 520, 810, 89 45, 546, 287, 00 724, 571, 590. 33 2, 479, 663, 210, 45	\$1, 933, 800. 00 364, 114, 807. 00 63, 285, 930. 02 118, 236, 000. 00 661, 847, 988, 89 67, 292, 287. 00 2, 784, 485, 270. 68 2, 796, 612, 917. 45	\$3, 347, 200, 00 364, 114, 807, 00 61, 601, 337, 02 116, 226, 000, 00 661, 847, 988, 89 60, 086, 287, 00 2, 652, 860, 866, 88 2, 636, 489, 417, 45
	\$835, 118, 613, 00 46, 915, 207, 00 1, 651, 087, 340, 00 159, 538, 815, 23 30, 535, 770, 00 21, 636, 278, 00 773, 420, 241, 00 121, 399, 120, 00 1, 700, 591, 354, 00 499, 857, 936, 00 305, 188, 514, 00 6, 145, 289, 188, 23  Passed House  \$713, 896, 084, 00 48, 291, 717, 00 1, 100, 187, 287, 00 118, 578, 187, 05 1, 021, 639, 700, 00 23, 907, 744, 00 965, 779, 438, 00 107, 225, 660, 00 1, 032, 154, 612, 00 784, 999, 094, 00 203, 472, 567, 00 6, 120, 132, 070, 05  Passed House  \$890, 824, 037, 00 52, 547, 681, 00 1, 404, 576, 838, 00 177, 027, 078, 00 1, 191, 776, 000, 00 24, 846, 047, 00 3, 415, 457, 250, 00 01, 146, 394, 496, 00 1, 146, 394, 496, 00	\$835, 118, 613. 00 46, 915, 207. 00 1, 651, 937, 340. 00 1, 651, 937, 340. 00 1, 658, 838, 815. 23 30, 535, 770. 00 21, 636, 278. 00 773, 420, 241. 00 121, 399, 120. 00 1, 700, 591, 354. 00 1, 701, 189, 114. 00 499, 857, 936. 00 305, 188, 514. 00 6, 145, 289, 188. 23 6, 579, 438, 285. 23  Passed House  \$713, 896, 084. 00 48, 291, 717. 00 1, 100, 187, 287. 00 118, 578, 187. 05 1, 021, 639, 700. 00 22, 907, 744. 00 23, 907, 744. 00 965, 779, 438. 00 107, 225, 660. 00 1, 032, 154, 612. 00 1, 322, 154, 612. 00 1, 323, 636, 517. 00 52, 547, 981. 00 1, 502, 234, 988. 00 107, 225, 660. 00 1, 032, 154, 612. 00 203, 472, 567. 00 212, 037, 000 22, 154, 612. 00 1, 632, 754, 901. 00 1, 032, 784, 115. 00 1, 404, 576, 538. 00 177, 027, 078. 00 1, 191, 776, 000. 00 24, 846, 047. 00 24, 846, 047. 00 212, 087, 200. 00 1, 146, 394, 496. 00 1, 151, 156, 632. 00 1, 151, 156, 632. 00 1, 151, 156, 632. 00 1, 151, 156, 632. 00	\$835, 118, 613.00 46, 915, 207.00 1, 651, 937, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 608, 218, 340.00 1, 707, 420, 241.00 21, 638, 278.00 21, 638, 278.00 1, 701, 189, 110.00 1, 700, 591, 354.00 1, 701, 189, 114.00 1, 700, 615, 054.00 499, 857, 936.00 305, 188, 514.00 305, 188, 514.00 305, 188, 514.00 305, 267, 984.00 305, 188, 514.00 6, 145, 289, 188. 23 6, 579, 438, 285. 23 6, 545, 606, 797. 23  Passed House Passed Senate Law 1940-41  \$713, 896, 084.00 48, 291, 717.00 1, 100, 187, 287.00 118, 578, 187.05 1, 212, 639, 700.00 1, 225, 600.00 1, 032, 154, 612.00 1, 032, 154, 612.00 1, 032, 154, 612.00 1, 032, 154, 612.00 1, 032, 154, 612.00 203, 472, 567.00 203, 472, 567.00 203, 472, 567.00 203, 472, 567.00 203, 472, 567.00 203, 472, 567.00 203, 472, 567.00 203, 472, 567.00 204, 849, 994.00 1, 500, 324, 988.00 1, 308, 171, 138.00 177, 027, 078.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 404, 576, 838.00 1, 405, 576, 838.0	\$835, 118, 613, 00 46, 915, 207, 00 1, 651, 087, 340, 00 1, 665, 198, 340, 00 1, 665, 218, 340, 00 1, 668, 218, 340, 00 1, 668, 218, 340, 00 1, 668, 218, 340, 00 1, 668, 218, 340, 00 1, 668, 218, 340, 00 1, 668, 218, 340, 00 1, 773, 490, 151, 00 773, 490, 241, 00 773, 490, 241, 00 773, 490, 241, 00 1, 700, 591, 354, 00 1, 701, 189, 114, 00 1, 700, 615, 054, 00 1, 700, 591, 354, 00 1, 701, 189, 114, 00 1, 700, 615, 054, 00 1, 700, 591, 354, 00 1, 701, 189, 114, 00 1, 700, 615, 054, 00 1, 701, 189, 114, 00 1, 700, 615, 054, 00 1, 701, 189, 114, 00 1, 700, 615, 054, 00 1, 701, 189, 114, 00 1, 700, 615, 054, 00 1, 701, 189, 114, 00 1, 701, 615, 054, 00 1,	\$835, 118, 613, 00 449, 915, 237, 00 1, 700, 591, 354, 00 1, 700, 591, 354, 00 1, 700, 591, 354, 00 1, 185, 815, 23 305, 185, 770, 00 1, 700, 591, 354, 00 1, 700, 591, 354, 00 1, 701, 189, 114, 00 1, 701, 189, 114, 00 1, 701, 189, 114, 00 1, 702, 596, 00 1, 185, 277, 00	\$335, 118, 613, 00 46, 915, 207, 00 46, 915, 207, 00 46, 915, 207, 00 120, 888, 815, 23 21, 636, 737, 00 773, 490, 241, 00 773, 490, 241, 00 121, 390, 120, 00 122, 390, 120, 00 123, 384, 00 124, 390, 120, 00 125, 391, 394, 00 126, 385, 314, 00 127, 394, 915, 100 128, 391, 394, 00 129, 391, 394, 00 120, 391, 394, 394, 394, 394, 394, 394, 394, 394

1942-43	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1942-43	1942-43	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1942-43
1. Department of Agriculture. 2. District of Columbia. 3. Independent Offices. 4. Interior. 5. Labor and Federal Security. 6. Legislative. 7. Military. 9. State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary. 10. Treasury and Post Office. 11. War Department, civil functions.  Total.	\$648, 170, 517, 00 56, 129, 351, 00 2, 096, 048, 875, 00 162, 157, 965, 00 1, 058, 951, 660, 00 27, 463, 866, 00 42, 820, 003, 067, 00 17, 722, 565, 474, 00 221, 078, 100, 00 1, 112, 926, 899, 00 333, 950, 826, 00 66, 259, 446, 000, 00	\$680, 395, 695, 00 56, 329, 161, 00 2, 126, 042, 890, 66 186, 924, 998, 00 1, 157, 598, 426, 00 27, 884, 588, 00 42, 820, 003, 067, 00 23, 738, 865, 474, 00 425, 703, 235, 00 1, 113, 321, 439, 00 367, 039, 826, 00 72, 700, 108, 799, 66	\$665, 742, 646, 00 56, 306, 031, 00 2, 090, 885, 128, 00 178, 099, 712, 00 1, 071, 574, 318, 00 27, 570, 708, 00 42, 820, 003, 067, 00 23, 738, 865, 474, 00 426, 281, 885, 00 1, 113, 321, 439, 00 343, 938, 826, 00 72, 532, 589, 234, 00	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE-MENTAL ACTS  1. Fourth Supplemental National Defense, 1942. 2. First Deficiency, 1942. 3. Fifth Supplemental National Defense, 1942. 4. Sixth Supplemental National Defense, 1942. 5. Seventh Supplemental National Defense, 1942. 6. Emergency Relief, 1943. 7. Second Deficiency, 1942. 8. First Supplemental National Defense, 1943. 9. Second Supplemental National Defense, 1943. Total Deficiency and Supplemental National Defense, 1943.	\$12, 556, 672, 474, 00 160, 412, 611, 43 29, 720, 901, 900, 00 18, 156, 961, 345, 00 654, 999, 740, 00 282, 584, 000, 00 53, 513, 099, 84 1, 808, 669, 615, 47 6, 236, 956, 621, 00 69, 631, 671, 406, 74 135, 891, 118, 006, 74	\$12, 556, 672, 474, 00 163, 806, 854, 77 30, 412, 737, 900, 00 19, 062, 373, 260, 18 655, 074, 740, 00 282, 584, 000, 00 53, 721, 999, 74 1, 863, 961, 710, 90 6, 341, 196, 887, 66 71, 403, 167, 077, 25 144, 103, 275, 876, 91	\$12, 556, 672, 474. 0 163, 780, 819. 7 30, 412, 737, 900. 0 19, 001, 197, 010. 1 655, 074, 740. 0 282, 584, 000. 0 33, 721, 999. 7 1, 858, 939, 210. 9 6, 351, 184, 137. 6 71, 335, 892, 282. 2 143, 868, 481, 526. 9
1943-44	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1943-44	1943-44	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1943-44
1. Department of Agriculture. 2. District of Columbia 3. Independent offices. 4. Interior. 5. Labor. 6. Legislative and Judiciary. 7. Military. 8. Navy. 9. State, Justice, and Commerce. 10. Treasury and Post Office. 11. War Department, civil functions.  Total.	\$715, 099, 662, 00 54, 789, 434, 00 2, 620, 824, 379, 00 72, 861, 316, 00 1, 086, 059, 499, 00 40, 659, 273, 00 59, 034, 839, 673, 00 27, 463, 687, 198, 00 189, 629, 400, 00 1, 098, 840, 960, 00 63, 032, 683, 00  92, 440, 323, 477, 00	\$875, 680, 709, 00 55, 568, 210, 00 2, 621, 539, 379, 00 127, 980, 991, 00 1, 186, 367, 512, 00 40, 943, 778, 00 59, 034, 839, 673, 00 224, 850, 427, 198, 00 226, 105, 758, 00 1, 102, 381, 425, 00 63, 657, 098, 00	\$848, 295, 883. 00 55, 466, 565. 00 2, 621, 366, 879. 00 104, 608, 921. 00 1, 137, 167, 010. 00 40, 894, 478. 00 59, 034, 839, 673. 00 27, 637, 226, 198. 00 221, 405, 400. 00 1, 100, 691, 275. 00 63, 657, 098. 00  92, 865, 619, 380. 00	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE-MENTAL ACTS  1. Urgent Deficiency, 1943 2. First Deficiency, 1943 3. Naval Supplemental, 1943 4. Farm Labor Supply, 1943-44 5. Urgent Deficiency, 1943 6. Urgent Deficiency, 1943 7. Defense Aid Supplemental Supplemental Supplemental Second Deficiency. 10. First Supplemental National Defense. 11. Farm Labor Supply, 1944-45.  Total Deficiency and Supplemental Grand total	\$22, 410, 000. 00 4, 102, 569, 890. 87 3, 816, 206, 583. 00 26, 100, 000. 00 2, 911, 700. 00 134, 096, 279. 86 6, 273, 629, 000. 00 2, 880, 941, 504. 00 36, 158, 760. 60 166, 754, 124. 32 27, 000, 000. 00	\$22, 410, 676, 17 4, 108, 485, 949, 96 3, 851, 176, 119, 00 40, 000, 000, 00 7, 246, 700, 00 143, 630, 591, 56 6, 273, 629, 000, 00 2, 931, 215, 033, 00 363, 059, 927, 23 308, 340, 019, 23 (¹)  18, 049, 194, 016, 64 108, 234, 694, 747, 64	\$22, 410, 676, 11 4, 106, 261, 194, 96 3, 836, 176, 119, 00 26, 100, 000, 00 7, 246, 700, 00 143, 430, 591, 56 6, 273, 629, 000, 2 911, 697, 224, 00 188, 833, 720, 22 (1) 17, 769, 041, 405, 64 110, 634, 660, 785, 64
<sup>1</sup> Consideration not comp	leted during first se	ssion; carried over t	o second session.				
1944-45	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1944-45	1944-45	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1944-45
1. Department of Agriculture. 2. District of Columbia. 3. Independent Offices. 4. Interior. 5. Labor. 6. Legislative and Judiciary. 7. Military. 8. Navy. 9. State, Justice, and Commerce. 10. Treasury and Post Office. 11. War Department, civil functions.  Total.	\$535, 244, 192, 00 68, 585, 607, 00 8, 500, 590, 352, 00 87, 662, 580, 00 1, 104, 972, 514, 00 59, 666, 975, 00 15, 436, 031, 795, 00 27, 572, 202, 936, 00 231, 304, 700, 00 1, 318, 321, 980, 00 86, 911, 440, 00	\$524, 806, 718, 00 69, 159, 948, 00 8, 561, 391, 764, 00 123, 629, 345, 36 1, 114, 920, 609, 00 60, 232, 283, 66 15, 434, 814, 795, 00 27, 569, 798, 301, 00 242, 766, 700, 00 1, 332, 376, 669, 00 95, 190, 680, 00 55, 129, 087, 813, 02	\$562, 145, 918, 00 69, 111, 569, 00 8, 485, 099, 785, 00 103, 239, 796, 36 1, 112, 644, 464, 00 59, 701, 018, 66 15, 434, 814, 795, 00 241, 937, 700, 00 1, 330, 846, 169, 00 92, 455, 440, 00  55, 061, 794, 956, 02	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE-MENTAL ACTS  1. Farm Labor Supply 2. First Deficiency 1944 3. National War Agencies 1945 4. Defense Aid and UNRRA 5. Second Deficiency 1944 Total Deficiency and Supplement Grand total	\$500, 103, 748. 38 1, 030, 858, 367. 00 3, 920, 070, 000, 00 232, 385, 058. 92 5, 683, 417, 174. 30 60, 684, 842, 245. 30	\$36, 359, 200, 00 530, 773, 754, 97 1, 031, 100, 367, 00 3, 920, 510, 000, 00 245, 630, 992, 58 5, 764, 434, 314, 55 60, 893, 522, 127, 57	\$31, 359, 200.00 489, 762, 870.04 1, 030, 937, 242.00 3, 920, 320, 000.00 241, 270, 992.58 5, 713, 650, 304.62 60, 775, 445, 260.64
2 Passed House, 78th Cong.	, 1st sess.						
1945–46	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1945-46	1945-46	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1945-46
1. Agriculture. 2. District of Columbia. 3. Independent Offices. 4. Interior 5. Labor and FSA. 6. Legislative. 7. Military. 8. Navy. 9. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, and Federal Loan Agency. 10. Treasury and Post	101, 242, 628. 00 1, 086, 210, 337. 00 50, 742, 447. 66	\$594, 724, 527, 00 65, 703, 280, 00 3, 145, 638, 626, 00 140, 392, 432, 00 1, 132, 093, 241, 00 50, 994, 481, 66 21, 496, 902, 030, 00 23, 603, 775, 868, 00 270, 180, 838, 00 1, 343, 094, 670, 00	\$589, 931, 520, 00 65, 635, 660, 00 3, 121, 900, 230, 00 1111, 690, 258, 00 1, 115, 617, 256, 00 50, 94, 481, 65 21, 496, 902, 030, 00 23, 601, 136, 064, 00 265, 521, 700, 00 1, 342, 958, 105, 00	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE- MENTAL ACTS  1. First Deficiency, 1945 2. National War Agencies, 1946 3. Second Supplemental, 1945 4. Second Deficiency, 1945. 5. National War Agencies, 1946  Total Deficiency	\$2, 338, 877, 125. 62 752, 764, 850. 00 3, 634, 044, 238. 78	\$2, 375, 332, 528. 31 774, 005, 765. 00 3, 675, 508, 776. 79	\$2, 373, 837, 128, 31 769, 364, 850, 00 3, 636, 203, 476, 79
Office	99, 165, 940. 00	1, 343, 094, 670, 00	1, 342, 958, 105. 00	and Supplemental Acts	6, 725, 686, 212. 40	6, 824, 847, 070. 10	6, 779, 405, 455. 10
functions							

1946-47	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1946-47	1946-47	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1946-47
1. Agriculture 2. District of Columbia 3. Independent Offices 4. Interior 5. Labor and FSA 6. Legislative 7. Military 8. Navy 9. State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, and Federal Loan Agency 10. Treasury and Post Office 1. War Department, civil functions Total	\$573, 601, 949. 00 72, 585, 009. 00 5, 593, 262, 262, 60 179, 426, 847. 00 1, 136, 500, 238. 00 52, 801, 676, 66 7, 091, 034, 700. 00 365, 178, 758. 00 1, 604, 556, 940. 00 285, 987, 498. 00 21, 094, 654, 241. 66	\$598, 737, 735, 00 79, 478, 262, 00 5, 096, 385, 177, 00 341, 890, 788, 00 1, 157, 155, 365, 00 53, 947, 946, 16 7, 595, 449, 868, 00 4, 100, 009, 100, 00 453, 042, 983, 00 1, 616, 067, 840, 00 361, 618, 998, 00 21, 442, 764, 042, 16	\$581, 240, 121. 00 76, 755, 009. 00 5, 094, 976, 677, 00 247, 167, 036. 00 1, 155, 015, 670. 00 33, 809, 736. 16 7, 263, 524, 400. 00 4, 119, 659, 300. 00 437, 703, 212. 00 1, 604, 862, 140. 00 333, 230, 498. 00 20, 967, 961, 799. 16	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE-MENTAL ACTS  1. Urgent Deficiency, 1941. 2. Fourth Supplemental National Defense, 1941. 3. First Deficiency, 1941. 4. Defense Ald Supplemental, 1941. 5. Firth Supplemental National Defense, 1941. 6. Additional Urgent Deficiency, 1941. 7. Emergency Relief, 1942. 8. Second Deficiency, 1941. 9. First Supplemental National Defense, 1942. 10. Second Supplemental National Defense, 1942. 11. Third Supplemental National Defense, 1942. 12. Additional appropriation, National Defense, 1942. 12. Additional appropriation, National Defense, 1942.  Total deficiency and supplemental National Defense, 1942.	\$388, 140, 000. 00  1, 376, 277, 202. 00  188, 863, 693. 68  7, 000, 000, 000. 00  1, 980, 356, 820. 00  173, 749, 630. 00  879, 321, 270. 80  7, 063, 238, 478. 00  6, 159, 522, 799. 39  7, 650, 001, 531. 00  512, 000, 000. 00  34, 257, 406, 424. 87	\$395, 357, 775, 00 1, 376, 464, 602, 00 191, 803, 544, 88 7, 000, 000, 000, 00 2, 295, 967, 920, 00 174, 409, 630, 00 936, 395, 000, 00 1, 042, 565, 565, 03 5, 838, 436, 948, 00 6, 161, 615, 969, 39 9, 478, 310, 750, 00 512, 000, 000, 00	\$393, 687, 775. 00  1, 376, 464, 602. 00  191, 478, 544, 88  7, 000, 000, 000, 000. 00  2, 299, 767, 920. 00  174, 409, 530. 00  10, 905, 000. 00  1, 041, 444, 529, 75  6, 586, 896, 948. 00  6, 161, 467, 229, 36  9, 283, 037, 005. 00  512, 000, 000. 00  35, 931, 559, 184. 02
	in the second		10 29 10	Grand total	52, 820, 724, 171. 87	55, 091, 168, 742. 30	55, 325, 771, 373. 02
1947-48	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1947-48	1947-48	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1947-48
1. Agriculture 2. District of Columbia 3. Government Corps 4. Independent Offices 5. Interior 6. Labor and FSA 7. Legislative 8. Military 9. Navy 10. State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary 11. Treasury and Post Office 12. War Department, civil functions Total	\$569, 301, 266, 00 95, 300, 310, 00 36, 997, 580, 00 8, 167, 869, 027, 00 161, 413, 513, 00 1, 684, 586, 780, 00 54, 895, 005, 00 5, 280, 982, 423, 00 3, 135, 481, 100, 00 538, 976, 492, 00 3, 202, 050, 750, 00 339, 186, 869, 00	\$662, 205, 426, 00 94, 947, 504, 00 31, 746, 918, 00 8, 307, 978, 247, 00 215, 530, 353, 00 1, 676, 198, 080, 00 55, 631, 908, 00 5, 616, 618, 799, 00 3, 312, 044, 300, 00 553, 595, 932, 00 3, 243, 045, 173, 00 539, 927, 449, 00 24, 309, 470, 089, 00	\$613, 046, 826, 00 95, 504, 737, 00 35, 040, 000, 00 8, 188, 822, 927, 00 194, 587, 859, 00 1, 674, 188, 631, 00 55, 294, 435, 00 3, 268, 766, 100, 00 551, 175, 932, 00 3, 216, 509, 450, 00 502, 123, 912, 00 23, 877, 560, 442, 00	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE- MENTAL ACTS  1. Urgent	\$139, 360, 000. 00 9, 000, 000. 00 243, 255, 607. 00 2, 827, 526, 186. 35 170, 478, 658. 70 70, 856, 257. 87 6, 180, 000. 00 1, 603, 199, 094. 47 35, 500, 000. 00 100, 059, 200. 00 5, 205, 415, 004. 39 28, 472, 276, 119. 39	\$181, 486, 231. 40 9, 000, 000, 00 243, 255, 607, 00 2, 835, 199, 009, 32 210, 418, 858, 70 72, 236, 257, 87  1, 680, 793, 697, 22 35, 500, 000, 00 112, 334, 200, 00 5, 380, 223, 861, 51  29, 689, 693, 950, 51	\$179, 645, 668, 44 9, 000, 000, 00 243, 255, 607, 00 2, 835, 161, 509, 32 192, 438, 858, 7 72, 236, 257, 87 6, 180, 000, 00 1, 658, 802, 197, 22 35, 000, 000, 00 106, 695, 100, 00 5, 338, 915, 198, 51 29, 216, 475, 640, 51
1948-49	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1948-49	1948-49	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1948-49
1. Agriculture 2. District of Columbia. 3. Government Corporations. 4. Independent Offices. 5. Supplemental Independent Offices. 6. Interior. 7. Labor and Federal Security. 8. Supplemental Federal Security. 9. Legislative. 10. National Military Establishment: (a) Military Functions. (b) Civil Functions, Department of Army. (c) Department of Army. (d) Department of Army. 11. State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary. 12. Treasury and Post Office. 13. Treasury and Post Office, supplemental.	\$545, 533, 453, 00 101, 164, 983, 00 37, 979, 061, 00 991, 518, 551, 00 5, 795, 048, 931, 00 375, 692, 591, 00 905, 405, 250, 00 969, 050, 000, 00 55, 859, 690, 00 6, 447, 689, 000, 00 606, 558, 766, 00 3, 686, 733, 250, 00 503, 590, 263, 00 1, 981, 722, 350, 00 248, 414, 255, 00	\$580, 400, 278. 99 99, 567, 983. 00 43, 422, 061. 00 967, 705, 551. 00 5, 855, 308, 851. 00 422, 179, 098. 00 890, 751, 440. 00 983, 227, 319. 00 56, 362, 726. 00  708, 586, 666. 00 3, 812, 170, 250. 00 516, 029, 937. 00 2, 010, 601, 200. 00 248, 414, 255. 00	\$577, 546, 953, 00 99, 729, 483, 00 38, 479, 061, 00 967, 442, 551, 00 5, 819, 659, 851, 00 407, 836, 974, 00 890, 139, 000, 00 975, 914, 700, 00 56, 140, 401, 00 6, 705, 418, 163, 00 641, 575, 666, 00 3, 749, 059, 250, 00 511, 129, 662, 00 1, 996, 313, 425, 00 248, 414, 255, 00	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE-MENTAL ACTS  1. Urgent Deficiency 2. Foreign Aid, Welfare of Indians, and tax refunds 3. First Deficiency 4. Supplemental National Defense 5. Foreign Aid 6. Second Deficiency 7. Supplemental  Total, deficiency and supplemental acts  Grand total	\$131, 015, 365, 67 555, 125, 000, 00 339, 160, 952, 33 923, 100, 000, 00 5, 980, 710, 228, 00 485, 204, 240, 42 15, 000, 000, 00 8, 429, 315, 806, 42 31, 681, 276, 200, 42	\$137, 489, 385, 67  555, 125, 000, 00  780, 962, 279, 84  958, 200, 000, 00  6, 125, 710, 228, 00  605, 792, 130, 36  15, 300, 000, 00  9, 178, 579, 023, 87  33, 226, 732, 690, 87	\$136, 368, 385, 67 555, 125, 000, 00 778, 768, 845, 84 949, 000, 000, 00 6, 030, 710, 228, 0 549, 774, 876, 36 15, 300, 000, 00 9, 015, 047, 335, 87 32, 699, 846, 730, 87

1949-50	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1949-50 (1st sess.)	1949-50	Passed House	Passed Senate	Law 1949-50 (1st sess.)
1. Agriculture	\$701, 122, 079, 00 98, 923, 621, 00 7, 103, 506, 553, 00 536, 461, 908, 00 2, 210, 694, 985, 00 62, 200, 705, 00 13, 272, 815, 800, 00 3, 700, 000, 00 189, 000, 000, 00 4, 481, 834, 200, 00 4, 375, 327, 600, 00	\$723, 083, 249, 00 103, 142, 153, 00 7, 663, 429, 323, 00 595, 262, 257, 00 2, 409, 408, 765, 00 62, 262, 110, 00 13, 165, 803, 089, 00 3, 700, 000, 00 202, 230, 000, 00 4, 570, 907, 089, 00 4, 388, 079, 000, 00	\$715, 601, 607, 00 102, 754, 447, 00 7, 617, 739, 361, 00 584, 098, 797, 00 2, 387, 381, 385, 00 62, 262, 110, 00 12, 949, 562, 498, 00 3, 700, 000, 00 191, 450, 000, 00 4, 380, 644, 298, 00 4, 285, 382, 200, 00	DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLE-MENTAL ACTS  1. Disaster Relief 2. Disaster Relief 3. First Deficiency 4. Second Deficiency 5. Veterans' Administration 6. Foreign Aid Appropriation 7. Third Deficiency 8. Grasshopper Control 9. First Supplemental 10. Second Supplemental Total deficiency and supplemental	\$500, 000. 00 500, 000. 00 471, 895, 177. 52 671, 069, 672. 84 595, 890, 000. 00 127, 032, 243. 75 1, 500, 000. 00 72, 790, 521. 87 1, 038, 506, 380. 41	\$500,000,00 500,000,00 542,303,473,59 \$62,563,510,27 595,890,000,00 193,978,469,02 3,500,000,00 104,172,589,95 1,083,161,658.73	\$500, 000. 00 500, 000. 00 524, 649, 473. 50 854, 838, 710. 27 595, 890, 000. 00 177, 740, 619. 02 1, 750, 000. 00 78, 005, 129. 05 1, 079, 082, 880. 41
9. Civil functions, Department of Army 10. State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary 11. Treasury and Post Office Departments	4, 222, 954, 000. 00 593, 292, 270. 00 684, 616, 102. 00 3, 072, 817, 903. 93	4,000,887,000.00 751,440,690.00 671,782,281.00 3,113,068,503.93	4, 088, 386, 000. 00 664, 178, 190. 00 677, 972, 102. 00 3, 090, 528, 903. 93	Grand total	36, 933, 605, 023. 32	37, 858, 107, 511. 49	37, 825, 026, 214. 17
Total	28, 336, 451, 026. 93	28, 824, 713, 809. 93	28, 852, 079, 400. 93	The state of the s		0.000	S CALL

Mr. Speaker, to find out who is spending the money, the people of the Nation should compare the column "Passed House" with the column "Passed Senate."

SENATE SPENT OVER \$18,000,000,000 MORE THAN HOUSE FROM 1940 TO 1950

The figures show that from 1940 to 1950, the Senate voted to spend approximately \$18,390,210,943 more than the amount of money the House of Representatives was willing to vote. It is not my purpose in this talk to analyze the reasons why the action of the Senate in seeking to spend more money may have been wise or unwise, sound or unsound, economical or uneconomical. That is a matter of interpretation that may be subject to opposite conclusions being reached by different people. The cold fact that the Senate voted to spend over \$18,000,000,000 more than the House is not subject to different interpretations. It is simply an established fact.

## THE FIGURES CANNOT BE DENIED

Beginning with the year 1940, here are the figures that show the amount of money voted by the Senate over and above the amount voted by the House for the same purpose and the same year:

1940: \$684,492,486 more than the House.

1941: \$1,724,184,596 more than the House.

1942: \$2,270,444,571 more than the House.

\*1943: \$8,212,157,870 more than the House.

\*1944: \$1,694,315,573 less than the House.

1945: \$208,679,882 more than the House.
1946: \$482,021,000 more than the

House. 1947: \$2,815,169,291 more than the House.

1948: \$1,217,417,830 more than the House.
1949: \$1,545,456,490 more than the

House. 1950: \$924,502,500 more than the House.

Total: Senate voted about \$18,390,-210,943 more than the House.

I have starred the years 1943 and 1944 because the figures for the military establishment for those years apparently caused a great part of the difference between the two bodies of Congress. It is probable that rapidly accruing events abroad caused the discrepancy, since the appropriations were considered at different times of the same year by the two bodies.

In the 11-year period of 1940 to 1950, the Senate voted well over \$18,000,000,000 more than the House.

Not counting the 2 years, 1943 and 1944, the Senate voted over \$12,000,000,000 more than the House in the 9-year period.

Counting every year except the one of 1944, the only year that the House voted more money than the Senate, the figures show that the Senate voted to spend over \$20,000,000,000 more than the House in the 10-year period.

## SENATE CONSISTENTLY SPENDS MORE THAN HOUSE

No matter how it be analyzed, the fact is that the Senate has consistently voted to spend more money than the House has been willing to spend. On an average, the Senate exceeds the expenditures wanted by the House by anything from \$1,250,000,000 a year to a little over \$2,000,000,000 a year.

#### SENATE HIGHER 170 TIMES OUT OF 196 APPROPRIATIONS

There were 212 appropriations voted upon by both bodies of Congress. Sixteen times the two bodies agreed upon the amount. Twenty-six times the House voted to appropriate more money than the Senate. One hundred and seventy times the Senate voted more money than the House. Or, to put it another way, the two bodies differed in the amounts to be appropriated 196 times. The Senate voted for more money than the House 170 times out of the 196 times on which the two bodies differed.

To answer the question, "Who is spending the money?" The admitted figures lead to one inescapable conclusion: The Senate is spending the money.

As I stated above, it is not my purpose in this talk to analyze the reasons for the expenditures. I want to prove not why the money is being spent, but merely who is responsible for the expenditures.

BRING SENATE EXPENDITURES DOWN FIRST

I also want to emphasize that I am not trying to make a point that the House of Representatives is not spending too much money simply because the figures show the Senate is spending more. It may well be that, even though the House wants a great deal less money spent, even the House figures may be too high. I merely want to point out to the people of the Nation that, if they want to cut down on expenditures, the first task is to begin with the Senate. In other words, if the people believe too much money is being expended, they should first try to bring Senate expenditures down to the House level and then take the next step after that.

## "PORK BARREL"

Now I would like to spend just a few minutes discussing the appropriations for two specific functions—Interior and civil functions. When people speak of "pork barrel" and "logrolling" expenditures, the items criticized—whether justly or unjustly—are usually found under the headings of Interior and civil functions in appropriation bills.

There are many expenditures under those headings that the general public often criticizes as being unnecessary, uneconomical, and unsound. It is not my purpose today to arrive at any conclusion as to whether the general public is right or wrong in its opinions about extravagance in items under civil functions. I merely want to let the admitted figures prove who is spending the money for civil functions and Interior items.

Listing only the expenditures made under the headings "Civil functions" and "Interior"—the two headings that, among other things, include money expended by the Army engineers and other agencies for dams, rivers, harbors, and so forth—the following figures show that the Senate voted more money for such

purposes than the House felt was necessary in every single year in the period from 1940 to 1950. The following chart illustrates it by showing under "Civil functions" the amount voted by the Senate each year over and above the amount voted by the House. Under "Interior," the chart is similar:

#### CIVIL FUNCTIONS

1941: Senate voted \$20,000,000 more than the House.

1942: Senate voted \$13,500,000 more than the House.

1943: Senate voted \$33,000,000 more than the House.

1944: Senate voted \$1,000,000 more than the House.

1945: Senate voted \$10,000,000 more than the House.

1946: Senate voted \$13,000,000 more than the House.

1947: Senate voted \$76,000,000 more than the House.

1948: Senate voted \$200,000,000 more than the House.

1949: Senate voted \$102,000,000 more than the House.

1950: Senate voted \$158,000,000 more than the House.

Total: Senate voted about \$636,000,-000 more than the House for civil functions from 1940 to 1950:

## INTERIOR

1941: Senate voted \$19,000,000 more than the House.

1942: Senate voted \$8,000,000 more than the House.

1943: Senate voted \$24,000,000 more than the House.

1944: Senate voted \$55,000,000 more than the House.

1945: Senate voted \$36,000,000 more than the House.

1946: Senate voted \$39,000,000 more

than the House. 1947: Senate voted \$163,000,000 more

than the House.
1948: Senate voted \$54,000,000 more

than the House. 1949: Senate voted \$46,000,000 more

than the House.

1950: Senate voted \$58,000,000 more

than the House.
Total: Senate voted about \$502,000,-

Total: Senate voted about \$502,000,-000 more than the House for Interior from 1940 to 1950.

Grand total: Senate voted about \$1,138,000,000 more than the House for civil functions and Interior from 1940 to 1950.

The figures for both civil functions and Interior show that it is the Senate expending the money.

For civil functions and Interior the grand total establishes the fact that the Senate voted to spend about \$1,138,000,000 more money than the House believed should be spent for such projects. On a yearly basis, the figures prove that the Senate has consistently tried to spend over 100 million dollars a year over and above the amount the House felt was necessary.

Again let me emphasize that it is not my purpose in this talk to analyze the reasons for the expenditures or to determine whether the public is right or wrong in the descriptive terms it applies to such projects. Whatever the reasons be, whatever the projects are, the cold

fact still remains that the money for such purposes is being spent by the Senate.

I do not know whether the public is familiar with the figures I have given but they are a matter of public record. I do not know whether the public is aware of who is spending the money, but that also is a matter of public record.

#### WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT?

I now want to discuss for a few minutes the following proposition: Assuming the people of this Nation want to cut down on expenditures, do I have any constructive suggestion as to what action they may take?

Of course, we are all familiar with the obvious measures the people already have been taking of making general protests to members of both the House and Senate, of sending articles to newspapers, and so on. But is there anything else that may help? I offer the following suggestion because, as far as I have been able to determine, it is new in the sense that it has not been used to try to cut down Federal expenditures.

#### "GRASS ROOTS" ECONOMY

I propose that the local governing bodies of towns, cities, and States become a part of a united effort to achieve Federal economy. I also propose that citizens' committees be set up to function as "watchdogs of the Federal Treasury." I am proposing what amounts to a "grass roots economy movement," in which the people of the Nation will join to achieve every sound and possible saving.

Let me apply the suggested solution to the two most criticized items, civil functions and Interior projects. Let me also use the Senate as an example because the figures make it readily apparent that more money can be cut from Senate appropriations than from House appropriations, assuming any cuts at all are possible.

## THE SYSTEM NOW

Before I discuss my proposal, let me first try to give an analysis of the system as it now works. The average Senator does his best to obtain whatever dams, flood control walls, river and harbor improvements, highways, post offices, and other Federally financed projects that he believes are beneficial and necessary for the people of the Nation and the people of his State. Of course he scrutinizes such projects with an economy eye focused on real necessity and not with a political eye focused on the thought that an inpour of Federal money into a State means an outpour of votes for the person responsible.

As far as the Senator's own State is concerned, most Senators naturally try to represent the wishes and best judgment of their constituents when such opinion is not in conflict with the Senator's own conviction. Experience has shown that, as concerns work on highways, dams, rivers, post offices, harbors, and so on, usually a Senator's opinion is that the people of his State want Federal money spent on such projects in their own State. A Senator who seeks to obtain Federal money for such projects in his own State usually feels that, in addition to the fact that he himself is sincarely convinced of the necessity, the people of his own State want him to take such action, too.

#### A NEW SYSTEM

Under the proposal I am making, the Senator would not guess at the thoughts of the people he represents—he would know.

If he knew his people wanted the projects, he would fight for them as hard as he does now, because his own courage and opinion would be bolstered by political fortitude. The valor of any elected official is always enhanced by knowledge that his efforts meet with the approval of those who have the power to continue or discontinue him in office.

On the other hand, if the people he represents do not want worth-while projects at this time-if they prefer to postpone them because they want to balance the Federal budget or reduce taxes or practice austerity economy—that may make a difference to the Senator. Of course he may disregard their wishes. We all know that a Senator will not be swayed by political considerations and. in that situation, a Senator who still wanted to vote for projects his people did not want would undoubtedly vote according to his convictions, even though he knew it meant political suicide. But if we take the case of a Senator who was in doubt whether to vote for or against a project in his own State, then the opinion of the people of his State would be very helpful. In such a case, the Senator would undoubtedly be influenced by the wishes of his constituents. Let us help that Senator by the suggestion I now

## MEMORIALIZE THE CONGRESS

I propose that, at the beginning of each annual session of Congress, every Senator notifies his State legislature of the projects under civil functions and the Interior Department that he proposes to sponsor or support. Then let the State legislature memorialize the Congress in favor of or against that particular project.

## GET TO THE PEOPLE

The Senator represents all the people of that State. So does the State legislature. The Senator tries to learn the wishes of the people of his State. So does the State legislature. The Senator tries to keep close to the people of his The State legislators are even State. closer to the people because they live and hold office throughout the year right in the districts they represent and they are in constant daily touch with the people. Most Members of Congress are away from home at least 6 months of the year. In addition, a Senator who takes a stand on a project may not come up for reelection until 5 or 6 years later—a long time for political memories. The members of the State legislature come up for reelection within a matter of months for the most part-a short time for those who disregard the wishes of their constituents.

## MIGHT HELP ECONOMY

If the State legislature memorializes the Congress against a certain project in the State that will cost Federal money, the Senator has been put on notice that in all probability the people in his State prefer economy to the project. That might result in an economy vote by the Senator.

Of course, the State legislature might memorialize in favor of the project. Will that hurt economy? I believe an analysis of the votes in the Senate will show that it will not make any difference. Perusal of the Congressional Record reveals very few votes against any project in any State that any Senator represents. In other words, those who advocate economy have everything to gain and nothing to lose if the plan I suggest to memorialize the Congress be put into effect.

#### THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

As far as the other body of Congress is concerned—the House of Representatives—a similar system could be inaugurated. Instead of working through the State legislature—because most Representatives in Congress do not represent an entire State but merely a district within it—the Representative of a district would merely notify the local governing bodies of the towns and cities in his district of any project under civil functions and Interior that he intended to sponsor or support. The city council or board of aldermen, for example, would then pass a resolution stating their stand on it.

#### ONE VOTE COUNTS IN THE SENATE

Of course, I think the figures I have given show beyond question that the money is being spent by the Senate. I also believe that the Senate is the body where the expressed opinion of the people may have great weight if any senatorial vote is influenced by it. That is where a single vote counts much more than in the House of Representatives. The result of balloting in the Senate would often be completely reversed if two or three Senators changed their votes. That is not true of the House where usually it would be necessary to turn over at least 20 or 30 votes to reverse the result of the balloting.

If the people of the State prefer economy so much that their State legislators ask a Senator to vote against a project that will bring Federal money into the State, I am inclined to think the Senators from that State will be greatly impressed. A Senator who votes against the expressed wish of the people who elected him will certainly have a great deal of explaining to do.

## NO EXTRA WORK INVOLVED

The proposal I make does not involve any extra work on the part of anyone. Senators and Representatives in Congress know, or should know, about projects in the civil functions and the interior affecting their districts. They merely write one or more letters to the State governing bodies and outline what the projects are and ask them for an opinion.

## QUESTION

There is one other point that bears investigation and I believe my suggestion will highlight it. That is: Do the people really want economy where they themselves will be affected by it? We all know they want economy for the other fellow. We all know they want "economy, but—." Maybe they really want economy when it affects them, too.

Let us find out. It will make our task easier if we know.

#### LET'S FIND OUT

If the people are willing to pay for better conditions, if they will prefer to have worth-while projects right now rather than to postpone them in order to reduce the national debt or to cut taxes, let us know about it. On the other hand, if they would choose to do without some of the things they describe as porkbarrel legislation—not projects for someone else but for themselves—let us know that.

#### HOW?

The best way to find out, in my opinion, is by the people themselves. Only one in a thousand will write to us and we are often in the dark. The closer you get to the people, the more you know their feelings. State legislators, aldermen, councilmen, and selectmen are much closer to the people than anyone in Washington. In addition to what we ourselves may know or guess as to the opinion of the people on any project under civil functions or Interior, let us also have the opinion of their local representatives and governing bodies. Let us not only put ourselves on the spot-let us also put the people themselves there. Let us see who really wants economy—not "economy, but"—just plain old economy, period.

#### LET'S GET SPECIFIC

I had better add this: I realize there may be many other places where economy can be put into effect. However, I have found a tendency in people not to be specific about those other places. It is usually, "Well, you cannot cut down on this but there are other places to economize." They never can find those other places. Let us get specific and begin with civil functions and Interior items for a start. Those are the items usually described as a major part of the wasteful pork barrel. Maybe we can find out whether or not the people want pork barrel, logrolling, and back scratching. The best, quickest, and simplest way I know is by the memorializing plan I have suggested.

## PRECEDENTS

As we all know, there is nothing involved or complicated about any State legislature memorializing Congress. They do it on countless occasions and on a variety of subjects, indicating not only the simplicity of the procedure but also the fact that there is no lack of precedent for my opinion that the people often express their views to the national governing body through the medium of their State governing body. The practice is recognized as an effective method of influencing legislation. Let us extend the practice to also include the people's opinion on economy measures that will affect themselves directly.

## ONE OBVIOUS CRITICISM

There is one obvious criticism of my plan. It will be said that, even if the people of the State want economy enough to so memorialize their Senators on matters affecting their own State, they will hesitate in the thought: "If the

Federal Government's going to spend money, why shouldn't we get our share, too?" That is a natural thought and, whether we agree with its logic or not, we must be practical enough to recognize its actuality.

#### ANSWERS

I believe there are two answers to that:

First. The Senator of a State is not compelled to blindly follow the advice of the State legislature in its memorializing petition. He can see whether or not other States are trying to take advantage of his own State, and then act accordingly.

Second, A system might be easily worked out in the Senate where, before any vote. Senators might rise and state that their State legislators had memorialized thus and so, and they intend to follow the dictates of the memorialization, provided other Senators were doing the same. There are many gentlemen's agreements and this could easily be another. Then, if a Senator saw that other Senators either intended to disregard the advice of their constituents or that the constituents of the other Senators wanted the Federal money for themselves, rather than economy, the Senator could act accordingly.

#### SUMMARY

To summarize, I believe I am correct when I state:

First. The facts show that the Senate is spending the money. The merits of the Senate's action may be subject to debate but the fact itself is not.

Second. It is probable that the Senate may reduce expenditures if the Senators believe the people who elect them prefer economy to projects for their own States.

Third. Memorializing by the legislative body of the Senator's State is a fairly strong indication to him of the wishes of the people of the State.

Fourth. The plan I have suggested will put it right up to the people themselves to take a clear-cut, honest stand either for real economy or for "economy, but—."

Fifth. The plan I have suggested may help and certainly cannot hurt efforts to achieve real economy.

## "GRASS ROOTS" FOR ECONOMY

I mentioned earlier that the people themselves could act as "watchdogs of the Treasury" for forming "grass-rootsfor-economy committees" for the items I have mentioned, at least for a beginning. It would be easy to establish such committees but I believe they are already functioning and it would only be necessary to advise them of and request them to take over this additional duty. I refer to the various committees already functioning in every State and community advocating the Hoover Report. Those committees could be kept informed of the Federal projects I have discussed and, in addition to exerting their influence on Federal Congressmen and Senators, they could also exert their influence upon their State governing bodies to memorialize Congress properly.

#### FIRST THINGS FIRST

Let me again emphasize in conclusion that I am not saying expenditures made by the House are sound and proper. I do not want anyone to draw that conclusion simply because I have directed my remarks to the fact that Senate expenditures exceed House expenditures. My point is merely this: If too much money is being spent let us focus attention first on the body that is spending the most money, the Senate. If Senate expenditures can be reduced to the House level, then it may be possible to make still further reductions in the expenditures of both bodies.

#### WHY NOT TRY IT?

Perhaps the final argument in favor of the plan I have suggested is this: It will not cost one penny and it may save millions or billions of dollars. Why not try it and see?

#### FORWARD TO PEACE

Mr. TRIMBLE. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, America is in one of the most critical periods of her history, perhaps the most critical period in her history, as a result of Russia's refusal to cooperate for peace. We find ourselves, therefore, confronted with a financial burden almost as great as that imposed by war as we inch forward in our efforts for peace.

Two things are necessary in these critical hours: First, America must be strong spiritually; second, she must be strong materially. If we lack either of these sustaining factors, the hopes for world

peace are dim indeed.

Not long ago, I saw again a picture in my fifth grade history which I studied as a child. It showed a Pilgrim father with his musket on his shoulder, his Bible under his arm, with his wife on one side and his children on the other, wading through the snow of a New England village toward a small log church to worship. To me, that typified the spiritual awareness which our forefathers knew and exemplified the necessity for Divine guidance which they felt. If we in this day have lost that eagerness for guidance and that spiritual awareness, America has lost her strong right arm. If we have lost it, it is imperative that we regain it.

In the second place, and complementing spiritual awareness, is the strength of our own economy. It is necessary that we work and strive to prevent another depression. To do this will require the combined courage, cooperation, and com-

mon sense of all Americans.

In the great district which I am honored to represent northwest Arkansas, I believe we are laying out a pattern for the days that lie ahead. Our farmers have developed a fine diversified farm program centering around small grain, dairying, poultry, livestock, and the canning industry. Our farmers in the past 15 years have seen the benefits of electricity come to almost every farmstead through the efforts of the Rural Electrifi-

cation Administration, and they are happy about it. They have embraced the soil-conservation program and are rebuilding the soil of their farms systematically and carefully.

We are a district of small businesses a fine, upstanding, independent group who always look forward and are behind all the movements to develop our communities and surrounding farms. The people in our district—farmers, businessmen, laborers, and those in the professions alike—are patriotic, industrious, and God-fearing.

One of the greatest movements in our section, in particular, is the building of great flood control and hydro-electric dams. The White River and its tribu-taries traverse our district. Already Norfork Dam in Baxter County has been completed, and when all the generating units are ultimately installed, this great project will generate 323,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually. A few miles from this project, the great Bull Shoals Dam. is under construction and practically 65 percent completed. When this dam shall have been completed and the generators installed, it will generate 1.528.000.000 kilowatt hours of electric energy annually. Table Rock Dam, just across the Arkansas line in Missouri, has been authorized by the Congress, and an initial appropriation is now pending in the Congress, looking toward the programing of it for early construction. When this dam is completed and its generating unit installed, it will generate 788,000,000 kilowatthours of electric energy annually. The construction of this dam is assured.

There are four other dams in our Congressional district which are under consideration. Lone Rock in Searcy County has been authorized by the Congress for flood control, but it is being reconsidered by the Engineers for power also. I understand it will be favorably recommended to the Congress as both a floodcontrol and power project. When it is completed and all generators are installed, it will generate 144,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. Also in Searcy County, Gilbert Dam is now under consideration and has been favorably reported by the Corps of Engineers as a flood-control and power project. When it is completed, it will generate 156,000,-000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually. In adjoining Van Buren County, I have asked the Corps of Engineers to restudy the Archey Fork project near Clinton with the hope that it, too, can be reported favorably to the Congress for construction as a flood-control and power project. If this is done, I am informed it will generate in the neighborhood of 75.000.000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually. On the other side of our district in Benton County is the Beaver project, which has been approved by the district engineer and will be favorably reported to the Congress for approval as a flood-control and power project. When this dam is completed, it will generate 129,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power annually.

I shall do everything I possibly can to get Lone Rock approved as a power project and to secure the authorization for the Gilbert Dam, for the Beaver Dam, and for the Archey Fork Dam. When all these dams shall have been completed, it is easy to see the amount of electric energy we will have for disposal to the towns, cities, and farms of our district, and to the small industry which we hope to attract. In addition, the beautiful clear-water lakes which will be formed, as we know from our experience with Norfork, will make our section one of the garden spots of the whole country.

In addition to the construction of flood control and power projects, our district is in the forefront of the road-building program, which will insure better communication facilities between our rural communities. Without good roads, we cannot develop our rural sections properly. We are making great progress.

Another thing that we are doing in Arkansas, and especially in our district in northwest Arkansas, is to improve our school facilities. We are trying to see to it that every child in our district has an opportunity to attend a good school from the first grade through college,

Working together, we can achieve these things: A deeper sense of our spiritual responsibility; better education; all the electricity that is needed at prices that can be afforded; good roads. We are not going to fail in our quest for a strong economy at home, nor will we fail in our quest for a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

## DEVELOPMENTS IN KOREA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, developments in Korea, which unfortunately were not entirely foreseen by our Intelligence, constitute a real threat to world peace. The United Nation's resolution urging the combatants to cease and desist can apparently be implemented only by the United States. Whether we will have widespread moral support from other nations remains to be seen. Clearly, we will have to enforce our own decision to stop this unwarranted aggression.

Undoubtedly, southern Korea has been powerfully infiltrated by communism and that may account for the half-hearted, ineffective resistance of the defenders up to this time. Inadequate arms and equipment is another factor. There is some evidence that Russia has rendered substantial aid to the invaders.

We can supply the arms necessary to permit the Koreans to repel invasion but without the will to fight for and defend their country, these arms will have little effect. Perhaps the deadly Marxist fifth column has done its jobs so well that the will of the southern Korean people to resist has been overcome by propaganda. There is also a possibility that this attack is the forerunner of similar attacks elsewhere but I hope such fears are groundless.

Our Nation was left with no alternative but to oppose this sudden and unconscionable aggression. Thus the chain of appeasement which reaches back to the immediate postwar period is broken, and our country declares to the world that we are prepared to defend our free way of life against communism wherever the security of the Nation is threatened, wherever democratic rights are trampled.

It is the time, I think, for Americans to remain calm and free of hysteria. Let us have hope that the United Nations and all individual nations outside the iron curtain will stand with us. Above all, let us have faith in ourselves and be determined to stand by the decisions which have been made to check the further spread of the consuming fires of communism which are burning fiercely in so many parts of the world.

We must at this grave hour be prepared for any eventuality. While we hope and pray for peace, we must so gird our armed strength that it can be ready for instantaneous action, if needed, against the enemies of America and hu-

man decency.

Perhaps this episode will serve as a springboard for additional efforts to settle the fundamental problems relating to peace and war, infiltration, conspiracy, and subversion upon which our lasting world peace must ultimately rest. It is indeed later than we think.

#### LOBBYING AND PROPAGANDA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today in the House of Representatives a bill to prohibit Members of both branches of the Congress of the United States and employees and relatives of Members, during their tenure of office or employment, and for 2 years after their offices or positions terminate, from accepting more than actual traveling and hotel expenses for delivering personally or through another or by transcription, any of their speeches or other writings; from directly or indirectly accepting campaign aid from lobbying and propaganda agencies; prohibiting other persons, firms, or corporations from violating or conspiring to violate or aid, abet, or assist in the violation of this act; from permitting the franking privileges of Members of Congress to be used gratuitously or for pay by lobbyists and lobby and propaganda agencies; defining lobbying for the purposes of this act; and providing that any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of \$10,000 and 10 years imprisonment, and shall also forthwith forfeit his right to his office or position, if he still retains same at the time of his conviction.

A fine of \$10,000 and 10 years in prison was inspired by recent news items which disclosed that \$10,000 was the all-time high figure ever paid to any Member of Congress for his claimed literary efforts.

The recent disclosures brought forth by the committee investigating lobbying activities locally and nationally shows the urgent necessity of such legislation. It is high time, I believe, for all Members of Congress and their employees to give all of their time and effort to their only real employer, the United States Government, instead of using their office and position to scab on the newspaper fraternity and other writers, and giving the reading public sometimes a very inferior brand of reading matter, and unwittingly, in their effort to make money, become the brazen and misguided tools of lobbyists and propaganda agencies.

I will discuss this matter more at length in the Appendix of today's Congressional Record.

#### AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind the House that the time expires for the leg amputees to apply for their automobiles on the 30th of June. The boys, therefore, who cannot receive those automobiles, will be the leg amputees who have been hospitalized the longest; the men who have been hospitalized since the time they were wounded during the war. I know that the House will be very glad to extend the time for another year. There are now, I think, some hundred and fifty veteran amputees who cannot secure their cars under the present authorization, because the appropriation, unfortunately, ran out. I am sure the House will not adjourn permanently without passing the necessary legislation to extend the time for appropriation of cars. At the most, only 500 in all, from the present date to June 1951, will come under the provisions of the legislation. This Congress has never in my recollection refused a matter of simple justice like this.

I enclose a copy of a letter and resolution sent to certain members of the Appropriations Committee:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1950.
Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Referring to our telephone conversation today in reference to House Joint Resolution 473, I enclose copies of my letters to Congressmen Albert Thomas, Albert Gore, George W. Andrews, Francis Case, and John Phillips.

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

THE AMERICAN LEGION, Washington, D. C., June 16, 1950. Hon. Albert Thomas,

chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, House Appropriations Committee, Washington,

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There now is pending before your subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House Joint Resolution 473, introduced by Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, the purpose of which is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue providing automobiles and other conveyances for certain disabled veterans and to provide funds therefor.

For your ready reference, I enclose copy of Resolution 85, adopted at the Miami, 1948, national convention of the American Legion, which is self-explanatory.

As I understand the situation, under legislation now in effect, these benefits were to expire on June 30, 1950, but unfortunately the funds allocated thereto were exhausted on or about April 30, 1950. As you know, there still are hundreds of disabled veterans in hospitals, as result of their wartime service, and in addition thereto, there are also hundreds of cases of veterans whose claims have not as yet been adjudicated in order to determine their entitlement to an automobile or other conveyance of the type in question. Actually, there are numerous cases in which the veteran's entitlement has been established but unfortunately, due to the lack of funds, they have been unable to avail themselves of the benefits intended by this legislation.

Hundreds of these men will not be discharged from their respective hospitals until after July 1, 1950, and as you can well appreciate, until they shall have been discharged and their claims adjudicated, they are not in position to apply, through channels, for these automobiles, etc.

In other words, we respectfully submit that a veteran should not be denied the opportunity to obtain an automobile or other conveyance due to the fact that he was not fortunate enough to be discharged or have his entitlement established prior to either June 30, 1950 (the date of expiration of the current legislation), or prior to April 30, 1950 (the date which we understand the fund became exhausted).

In view of the foregoing, and on behalf of the national organization of the American Legion, may I respectfully request your favorable consideration of House Joint Resolution 473.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation in this matter, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

(Copy to Edith Nourse Rogers, Member of Congress.)

## MIAMI, FLA., October 18-21, 1948. Resolution 85

Resolution to extend time to apply for purchase of automobiles under Public Law 663

Whereas inasmuch as the time limit in which amputees may apply for the purchase of automobiles under Public Law 663 of the Seventy-ninth Congress has expired, and many of our veterans entitled to this benefit have been unable to apply therefor because they have not been granted a discharge from the service on account of being confined in hospitals; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled at Miami, Fla., October 18-21, 1948, That the Congress of the United States be requested to so amend the present law as to make these benefits available to any veteran otherwise entitled thereto at any time within 1 year from the date of his discharge, or from the date of the contingency upon which entitlement is based, whichever is the later.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he recently made.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on inflation, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$273.46.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. Keating) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include excerpts from newspapers and letters.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5002. An act to incorporate the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3258. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia;

S. 3527. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; and

S. 3776. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended.

## BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRE-SENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5002. An act to incorporate the Reserve Officers Association of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 492. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 30, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1524. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other pur-

poses"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1525. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide that personnel of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States shall have common Federal appointments or enlistments as reserves in their respective services, to equalize disability benefits applicable to such personnel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 673. Resolution rescinding the action of the House in passing House Joint Resolution 494; without amendment (Rept. No. 2397). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 643. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to investigate the recent explosion at South Amboy, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2398). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7639. A bill to amend certain acts relating to the retired status of the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; with amendment (Rept. No. 2399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 88. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of the report of the Committee on the Judiciary on the immigration and naturalization systems of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2423). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 494. Resolution providing for the employment of a secretary to the Sergeant at Arms; without amendment (Rept. No. 2424). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 624. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 617; without amendment (Rept. No. 2425). Ordered to be printed. Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Ad-

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 637. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 2426). Ordered to be printed.

No. 2426). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 170.

Joint resolution to provide for the transfer of the paintings The Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone and The Chasm of the Colorado from the United States Capitol to the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 2427). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 171. Joint resolution transferring the plaster cast of the statue of George Washington from the United States Capitol to the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 2428). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 2429). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 484. Resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit to the Abraham

Lincoln Association at Springfield, Ill., copies of certain Abraham Lincoln documents; without amendment (Rept. No. 2430). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 8958. A bill relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2431). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. S. 2348. An act to increase the annual authorization for the appropriation of funds for collecting, editing, and publishing of official papers relating to the Territories of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2432). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 8591. A bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HART: Committee of conference. S. 3571. An act to continue the authority of the Secretary of Commerce under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2434). Ordered to be printed.

# 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. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 557. An act for the relief of the McCormick Engineering Co., and John E. Price, an individual doing business as the Okeechobee Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1086. An act for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2376). Referred to the Committee tee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lydia L. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 2377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 661. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1130. A bill for the relief of Hanna Mussbach; without amendment (Rept. No. 2379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1611. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 2380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1616. A bill for the relief of S. L. Ayres & Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1618. A bill for the relief of Kenneth J. MacKenzie; with amendment (Rept. No. 2382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1988. A bill for the relief of

Leslie A. Fry; with amendment (Rept. No. 2383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion M. Martin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3664. A bill for the relief of Bruce M. Stern; without amendment (Rept. No 2385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judicary, H. R. 3919. A bill for the relief of John S. Steber; with amendment (Rept. No. 2386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4045. A bill for the relief of Katherine L. Anderson, a civil-service employee, permanently injured through negligent treatment at the Army Advisory Group Station Hospital in Nanking, China; with amendment (Rept. No. 2387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4142. A bill for the relief of Ralph D. Kinney; with amendment (Rept. No. 2388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4221. A bill to provide for the adjudication of a certain tort claim of Patricia Joyce Dunn, a minor, against the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4632. A bill for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 2390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4989. A bill to provide for the payment of just compensation to John II Estate Ltd., a Hawalian corporation, for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, T. H.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6020. A bill for the relief of Richard H. Sears; without amendment (Rept. No. 2392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6052. A bill for the relief of John M. Vick; with amendment (Rept. No. 2393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6885. A bill for the relief of E. Elmer Mynatt; with amendment (Rept. No. 2394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7202. A bill for the relief of Alexander Newman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7810. A bill for the relief of M. S. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 2396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House. Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 1503. A bill for the relief of George Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 2400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1585. A bill for the relief of Leilah begum Alaoui Mullin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3921. A bill for the relief of Nicholas G. Hadjipateras, Pipitsa N. Hadjipateras, and Costas N. Hadjipateras; with amendment (Rept. No. 2402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House, Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4014. A bill for the relief of Maria Hoffman; with amendment (Rept. No. 2403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4601. A bill for the relief of Jeannette Passayanni-Capodistria; with amendment (Rept. No. 2404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6578. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gunnborg Janzon Hamilton; with amendment (Rept. No. 2405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6657. A bill for the relief of Georges Jules Louis Sauvage; with amendment (Rept. No. 2406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6707. A bill for the relief of Sirius Proestopoulos; with amendment (Rept. No. 2407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7613. A bill for the relief of Miyako Horikoshi and her minor daughter; with amendment (Rept. No. 2408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8061. A bill for the relief of Yuki Sugimoto and her minor son; with amendment (Rept. No. 2409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8069. A bill for the relief of Michiko Kohga; with amendment (Rept. No. 2410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8073. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Iso and her minor daughter, Midori; with amendment (Rept. No. 2411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary, H. R. 8134. A bill for the relief of Elona Schwietza; with amendment (Rept. No. 2412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8153. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Akashi; without amendment (Rept. No. 2413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8284. A bill for the relief of Nicolae G. Caranfil and his family; without amendment (Rept. No. 2414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8450. A bill for the relief of Raief Neahem, Iffef Neahem, and Ihsen Neahem; with amendment (Rept. No. 2415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciclary. H.R. 8584. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tokie Sato Keating, Terry Yoichi Keating, and Betty Jean Keating; with amendment (Rept. No. 2416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8759. A bill for the relief of Rev. Andrew Chai Kyung Whang; with amendment (Rept. No. 2417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8741. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nobuko Yonashiro Martin and Gerald Philip Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8751. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yoshiko Ogiso Peterson; without, amendment (Rept. No. 2419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiclary. H. R. 8794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eiko Yoshizawa Lendrum and Charles Robert Lendrum, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8824. A bill for the relief of Tokuko Murayama; without amendment (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8956. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Claude Morita and Rodney Morita; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). 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. DOUGHTON:

H.R. 3992. A bill to eliminate the additional internal revenue taxes on coconut oil coming from the trust territory of the Pacific islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 8993. A bill relating to the classification of registration officers in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 8994. A bill relating to the classification of registration officers in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H.R. 8995. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, by providing that employees engaged in forestry or lumbering operations shall not be exempt from the wage and hour provisions of such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 8996. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate union-shop elections required by such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 8997. A bill to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from the gross income of employees the value of meals and living quarters furnished to them for the convenience of the employer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H.R. 8998. A bill amending section 34 of
the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended; to
the Committee on Interstate and Foreign

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

Commerce.

H. R. 8999. A bill to designate the lake created in the States of Oregon and Washington by the McNary lock and dam as Lake Umatilla; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 9000. A bill to assist and promote the development of the mineral resources located within the national forests of the United States, authorizing the construction of roads by the Secretary of Agriculture for the use of the owners or operators of mining properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'SULLIVAN:

H.R. 9001. A bill to prohibit Members of both branches of the Congress of the United States and employees and relatives of Members, during their tenure of office or employment, and for 2 years after their offices or positions terminate, from accepting more than actual traveling and hotel expenses for delivering personally or through another, or oby transcription, any of their speeches or other writings; from directly or indirectly accepting campaign aid from lobbying and propaganda agencies; prohibiting other persons, firms, or corporations from violating or conspiring to violate or aid, abet, or assist in

the violation of this act; from permitting the franking privileges of Members of Congress to be used gratuitously or for pay by lobbyists and lobby and propaganda agencies; defining lobbying for the purposes of this act; and providing for penalties for the violation thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 9002. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system in view of the increased cost of living; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 9003. A bill to extend the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to those members of the military and naval forces who are actively engaged in combat with the Communist elements of the Korean Government and who are not entitled to the benefits of the afore-men-tioned act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. J. Res. 495. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim April 12 of each year Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the thirty-first President on the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 496. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Interna-tional Food Exposition, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 497. Joint resolution excluding from gross estate of a nonresident alien works of art on loan to the Trustees of the National Gallery of Art; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. J. Res. 498. Joint resolution designating the third Sunday in September of each year as National Family Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 499. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp to commemorate the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution providing for the return to the United States of ships delivered to Russia under the Lend Lease Act; to the Committee on Foreign Af-

By Mr. GORSKI:

H. Con. Res. 229. Concurrent resolution re-lating to admission of certain representatives of the press to the Senate and House press galleries and to White House and departmental press conferences; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:
H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution to establish the means for obtaining a valid expression of the will of the people of China and Formosa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution to establish the means for obtaining a valid expression of the will of the people of China and Formosa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution to establish the means for obtaining a valid expression of the will of the people of China and Formosa; to the Committee on Foreign

By Mr. MILES: H. Res. 686. Resolution rescinding the action of the House in passing House Joint Resolution 494; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio: H. Res. 687. Resolution authorizing an increase of \$300 in the stationery allowance for each Representative. Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico for the second session of the Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PETERSON:
H. Res. 688. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 8221, a bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Res. 689. Resolution to make a study and investigation of social-security programs; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 9004. A bill for the relief of Chester Macomber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 9005. A bill for the relief of Ella Henriette Nielsine Bonnerup; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. HOPE: H. R. 9006. A bill for the relief of Karl Chimani and Ada Chimani; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. KENNEDY: H. R. 9007. A bill for the relief of Eugene M. Doran; to the Committee on the Judiciary. By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 9008. A bill to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 9009. A bill for the relief of Aba Abysz Warszawczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 9010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jessie B. Fradeneck, Cynthia Blair Fradeneck, and Donna Jean Fradeneck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. R. 9011. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emi

Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD; H. R. 9012. A bill for the relief of Masako Sato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 9013. A bill for the relief of Anna Leonard, an American citizen, covering damages by American troops to her property located in Salzburg, Austria; 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:

2232. By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, relative to the importance of stockpiling worsted fabrics instead of raw wool; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2233. Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature, relative to including in the rivers and harbors bill the necessary funds to dredge Wellfleet Harbor; to the Committee on Public Works.

2234. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to take immediate action

to prevent the complete liquidation of the shipbuilding industry in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2235. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Serge Sarkis Besoyan, chairman, American-Armenian Reparations Commission, Washington, D. C., requesting that action be taken to have the Government of Turkey recognize the doctrine of the right of expatriation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2236. Also, petition of Rafael Arjona-Siaca, San Juan, P. R., relative to Senate bill 3336, a bill to provide for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public

## SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 30, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 7, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, bowing for a hallowed moment at this shrine of Thy grace, we acknowledge before Thee that our lives are so often as restless pools; we are disturbed by the social turmoil of our times, burdened by many anxieties, tempted to cynicism by human cruelty and perversity, often disheartened by human folly which seems to profit so little by bitter reaping. We would lay our problems and tasks before Thee, not to escape them but praying for Thy empowering; so that with strength and courage we may carry them with a new gallantry. In a divided and violent world, may we be among those whom the generations to come shall call blessed, because our record, even when rampant evil compels us to unsheath a clean sword, shall write our names among today's peacemakers. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

> UNITED STATES SENATE, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE, Washington, D. C., June 30, 1950.

To the Senate: Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CARL HAYDEN, a Senator from the State of Arizona, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR. President pro tempore.

Thereupon, Mr. HAYDEN took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFarland, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 29, 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