

Richard H. Jacobs.  
 Richard E. Leithiser.  
 George A. McClellan, Jr.  
 James E. Price, Jr., O972126.  
 James B. Stewart, O2206904.  
 John P. Sullivan, Jr.  
 Whitfield F. Woodhead.  
 Thomas W. Worthington.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 281, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as a distinguished military graduate, and subject to physical qualification:  
 Dan C. Cavanaugh, O971021.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 15 (legislative day of July 20), 1950:

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Thomas H. Roberts to be United States district judge for the district of Puerto Rico.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harvey L. Carey to be United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Leo A. Casey to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia.

##### IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Frank William Milburn, O3738, United States Army, for appointment as a corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 1950

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

Infinite and eternal God, the strength of heroic souls in every generation, grant that daily we may be inspired with those lofty ideals and aspirations which are the progenitors of noble achievements.

May our minds and hearts be brought under the spell and sway of the guiding and interpreting light of Thy divine spirit for we humbly confess that we are frequently bewildered and doubt our own best judgment.

We pray that the leaders and Members of this legislative body, whom we honor and revere as our first men and women, may also be our best men and women, walking and working in the fear of the Lord, thinking clearly and acting courageously as they strive to kindle anew the high idealism of our beloved country.

Grant that the day may come when nations everywhere shall be eager to enlist in that glorious warfare, not waged with carnal weapons but with the insight and understanding of minds and souls that are seeking to witness to the glory of Thy righteousness and the wonder of Thy goodness.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who is our hope and our peace. Amen.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3666. An act to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

#### POSTAL SERVICE CURTAILMENT RESCISSION BILL

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if House Resolution 667, which the House adopted yesterday, having to do with the recognition of the gentleman from Indiana for the purpose of bringing up the so-called curtailment rescission bill would be in order at any time during this legislative day?

The SPEAKER. It would.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

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

#### DANGEROUS PROPAGANDA

Mr. CROOK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to state that over the week end I received a package of mail at my hotel address, the same coming from the Constitutional Educational League, Inc., of New York. The envelope contained a red-covered pamphlet carrying these words in very conspicuous black letters, "It isn't safe to be an American."

In my judgment, this type of spurious, vicious, and unpatriotic propaganda designed to shield some individuals that have never learned to adjust themselves and govern their actions in keeping with the long-established principles, ideals, and philosophy of our American Republic, should never be permitted dissemination through our United States postal service.

I harbor no respect for a person, firm, or group of people that resort to such un-American practice that would poison the minds of men. This is America and we propose to keep it America for freedom-loving people, notwithstanding the fact that a few organized groups attempt to usurp power delegated to the Executive, the Congress, the FBI, the State and national police, and the educational system of our Republic.

We have always had a few people that have caused about 99 percent of the trouble in the world and a very small fraction of 1 percent of the population

causing most of the trouble in the United States. If any man or woman privileged to live in and enjoy the blessings and opportunities of America, the greatest country on the face of the globe, is not satisfied with the philosophy of our Government, and thinks he knows of a better country in which to live, let him pack his grip and take the splendid transportation afforded to some other country where his convictions are not in conflict with the dictator that stimulates his thinking and enslaves his actions.

#### REREFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have rereferred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service the bill (S. 2927) for the relief of Edmon Burgher, since that bill provides for an advancement in status in the civil service, particularly the Post Office Department.

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

There was no objection.

#### REPUBLICAN PARTISAN BICKERING

Mr. CELLER. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we are being treated to more partisan pronouncements of Democratic guilt for lack of war preparation.

Democrats, according to Republican standards, are guilty of all the sins in the decalog, and are to blame even for the fall of Humpty Dumpty.

How wonderful is hindsight.

Republicans are real smart—they know all the answers—now—but not then.

Frankly, all the American people are to blame for lack of preparedness. "Get the boys back home at once" was the cry. "Reduce taxes."

"Stop military expenses."

And the Republicans joined the pack. I suppose the Truman plan, the Marshall plan, the ECA, the North Atlantic Treaty are just fiddlesticks.

Let us stop the bickering and partisan caterwauling which undoubtedly weakens morale at home and abroad and among our troops. Let us unite and get the Korean affair over as soon as possible so that the Kremlin will not dare risk again our thrusts—the thrusts of a unified nation.

#### RENT DECONTROL IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. POULSON. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, we find in the office of Mr. Tighe Woods, the Housing Administrator, the greatest display of autocratic disrespect for Congress that has yet been seen. The City

Council of Los Angeles by an overwhelming majority voted on July 28 to decontrol rents in the city of Los Angeles. Tighe Woods and his gang of power-hungry bureaucrats have tried every conceivable method of postponing the signing of the order to decontrol.

Just yesterday Mr. Woods flew to Los Angeles and appeared before the city council to try and have them rescind their actions and right in the face of that they again voted 10 to 5 to decontrol rents. That was yesterday morning, and last night after hours the machinists union, under the pretext of representing the tenants' group, filed a restraining order in the chambers of Judge James E. Kirkland.

Now, it seems strange that this order should not be filed until after the meeting of the city council, and at a time when the regular Federal judges who hear such motions were not in session, and that they should go to the offices of a newly appointed judge who no doubt has been indoctrinated with the philosophy that the bureaucrats shall control this country.

Is there not collusion between Mr. Woods and the proponents of rent control? I charge that Mr. Woods is not fulfilling his office in a respectful manner. Of course, such a charge will no doubt strengthen him with the administration.

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

#### HINDSIGHT VERSUS FORESIGHT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was telling us that Republican hindsight was better than their foresight. I am one Republican who wants to admit that. That happens to a lot of us, but if my hindsight was as helpful to me as the hindsight of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I would be pretty happy.

I remember when the gentleman from Texas, Martin Dies, the gentleman from Alabama, Joe Starnes, the gentleman from Mississippi, John Rankin, and the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Hébert, were trying to uncover Communists, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was so mistaken that he stood up here and he condemned that Committee on Un-American Activities from that place to breakfast. In my extension of remarks I will cite you to some of the things the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has had to say about that committee. In view of his statement of a few days ago you may find them interesting—just see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, volume 84, pages 1099, 1115, 1127; Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, volume 86, pages 583, 584, 4227, 4228, 4296; Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, volume 88, page 3755; Seventy-eighth Congress, first ses-

sion, volume 89, pages 1110, 1111; Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, volume 91, pages 142, 209, 420, 421, 10025-10032, A261; Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, volume 92, pages 3763, 5210, 5211, 5213; Eightieth Congress, first session, volume 93, pages 10782, 10783; Eightieth Congress, second session, volume 94, pages 2405, 2406, 6033, 6034.

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

#### RUSSIAN CRABMEAT

Mr. MACK of Washington. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on its front page this morning carried a news story which stated that union longshoremen in New York City were refusing to unload 80 tons of Russian canned crab, valued at \$250,000, from the British Cunard liner, *Parthia*. The steamship *Parthia* then sailed to Boston and endeavored to unload the Russian canned crab there, but the Boston longshoremen this morning likewise refused to handle this cargo.

A union leader, explaining the longshoremen's action, said, "Why help Russia to make money in this country?" That is a question our Cabinet Department heads should answer.

In the first 5 months of this year the United States bought \$17,049,488 in goods from Russia, according to figures supplied me by the Department of Commerce. During the same 5 months we sold Russia only \$514,050 worth of American goods. In short, in these 5 months there was a balance of trade favorable to the Russians of more than \$16,500,000. Russia got that much of our money.

What are the Russians doing with this almost \$3,000,000 a month which our trade is dumping into her war coffers? Why she is spending it to buy war supplies in western Europe.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] the other day inserted tables of statistics in the RECORD—page A5640—showing that Russia last year bought millions of dollars of steel, iron, copper, zinc, lead, and rubber from Belgium, France, and the United Kingdom. Is there any Member of Congress so naive as to believe these materials did not go into Russian weapons of war? Is it not likely that some of this material bought with American dollars supplied to the Russians by our trade went into the making of the very tanks, guns, and shells that are being used against American troops in Korea?

There are those who say we should demand that western European nations discontinue their trade with Russia. How can we do that with good grace when our own State Department and other top Government agencies are encouraging Russian imports into the United States? If we want western European nations to discontinue carrying on a billion dollars a year trade with

the enemy, we must set example by refusing to trade with the enemy ourselves.

What are we buying from Russia? Mostly such luxury items as crab and furs, these two items alone accounting for more than 60 percent of all the goods we buy from Russia. In exchange for these luxury items we give the Soviets American dollars with which they can purchase war supplies.

This trade with the Russians ought to be stopped. There are laws on the books that will stop it, if only our administrative officials will enforce those laws.

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

#### MONDAY MORNING QUARTERBACKS

Mr. SHORT. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am getting a little sick and tired of hearing the gentleman from California, Mr. CHET HOLIFIELD, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. EMANUEL CELLER, getting up here and talking about Monday morning quarterbacking. We all know that hindsight is better than foresight; they did not make that discovery. I stood here ten years ago in the well of this House. A man is not so much different from a lighting bug who has his headlight on his rear end. We all know that hindsight is better than foresight, but I want to call your attention to a speech I delivered on September 17, 1945, five years ago, immediately after the surrender of Japan. I said:

Sir, when I have been engaged in deadly combat with a bitter, vicious, and ruthless foe, I shall not throw away my weapons and carelessly walk away from him after beating him to the ground unless I want a stab in the back or a shot through my head.

After all the billions of treasure we have poured out; after all the lives we have sacrificed; after all that we have given up not only on the battlefields, on the seas, in the air, but here on the home front shall we foolishly and recklessly abandon the objective of our achievement and let the sands of victory flow through our open fingers?

I made a fight against demobilization when my own Republican friend, the gentleman from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN, took me to task. I want you to read that speech, September 17, 1945, when it took guts to say it, when you were all clamoring to bring the boys back home, not next month, not next week, but fly them back tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the speech I made on September 17, 1945:

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, if there is one admonition that the Members of this body ever needed and particularly at this moment, it is the advice that Hamlet's mother gave her son in that great tragedy of Shakespeare's when she said:

"O gentle son, upon the heat and flame of thy distemper sprinkle cool patience."

If we will keep calm and try to throw more light and less heat on this subject, I think

we will discover there is not so much difference between the various views that have been expressed on this floor.

The whole problem of demobilization is not as simple as it first seemed. Indeed, it is very difficult and complex, and it is utterly impossible for anybody or any agency, not only the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps, but even this august Congress, to lay down a definite, hard, and fast plan, or rule, or inflexible formula without doing some men an injustice. It is inescapable by the very nature of the problem. There are bound to be cases of individual inequities. I regret there are so many. We must correct all we can.

During the recess I had prepared a resolution to introduce the first day we reconvened to declare a cessation of hostilities and an end of the war. I had another bill to introduce to stop the draft immediately. But our Committee on Military Affairs held hearings for a whole week before we reassembled and after listening attentively and carefully to the testimony of General Edwards and General Henry, I was convinced that for a little while following the capitulation of both Germany and Japan we should move slowly, cautiously, and exercise the greatest care in order not to lose the very thing for which millions of our men have been fighting and over a million of whom have suffered either death or serious wounds.

Sir, when I have been engaged in deadly combat with a bitter, vicious, and ruthless foe, I shall not throw away my weapons and carelessly walk away from him after beating him to the ground unless I want a stab in the back or a shot through my head.

After all the billions of treasure we have poured out; after all the lives we have sacrificed; after all that we have given up not only on the battlefields, on the seas, in the air, but here on the home front, shall we foolishly and recklessly abandon the objective of our achievement and let the sands of victory flow through our open fingers?

Mr. Chairman, what will it suffice us to defeat the Axis Powers—Italy, Germany, and Japan—on the field of battle and then lose all the fruits of peace in the open wide world of public opinion? There are economic, political, and moral, as well as military, issues to be considered.

If the Members of the House had heard the fair, logical, and clear presentation by the War Department there would not be all this hullabaloo on the floor and we would not as Members of Congress be swamped by an avalanche of mail from naturally disgruntled and discontented people all over America.

I do not know of any member of the Committee on Military Affairs or of this House—yes; I do not know of anyone in this country, regardless of race, party, or creed—who is not exceedingly anxious to bring as many of these boys and girls back home at the earliest possible moment unless it is the PAC of CIO. God knows I would like to see some of my kin. I have a nephew 36 years of age who has a wife and two children, 10 and 12 years of age, who has been in the Pacific for over 2 years. He is in Tokyo now. I was happy to receive a letter from him this morning in which he said, "Uncle Dewey, I am glad to be here as a part of this show. I would not have missed it." I have another nephew down in the stinking, steaming equatorial region in South America who was in the service 6 or 8 months before Pearl Harbor. He wants to come home. But he is not bellyaching. Of course, it is the privilege and prerogative of any soldier or sailor to bellyache at any time. We did it in the last war, and they do it in this. Another nephew is in Germany, and he is barely 19. His mother would like to see him. I have other nephews in this country. We all want these boys and girls brought home at the earliest possible moment. Nearly every family in America is affected.

How are we going to do it? We took five long years, gentlemen, to build up the mightiest war machine in the history of the world. About 12,000,000 men and women are scattered all over this universe—on every continent and on every sea. It has taken years to get them out there. Now, after four long years of war and after glorious victory over two of the mightiest, most determined, and most ruthless military powers the world has ever known, we stop fighting the Italians, the Germans, and the Japs and start fighting among ourselves and start kicking around the "brass hats" and the "gold braids" who, in spite of all their faults and shortcomings, have won immortal renown. Heaven knows that I have never claimed infallibility for any of our generals or admirals. No member of our committee has more violently opposed them at times. I know that they are not perfect, and that they have and will make mistakes. Nevertheless, it must be conceded that they are free from many of the pressures that elected officers are subject to and that they can with sympathy and resoluteness decide certain problems peculiar to their own field.

It does seem strange that only a few months ago when the fate of this Nation hung in the balance, when our very lives were at stake, that we were praising to the skies our generals and admirals. You know, I wonder how in the name of God, Leahy and Marshall, King and Arnold, Eisenhower and Devers, Bradley, Patch, Hodges, and Patton, Simpson, Brereton, Doolittle, and Chennault, Spaatz and Kenney, Eaker and Sommervell—I wonder how in the name of heaven Nimitz or his commanders in the Pacific, Mitscher, whom we will soon see in this House, along with Admirals Halsey, Kinkaid, and Spruance—I wonder how in the world these gallant marines under Vandegrift, and the forces under gallant and colorful MacArthur, able Krueger, suffering Wainwright, patient Eichelberger, ever won this war without these parlor generals and pink tea strategists back home who are now willing, after they have saved our necks, to kick them all over hell's half acre. But it is only natural after a war for everybody to want to come home. And it is also natural to "cuss" the generals and admirals. They expect it. And I say this as one who I do not think has ever kow-towed to them or been subservient in the least—I know that the generals and admirals make mistakes; even Members of Congress do sometimes, because all of us are human.

I do want to say that I think the Army was not prepared for demobilization as it was for war. Why should it be? The primary interest, the paramount duty of the leaders of our Armed Forces on land and sea and in the air was to win this war. It was not to think, plan, dream, and waste time about setting up machinery to demobilize. It was to win the war quickly and stop the bloodshed immediately. This they have done. Now, then, we are so darned impatient we are not willing to give them a few weeks to adjust themselves and find out where they really are. MacArthur has to take inventory.

I did not want to see the Eighty-sixth, the Ninety-fifth, or the Ninety-seventh Divisions that had seen long months of bitter combat in Europe transferred or redeployed to the Pacific. It was bad, but MacArthur demanded seasoned combat troops. Why? Because he did not know what in the world he was going to get into when he went into Japan. He did not want an army of green, raw, inexperienced troops. What intelligent general would? He knew he would have to go in there under an air umbrella; he knew he would have to have the best naval support possible; he knew he would have to have a ground force that could hold this toehold. He did not know just what resistance he might possibly meet. He did know there were millions of Japanese under arms

that they had never encountered, and he was thinking only of the safety of our men. That was the one thing foremost in his mind. That is why he demanded that these trained combat divisions go in there. I do not blame him. He did it for safety. We were assured by the War Department that these combat divisions from Europe will be the first to be brought back from the Pacific, and I dare say they will. They had better be.

I do not like to see 18- and 19-year-old boys drafted; in fact, I think that is one of the mistakes we made in this war. I never did think they were essential, and I think we could have won the war without them. We were told they were needed because of their boldness, their daring, their resiliency. I know they were good in combat, but the casualties were high; they were enormous and terrific. Certainly we should not need them for occupational purposes, because you need older men with mature judgment to occupy territory.

I also know we are going to wake up 5, 7, or 10 years from now with an acute shortage of doctors, dentists, technicians, scientists, and engineers. I think we have been more foolish than some of our allies. Britain and Russia and other countries have continued the education of their youth. I realize that it is tough to take 18- and 19-year-old boys, but you are confronted with this alternative. What are you going to do with these married men with families back home who have been in Europe and in the Pacific fighting for 2, 3, and 4 years through the stinking, steaming jungles of Burma and the Southwest Pacific, the hot sands of north Africa and India, the cold and fog of Iceland and the Aleutians, the mud and hills of Italy, the unspeakable conditions and the rugged barriers of western Europe. Are you going to keep them on without rotating them in an orderly and a gradual manner? That is the thing we have to decide. We want only justice. Most people want the other fellow to do it.

I think we can reduce the occupational forces in both Germany and Japan. I stated so in the hearings before our Committee on Military Affairs several days ago. General MacArthur so announced today. I do not see why in the name of common sense we need 370,000 to 400,000 men to occupy Bavaria, a little section of Germany. Germany is divided into four zones; it is occupied by the Russians, the British, the French, and the Americans. I do not see why any occupation force of 400,000 men is needed in our particular region in Bavaria in Germany. All Germany has been blasted and annihilated. General Knudsen was correct the other day when he stated it would take 50 years to repair the damage to Berlin. God only knows when there will be a market for automobiles or any other American goods in Germany, which has been literally leveled.

It is better to have too many men there than too few. Bring them home in a gradual and orderly manner. Tell your friends back home to be patient. They are a little impatient. I built a fire under the Army. I put a burr under the tail of several generals, and told them to get busy, that if they did not speed up demobilization, Congress would take this thing over. But I think the Army can do a better job than we can. I think a lot of us are demagoguing and taking advantage of a critical situation here in a perilous time, absolutely because we know it is popular back home. I had rather be right than to be popular. Play safe with the country and not your seat in Congress.

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

Mr. SHORT. I will always have to yield to my dear friend. I hate to oppose him, but I shall not hesitate to when I know he is wrong.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman must be conscious of being wrong or he would not say

he is opposing me, when he does not know what I am going to ask. The gentleman is talking about the armchair generals that demand the return of the boys. Does not the gentleman know it is the men themselves, their fathers and mothers and wives, who are asking it? I have not heard from any armchair generals, but I have heard from the boys.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, I have, too. However, I know several generals who are not let out and who want to be retired. I know a great many officers who are trying to be retired and they cannot get out. These subordinate officers are anxious to get home, to get into their professions, into law and medicine, and to go back on the farm. They have jobs to do and families to care for.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You talk about demagogues—will you speak for yourself and not for the rest of us?

Mr. SHORT. Oh, well, you maintain your own opinion; you are welcome to it. I speak for the whole country—neither for you nor myself.

They are landing thousands of men every day in the ports of Boston, New York, and Charleston, and particularly in Norfolk and Newport News, and they are landing thousands in Seattle and San Francisco. They are landing some in Los Angeles and in New Orleans. We will bring these men home just as quickly as shipping facilities will permit, and as quickly as we can set up these separation centers and the machinery whereby they can be carefully discharged. I am trying to tell my constituents, and I do not care what the gentleman from Michigan tells his, but I am trying to tell my constituents not to be too anxious to get out too fast. A lot of the boys did that in the last war. I had buddies who were so anxious to get back home that they never took the time nor the trouble to have their disabilities written on their discharges and ever since the close of the last war they have been hounding me to death, for the 14 years that I have been in Congress, trying to establish service connection. If they had been discharged just a little more slowly and in a little more orderly way, we would not have had all that trouble. We had only 2,000,000 men in France in the last war. We had 3,500,000 there this time. We have an Army and Navy and Air Force and Marine Corps of 12,000,000 men and women. I want to say that the parents in this country should be advised to see to it that each one of their boys or girls who happen to be in the service is given a proper physical examination. They should inquire about their GI rights and benefits, their insurance, reemployment, and all other rights. The Army is seeing to that much better in this war than they did in the last. They should see that everything is absolutely in order before they finally get their release because they will need that information in days to come. We want to avoid past mistakes and take proper care of those entitled to it.

The passage of this bill will speed the end of the draft. I am for it.

#### KOREAN WAR CASUALTY LISTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, the armed services furnished to all Members of Congress the casualty lists of all military personnel who were killed, or had received injuries in combat, or who were missing in action. This was a convenient service to

Members of Congress and it was an important service. It provided an easy method whereby Members could be informed concerning casualties of war in their own States and districts, as well as the Nation.

For some reason of which I am not informed, no such lists are being supplied to Members of Congress during the present struggle in Korea. It may merely be an oversight in the Defense Department, and if that is so, I hope my remarks will bring about the correction of that oversight. But if it is not an oversight and there is some other reason for not supplying us with the casualty lists, I believe the Department of Defense should explain what that reason is.

The Korean campaign is a war in the same sense as any other war in which the country has been engaged. When American young men are being killed or wounded or are missing in action, that is war.

Up to this moment, the only means I have of finding out what young men in my district have been killed or who have been wounded is to try to find the time in our busy days to closely follow the newspapers in my district.

This is information to which Members of Congress are clearly entitled and it is up to the Department of Defense to change its methods and see that we get this information. We should not be obliged to depend upon reading the newspapers to find out which of our fine young men are casualties of battle.

#### RUSSIAN CRAB MEAT

Mr. McDONOUGH. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House realize the importance of the statement just made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] on the Russian-produced crab meat that is being refused to be unloaded in New York and Boston. Let me call your attention to another situation that you can do something about along those lines. A discharge petition is at the Clerk's desk, filed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST], which calls upon the President to withdraw the reciprocal trade agreements between this country and Communist-controlled countries.

Are we going to be so naive as to permit the wealth of this Nation to pour through the ports of these Communist-controlled countries and their products to us to subordinate our labor, to reduce our wealth, to finance the military aggression approach on the part of Russia to control the world? That is what we are doing and we are doing nothing about it. It is time we wake up to the dangers we are facing—to the threat to democracy. We must be alert to the duplicity of Russia, especially where our reciprocal trade agreement permits Communist-controlled countries to ship goods to us while Russia grows fat at our expense, and at the same time pre-

pares to fight us at every turn through her satellites.

#### HINDSIGHT VERSUS FORESIGHT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of saying anything about this question of hindsight and foresight which is now being discussed on this floor, but I think the membership of the House should be informed of the fact that one committee of this House, the Armed Services Committee, had the foresight to do something of advantage to this country in an hour of danger. Because of the firm stand of 33 members of the House Committee on the Armed Services we have been reaping the rewards of foresight as it pertains to military preparedness. Had it not been for the action of our committee, and I say this as sincerely as I know how, our Marine Corps today might well have been practically liquidated and we would have had but a toy or token Navy. Here is a definite example of foresight for you to look at. Our committee took a long-range view toward a better prepared America and events today show how right we were. Mistakes have been made and such mistakes should be placed right in the laps of those who made them.

#### COMMUNISTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, my office recently had a request for copy of H. R. 9321, covering a new navigation code. The bill was sent, and today a reply was received thanking us, together with the following comment:

While they seem to be able to dash off navigation codes without difficulty, they are having one sweet time steering the ship of state through this international mess. I'll bet they couldn't hit more shoals and boulders if Browder were at the helm.

Mr. Speaker, now that we have locked up Harry Bridges, let me remind you that there are plenty more in this country who bear careful watching. And I hope this President will not pardon Bridges, as was previously done by the President. We seem continually to overlook the fact that Communists in this country are dangerous to the American way of life.

This is no red herring.

#### DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCE

Mr. BROOKS. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said in the press recently about the possibility of a dependency allowance bill. I think it proper to take this opportunity to tell the Members of the House what is being done in this direction.

I am chairman of a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee that has been given the job of writing a proper dependency allowance bill. That committee has already met several times and has gone over this situation very carefully. Today the experts from our committee are meeting with the Senate committee so that we can harmonize our ideas. Tomorrow we will have a committee meeting with the idea of writing a bill which we hope to have before the House before the end of this week.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the country want well-considered legislation. I do not think it wants the subcommittee of any committee to be stamped into hasty action.

I invite the attention of the Members to the fact that dependency allowances in the Second World War cost this Government approximately \$12,000,000,000. Of that sum a little less than \$10,000,000,000 was paid by the United States of America. The balance was paid by the enlisted personnel.

Mr. Speaker, in writing such a bill we should write it carefully and bring in a bill which we can defend and which the country, the men entering the armed services and those dependent upon them will feel is well-considered legislation and legislation which is proper. I personally favor such a bill, and I hope we can get it to the House for consideration very soon.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

#### RETIREMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on the Armed Services reported out, and the Congress passed, a retirement bill forcing men to retire from the Army, including the disabled, instead of being discharged so that they could receive their compensation from the Veterans' Administration in lieu of retirement pay, which was often lower, I do not think that committee and the Congress realize the great injustice it was doing to those men. They lose their mustering-out pay unless the Comptroller General decides that they may receive their mus-

tering-out pay and be retired, also. Officers have the option to take discharge or retirement; the enlisted men should be allowed also to elect that which they choose to take.

The Comptroller General will decide, I think, whether legally they can have that mustering-out pay. I know the Committee on Armed Services meant no injustice when they presented that bill. That injustice should be rectified and rectified at once.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

#### RADAR SCREEN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to raise the question of the radar defense. I understand that a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services is studying the problem.

From what I have been able to learn, the problem is being approached from a "short distance" point of view. If we have planes as we do today traveling at the rate of 600 to 1,000 miles an hour and try to set up an umbrella radar screen just a few hundred miles away from these large cities of ours, No. 1, there is no time for interception because our planes cannot get up to intercept, or overtake the attackers; No. 2, there is no time for the population to get to adequate air raid shelters and there are not any, anyhow; No. 3, if you have fighter bomber dogfights, they will occur over the towns, cities, and built-up communities themselves; and, No. 4, should an atomic bomb be carried, the bomb will be released over the United States rather than over the ocean expanses.

My point this morning is that we should put the outer radar screen much farther away than just the eastern and western coast of the United States or the northern border of the United States and have coverage clear out in the oceans, possibly, on these jeep carriers, or guard ships moored or patrolling for both surface and air coverage.

We should face the known fact that we are not now adequately defended against bombing attack with World War II equipment because of its limited range and inability to give total coverage. World War II certainly demonstrated the inability of World War II equipment to handle saturation bombing by World War II planes, let alone the modern jet planes. I have seen the results in Berlin, Hamburg, and other European cities. We should plan now to integrate immediately an umbrella coverage by radar with our various associated nations, so that we have adequate warning not only for certain picked cities, but for our whole country, our allies, and the logical approaches from which possible attacks almost certainly would originate.

I urge the Air Force to proceed quickly for the development of the \$85,500,000 aircraft warning and radar system which was authorized by Congress in 1949. I

have been pressing for the development of an integrated radar warning system by friendly countries through the mutual defense assistance legislative programs, as a complement to our own radar defense system.

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

Mr. PRICE. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to allay the fears of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]. Apparently he is under the impression that the country at the present time is not defended by a radar screen. That is a common misapprehension. We do have a radar screen. We have, however, what we might term an inadequate screen because it happens to be of World War II character. The problem at hand is to improve the radar screen, and I think we can allay the fears of the House and at the same time assure the American people that the proper attention is being given to this important matter by the military. The House Committee on Armed Services is greatly interested in it; a special subcommittee is now at work with the Air Force and the proper officials in trying to expedite improvement in the radar network, which I assure the gentleman is not circled around any one particular city but over the entire North American Continent.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. My information is directly contrary to the gentleman's, that there is any adequate radar screen or that it does circle the North American Continent.

Mr. PRICE. I will say to the gentleman that he probably has considerable misinformation. I do not say that the screen is now adequate, but we are working to improve its adequacy and have been increasing its efficiency rapidly.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include newspaper editorials.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include several editorials.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he made on the Voice of America.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement regarding the Texas tidelands case.

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

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

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

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

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

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Griffith at an American Legion convention.

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

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

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter on the report on flood conditions in Minnesota and North Dakota.

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

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

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two radio broadcasts.

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

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a reprint of the speech he made on September 17, 1945.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

#### PASCH BROTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1208) for the relief of Pasch Bros.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### MRS. BARBARITA ROMERO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1320) for the relief of Mrs. Barbarita Romero.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Barbarita Romero, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., the sum of \$10,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation on account of the death of her daughter, the late Rosina Romero, who was fatally injured on September 12, 1947, in the performance of her duties as an employee of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### OTHO F. HIPKINS AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 734) for the relief of Otho F. Hipkins, individually, and Otho F. Hipkins; Cecil Clyde Squier; Conrad Reid; J. Thomas C. Hopkins, Jr.; and Isaiah Lawrence Paxton, as trustees of the Hipkins Traction Device Co.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

#### H. HALPERN & BRO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9236) for the relief of H. Halpern & Bro., Inc., of Boston, Mass.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,874.79 to H. Halpern & Bro., Inc., of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement for dried apricots purchased from the Production and Marketing Administration, Fruit and Vegetable Branch, of the Department of Agriculture, and shipped from Memphis, Tenn., to Boston, Mass. Upon receipt of the said apricots they were found to be substandard quality, and upon advice from the Department of Agriculture a certificate was secured from the Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture showing that these apricots were United States Grade D, or substandard, on account of damage by discoloration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after the colon insert "*Provided,* That no part of the amount appro-

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### LT. COMDR. EDWIN M. ROSENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3446) to authorize the restoration of Edwin M. Rosenberg, lieutenant commander, retired, to the active list of the United States Navy.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to appoint Edwin M. Rosenberg, now an officer on the retired list of the United States Navy, an officer on the active list of the line of the United States Navy with the permanent rank of lieutenant commander and with the date of rank of October 3, 1945. Upon such appointment the said Edwin M. Rosenberg shall be given the same precedence on the lineal list of officers of the United States Navy to which he would have been entitled had he not been placed on the retired list of officers of the United States Navy.

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.

#### SALE OF CERTAIN LAND OF CROW CREEK INDIAN AGENCY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 815) to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Crow Creek Indian Agency, S. Dak.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell the trust allotments Nos. 190 and 192 of Red Star, deceased, described as the south half of section 21, township 107, range 74, fifth principal meridian, South Dakota, and the northeast quarter of section 33 township 107, range 74, fifth principal meridian, South Dakota, conveyance to be made by the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser, and to distribute the proceeds of such sale among the heirs of the said Red Star in accordance with their respective interests.

SEC. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Lower Brule Tribe, of Indians of the Crow Creek Reservation of South Dakota or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the superintendent of the Crow Creek Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof, and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Lower Brule Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon

the superintendent of the Crow Creek Agency.

(b) A certificate of the superintendent of the Crow Creek Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the register of deeds of the county in which such lands situated, shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, before the word "Tribe", insert the word "Sioux." Add a comma after the word "Tribe" and strike the remainder of the line.

Page 2, line 6, strike the first three words of the line as follows: "Creek Reservation of."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRIS: On page 3, line 5, after the word "lands", insert "are."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### SALE OF CERTAIN LAND OF PINE RIDGE INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 816) to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell the trust allotment No. 2109 of James Richard, deceased, described as the south half section 2, township 38 north, range 36 west, sixth principal meridian, South Dakota, conveyance to be made by the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser, and to distribute the proceeds of such sale among the heirs of the said James Richard in accordance with their respective interests.

Sec. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Pine Ridge Ogalala Sioux Tribe of Indians of the Pine Reservation of South Dakota or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the superintendent of the Pine Ridge Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof, and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Pine Ridge Ogalala Sioux Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the superintendent of the Pine Ridge Agency.

(b) A certificate of the superintendent of the Pine Ridge Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60

days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the register of deeds of the county in which such lands are situated, shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike the word "Ogalala" and insert in lieu thereof "Oglala."

Page 2, line 15, strike the word "Ogalala" and insert in lieu thereof "Oglala."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

#### SALE OF LAND ALLOTTED TO MRS. IRIS HUEBNER MARAK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the sale of land allotted to Mrs. Iris Huebner Marak on the Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell the trust allotment No. OS7531 of Mrs. Iris Huebner Marak, situated on the Pine Ridge Reservation and described as lot 4, southeast quarter southwest quarter, south half southeast quarter section 31, township 41 north, range 46 west, sixth principal meridian, Shannon County, S. Dak., conveyance to be made by the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser, and to distribute the proceeds of such sale to Mrs. Iris Huebner Marak, of Buffalo Gap, S. Dak.

Sec. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Ogalala Sioux Tribe of Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation of South Dakota or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the superintendent of the Pine Ridge Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof, and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Ogalala Sioux Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the superintendent of the Pine Ridge Agency.

(b) A certificate of the superintendent of the Pine Ridge Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the register of deeds of the county in which such lands are situated, shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "Ogalala" and insert in lieu thereof "Oglala."

Page 2, line 16, strike out the word "Ogalala" and insert in lieu thereof "Oglala."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

#### SALE OF CERTAIN LAND OF PINE RIDGE INDIAN AGENCY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1222) to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Pine Ridge Indian Agency, S. Dak.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell the trust allotment No. 1971 of Roy Lone Dog, deceased, described as the northeast quarter section 29, township 39 north, range 37 west, six principal meridian, South Dakota, conveyance to be made by the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser, and to distribute the proceeds of such sale among the heirs of the said Roy Lone Dog, in accordance with their respective interests.

Sec. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Oglala Sioux Tribe of Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation of South Dakota or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Pine Ridge Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Oglala Sioux Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Pine Ridge Agency.

(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Pine Ridge Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the register of deeds of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

The 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.

#### SALE OF LANDS ALLOTTED TO JAMES BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1426) to authorize the sale of lands allotted to James Brown on the Crow Reservation, Mont.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell, under existing regulations, the homestead and other land of James Brown, Crow allottee No. 3097, described as lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in section 3 and lots 1, 2, and 3 and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 4, all located in township 6 south, range 30 east, Montana principal meridian, containing three hundred and

nineteen and thirty-two one-hundreds acres, conveyance to be made by the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser, and to distribute the proceeds of such sale under existing regulations to James Brown.

Sec. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and such notice, together with a description of the lands and an offer by the owner thereof to sell such lands upon the terms specified in such notice to the Crow Tribe or any member thereof, shall have been posted in a conspicuous public place at such agency, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the superintendent of the Crow Agency.

(b) A certificate of the superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was given and was posted for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection shall, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated, be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

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.

#### SALE OF LANDS ALLOTTED TO GEORGE C. ESTES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1457) to authorize the sale of lands allotted to George C. Estes on the Lower Brule Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell the trust allotment No. 599 of George C. Estes, described as the southwest quarter section 27, township 107 north, range 77 west, fifth principal meridian, South Dakota, conveyance to be made by the issuance of a patent in fee to the purchaser, and to distribute the proceeds of such sale to said George C. Estes.

Sec. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, of Indians of the Crow Creek Reservation of South Dakota or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Crow Creek Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the said Lower Brule Sioux Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Crow Creek Agency.

(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow Creek Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in

accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the register of deeds of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Tribe", insert a comma and strike out the remainder of the line.

Page 2, line 2, strike out the first four words as follows: "Crow Creek Reservation of."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

#### SALE OF CERTAIN LAND OF ROSEBUD INDIAN AGENCY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3129) to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Rosebud Indian Agency, S. Dak.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell the trust allotment numbered 7500 of Anna Louise Whitford, deceased, described as the southwest quarter of section 28, township 36 north, range 25 west, sixth principal meridian in Todd County, S. Dak.

Sec. 2. (a) The lands herein described shall not be sold after the date of enactment of this act to any purchaser, other than the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of Indians of the Rosebud Reservation of South Dakota or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the said Rosebud Sioux Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency.

(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Rosebud Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the register of deeds of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

The 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.

#### CORNELIS RUHTENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 459) for the relief of Cornelis Ruhtenberg, also known as Cornelis Ruhtenberg Helmsing,

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Cornelis Ruhtenberg, also known as Cornelis Ruhtenberg Helmsing, of Colorado Springs, Colo. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Cornelis Ruhtenberg shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

Sec. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Cornelis Ruhtenberg, who entered the United States from Mexico on a temporary visa, shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, on payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

Sec. 3. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the proper immigration quota.

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.

#### CLARA SOGOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 918) for the relief of Clara Sogor.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Clara Sogor (A6707901), who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required head tax and visa fee.

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

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.

#### ANTONIO GARCIA JIMINEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1420) for the relief of Antonio Garcia Jiminez.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Antonio Garcia Jiminez, of Garfield, N. J. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Antonio Garcia Jiminez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

Sec. 2. In the administration of the immigration laws, the said Antonio Garcia Jiminez shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of Spain.

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.

ANNA RAJMANN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1568) for the relief of Anna Rajmann.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Anna Rajmann, of New York, N. Y. From and after the date of enactment of this act the said Anna Rajmann shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

Sec. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the said Anna Rajmann, who served as a civilian employee of the United States Army in Austria, and who entered the United States on a temporary visa, shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

Sec. 3. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Austria.

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

MRS. CLAYRE LOUISE FORSYTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1866) for the relief of Mrs. Clayre Louise Forsyth.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 801 (e)) (relating to loss of nationality through voting or participating in an election or plebiscite to determine the sovereignty over foreign territory), shall not apply in the case of the participation of Mrs. Clayre Louise Forsyth, who was born in Augusta, Ga., in the plebiscites held in Labrador in June and July of 1948.

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

GIUSEPPE MOSCHETTI AND HIS WIFE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2173) for the relief of Giuseppe Moschetti and his wife, Dina Bartoli Moschetti.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Giuseppe Moschetti and his wife, Dina Bartoli Moschetti, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the dates of their last entries into the United States upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the enact-

ment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

HYMAN WINTERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2257) for the relief of Hyman Winterman.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Hyman Winterman shall be deemed to be a native of Great Britain.

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.

ELIZABETH MARTHA HAUG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2401) for the relief of Elizabeth Martha Haug.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Elizabeth Martha Haug, of Wilhelmsburg, Germany, may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Elizabeth Martha Haug is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to Robert Koyen, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Elizabeth Martha Haug, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Elizabeth Martha Haug, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Elizabeth Martha Haug as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

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

ERMALINDA MARY PIZZUTO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2617) for the relief of Ermalinda Mary Pizzuto.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Ermalinda Mary Pizzuto. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Ermalinda Mary Pizzuto, shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced, or any such warrants and order have issued.

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.

JAIME RIEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2780) for the relief of Jaime Riel.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Jaime Riel, of Waukesha, Wis., an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, who entered the United States as a member of the Armed Forces, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

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

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.

HYMAN D. LANGER AND ALTA JOURARD LANGER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2897) for the relief of Hyman D. Langer and Alta Jourard Langer.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Hyman D. Langer and his wife, Alta Jourard Langer, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of their last entries into the United States upon payment of the required head taxes and visa fees. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

AGNES BIRO AND ANNA BIRO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2954) for the relief of Agnes Biro and Anna Biro.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Agnes Biro and Anna Biro shall be considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Slovak, United States citizens.

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.

OLGA HADDAD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3005) for the relief of Olga Haddad.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Olga Haddad, of Philadelphia, Pa., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her

last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

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

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

#### DR. FREDERICK DANIEL McDADE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3238) for the relief of Dr. Frederick Daniel McDade.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Frederick Daniel McDade, a native of Canada, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 4, 1944, the date on which he was lawfully admitted to the United States temporarily.

Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, Dr. Frederick Daniel McDade may file the petition for naturalization prescribed by law without making the preliminary declaration of intention and, upon satisfactory proof to the court that he is otherwise qualified to become a citizen of the United States, the said Dr. Frederick Daniel McDade may be admitted as a citizen of the United States.

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.

#### HISAKO OKAMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3289) for the relief of Hisako Okamoto.

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

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

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

#### ISOLDE BEZNER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3325) for the relief of Isolde Bezner.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration laws the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), shall not hereafter be held to apply to Isolde Bezner, a native and citizen of Germany, the fiancée of Lt. Jack L. White, a veteran of World War II, and a citizen of the United States, insofar as concerns any conviction or admission of the commission of a crime by her of which the Department of Justice or the Department of State has knowledge on the date of enactment hereof, and that Isolde Bezner may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Isolde Bezner is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to Lt. Jack L. White, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Isolde Bezner, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Isolde Bezner, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Isolde Bezner, as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required visa fees and head tax.

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.

#### FUKUKO ENDO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8385) for the relief of Fukuko Endo.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion from the United States of persons inadmissible because of race, shall not apply to Fukuko Endo, Japanese fiancée of Minoru Tsuchimochi (a natural-born United States citizen and honorably discharged World War II veteran who is serving in Japan in a civilian status with the Armed Forces of the United States) and the said Fukuko Endo shall be granted admission to the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws and if the appropriate administrative authorities find that marriage took place between the above-named parties not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this act.

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.

#### SUSAN E. SCOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8761) for the relief of Susan E. Scott.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Susan E. Scott, alien minor child in the care of Mr. and Mrs. Denny F. Scott, United States citizens, and the said Susan E. Scott

shall be held and considered to be the alien natural-born child of the said Mr. and Mrs. Denny F. Scott.

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.

#### LUM YING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8802) for the relief of Lum Ying.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is hereby directed to cancel any exclusion order and bond outstanding in the case of Lum Ying, Battle Creek, Mich. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Lum Ying shall be held and considered to have been born in the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lum Ying, of Battle Creek, Mich., shall be held to have been lawfully admitted to the United States under the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924 as amended (8 U. S. C. 204) on January 22, 1950, upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### HIDEKO KASAHARA AND FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9056) for the relief of Hideko Kasahara and family.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion from the United States of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not apply to Hideko Kasahara, Japanese fiancée of Donald W. Doss, United States citizen and member of the Armed Forces of the United States. The said Hideko Kasahara shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if the appropriate administrative authorities find that she is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of marrying the said Donald W. Doss and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. If such marriage does not occur within 3 months after her entry, the said Hideko Kasahara shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported under sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., secs. 155 and 156). If such marriage occurs within 3 months after her entry, the Attorney General shall record the lawful admission of the said Hideko Kasahara to the United States for permanent residence, as of the date of her entry, upon payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

Sec. 2. The provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion from the United States of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not apply to any minor child or children, now or hereafter in being, of which the said Hideko Kasahara and the said Donald W. Doss are the natural parents. The provisions of section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec. 204 (a)), relating to the nonquota immigrant status of unmarried children under 21 years

of age of a United States citizen, shall be held and considered to apply to such minor child or children.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Hideko Kasahara, the Japanese fiancée of Donald W. Doss, a citizen of the United States and a member of the United States Armed Forces, and her minor child, and that the said Hideko Kasahara and her minor child may be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Hideko Kasahara is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Donald W. Doss, and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Hideko Kasahara and her minor child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of Hideko Kasahara and her minor child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of them as of the date of their payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Hideko Kasahara and her minor child."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### KIMIE KURIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9077) for the relief of Kimie Kurio.

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

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

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

#### MRS. CHANG-SEI KIM AND DAVID KIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9082) for the relief of Mrs. Chang-Sei Kim and David Kim.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, excluding from the United States aliens ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Chiang-Sei Kim (King) nee Chung Sil Lee and David Kim (King). The said Mrs. Chang-Sei Kim and the said David Kim shall be granted admission to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed and without presenting immigration visas or other travel documents.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Mrs. Chang-Sei Kim and David Kim may be eligible for admission into the United States for permanent residence provided they are otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

"Sec. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States of Arthur Kim as of the date of his last entry into the United States upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. The Secretary of State shall, upon the enactment of this act, instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chang-Sei Kim, David Kim, and Arthur Kim."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HIFUMI KATO AND HER MINOR SON, KAZUYUKI KATO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9084) for the relief of Hifumi Kato and her minor son, Kazuyuki Kato.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion from the United States of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Hifumi Kato and her minor son Kazuyuki Kato. Hifumi Kato is the Japanese fiancée of John B. Howenstein, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II. The said Hifumi Kato and Kazuyuki Kato shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of three months if the appropriate authorities find that the said Hifumi Kato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said John B. Howenstein and that they are otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. If the marriage does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Hifumi Kato, she and her son shall be deported in accordance with sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration

Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 8, secs. 155 and 156). If Hifumi Kato and John B. Howenstein are married within 3 months after entry of Hifumi Kato, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Hifumi Kato and her son, Kazuyuki Kato, as of the date of their entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required fees and taxes.

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

#### HERMAN L. WEINER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 819) for the relief of Herman L. Weiner.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Herman L. Weiner, of Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of \$3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of money forfeited by him to the United States on March 5, 1941, in connection with the breach of the condition of a bail bond by one for whom the said Herman L. Weiner posted bond in the sum of \$4,000; such sum, having never been remitted to the said Herman L. Weiner although the person for whom such bond was posted and for whose breach of bail such sum was forfeited was subsequently apprehended and convicted in a court of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### MRS. SANFORD PRUITT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 858) for the relief of Mrs. Sanford Pruitt.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

#### J. DON ALEXANDER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1800) for the relief of J. Don Alexander.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Don Alexander, of Colorado Springs, Colo., the sum of \$16,720.41, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for refund of an erroneous payment of income tax for the year 1929 which covered the capital net gain from the sale of 9,000 shares of stock in the Alexander Industries, Inc., which stock was later held by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in Alexander against Theleman (69 F. (2d) 610) to be the property of such corporation

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

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

#### RUDOLPH FARCHER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2204) for the relief of Rudolph Farcher.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to Rudolph Farcher, of Huntington, W. Va., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for injuries sustained by him on August 21, 1939, when he was on a milk wagon which was struck by a truck operated by John Cromwell, an employee of the Work Projects Administration, who was assigned to the United States Engineer Office: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### A. K. CHAHROUDI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2457) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of A. K. Chahroudi.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding any limitation upon the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States by subjects of foreign governments which do not accord to citizens of the United States the right to prosecute claims against their governments, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such court, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of A. K. Chahroudi, a subject of Iran, now a permanent resident of the United States, growing out of an alleged breach by the United States of war construction contract No. W-512-eng-7, dated November 22, 1942, under which the said A. K. Chahroudi constructed certain cantonment buildings for the United States at Ahwaz, Iran.

Sec. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "court", insert "notwithstanding any statute of limitation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### O. O. HAUGEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2614) for the relief of O. O. Haugen.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to O. O. Haugen, Route 3, Box 147, Port Orchard, Wash., the sum of \$456, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for a fence removed from his land near Charlson, N. Dak., by the Works Project Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### SGT. JAMES C. HOLLON AND BESSIE L. HOLLON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3017) for the relief of Sgt. James C. Hollon and Bessie L. Hollon.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Sgt. James C. Hollon and his wife, Bessie L. Hollon, the sum of \$6,500, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their infant son, and (2) to Bessie L. Hollon the sum of \$6,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries received by her, both such death and such injuries having resulted from the collision of a train and a jeep owned by and on an official mission for the Department of the Air Force in which the said Bessie L. Hollon and her infant son were passengers, such collision having occurred near the Nagoya Air Force Base in Japan on January 23, 1949, due to the negligence of the driver of such jeep: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### JOHN J. SEBENICK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3059) for the relief of John J. Sebenick.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John J. Sebenick, of 4722 Cleveland Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, a sum equal to his pay and allowances for 34 additional days of terminal leave as a lieutenant (junior grade) in the United States Naval Reserve, which the Board for the Correction of Naval Records found he was entitled to, in a decision dated May 23, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### O. S. REES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3097) conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. S. Rees.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. S. Rees, of Jackson, Miss., against the United States for compensation for loss and damage sustained by him as a result of the destruction of his pipeline and the acquisition by the United States of land in which he claims to have held an easement for such pipeline, in connection with the construction of Foster General Hospital.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. In any such suit brought pursuant to this act proceedings shall be had and the liability, if any, of the United States shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of tort claims against the United States.

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.

#### R. W. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3610) for the relief of R. W. Harris, authorized certifying officer, Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of R. W. Harris, authorized certifying officer, Bureau of Federal Supply, Treasury Department, for the amount of \$149.40, for which credit has been suspended, and disallowances raised, by the General Accounting Office, on account of payments made in accordance

with two vouchers certified by the said certifying officer: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services or his authorized representative shall certify that in his opinion there is no evidence of fraud or collusion on the part of said certifying officer in connection with such payments.

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.

#### DORRANCE ULVIN AND GUY F. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3611) for the relief of Dorrance Ulvin, former certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Dorrance Ulvin, former certifying officer of the Federal Public Housing Authority (now Public Housing Administration), be, and is hereby relieved of financial liability by reason of erroneous payment in February 1943, in the sum of \$1,025 under disbursing office symbol 86-774, and the Comptroller General is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of the accounts of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, by reason of such erroneous payment.

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.

#### CERTAIN CHINESE STEWARDS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3613) for the relief of certain Chinese stewards of the United States Navy.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the claims of the United States against Chun S. Chien, SDC, United States Navy, Gin F. Fung, SDC, United States Navy, Sung Y. Koo, SD1, United States Navy, Chow (N) Lee, SDC, United States Navy, Kan (N) Ming, SDCA, United States Navy, Wan K. Wang, SDC, United States Navy, and Kam C. Yee, SDC, United States Navy, in the amount of \$756 each, said amount representing overpayments of money allowances for quarters from January 28, 1949, to August 31, 1949, inclusive, are hereby canceled and the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby directed to allow credit in the accounts of the disbursing officers concerned for the payments so made.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the persons mentioned in section 1 of this act, any sums which have heretofore been paid to the United States by such persons in partial or complete liquidation of the respective claims of the United States against such persons, which claims are canceled by section 1 of this act.

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.

#### JOHN B. UNDERWOOD, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3614) for the relief of John B. Underwood, Jr., TMC, United States Navy.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That John B. Underwood, Jr., TMC, United States Navy, is here-

by relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$576.25, said amount representing overpayments to him of money allowance for quarters for a dependent wife for the period July 28, 1942, to October 31, 1943.

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.

#### CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS AND FORMER DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE NAVAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3709) for the relief of certain disbursing officers and former disbursing officers of the naval service, and for other purposes.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following disbursing officers and former disbursing officers of the naval service the amounts listed opposite their names, which amounts represents moneys paid from their personal funds to liquidate deficiencies incurred in their accounts in good faith and without fraud or collusion on their part:

Asher, Jeanne A., lieutenant (junior grade), SC(W), United States Naval Reserve, \$260.

Battelle, Gordon K., lieutenant (junior grade), Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$1,022.99.

Brew, John P., lieutenant, Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$2,000.

Bock, Forrest J., warrant officer, United States Marine Corps, \$50.

Delany, Johnnie L., lieutenant, Supply Corps, United States Navy, \$790.61.

Folger, Francis W., ensign, Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$1,171.

Haydel, Henry J., ensign, Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$78.

Henson, Harry D., warrant officer, United States Marine Corps, \$462.

Jacobs, A. D., lieutenant (junior grade), Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$21.74.

Kaufman, F. A., commander, Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$122.

Moolenaar, C. E., ensign, Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$616.80.

Newlin, George W., lieutenant (junior grade), Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$688.

Powell, J. Z., lieutenant, Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$165.44.

Riewerts, D. E., ensign, Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$50.

Riley, Rosemary P., lieutenant (junior grade), SC(W), United States Naval Reserve, \$17.27.

Roman, C., Jr., lieutenant (junior grade), Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$280.

Stafford, Otis W., commander, Supply Corps, United States Navy, \$76.32.

Strange, R. P., lieutenant (junior grade), Supply Corps, United States Navy, \$222.

Vaughan, F. M., lieutenant (junior grade), Supply Corps, United States Naval Reserve, \$65.

Ward, David W., lieutenant, United States Coast Guard, \$1,000.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ensign Leland E. Byers, Hospital Corps, United States Navy, the sum of \$50. This amount represents a personal advance by Ensign Byers on July 20, 1945, to replace one-half of a shortage in the accounts of Warrant Officer Forrest J. Bock, United States Marine Corps, which resulted from acceptance of a forged pay receipt in connec-

tion with paying casual marine hospital patients at the United States Naval Hospital, Camp Lejeune, New River, N. C., when Ensign Byers was witnessing officer.

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.

#### MARY ALICE FLOYD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7539) for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Alice Floyd, of Woodruff, S. C., former teacher in the Woodruff Public Schools, the sum of \$10,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mary Alice Floyd against the United States for severe and permanent personal injuries and for continuing medical and hospital expenses arising out of an automobile accident in which she was involved on October 11, 1940, while she was traveling from Woodruff to Spartanburg, S. C., to receive instructions for conducting registrations under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The State of South Carolina paid the salary and medical and hospital expenses of the said Mary Alice Floyd from October 1940 until June 1945 but thereafter discontinued such payments on the ground that the said Mary Alice Floyd was acting for the Federal Government when injured: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### AMERICAN BARREL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8934) for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$29,292.10 to the American Barrel Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for the purchase of surplus steel drums from the Department of State, Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner, under contracts No. W-ANL (ETO-II) 3831 and W-ANL (ETO-II) 4125, dated October 30, 1947, and February 12, 1948. Such reimbursement is due to erroneous representations made that the said steel drums were in usable condition and it were determined that they were worthless: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### JULIO LAFFITTE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 305) for the relief of Julio Laffitte.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Julio Laffitte, of New York, N. Y., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of October 11, 1946, upon payment of the head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the non-preference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Spain.

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.

#### ANDRE LAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1506) for the relief of Andre Lan.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the laws relating to immigration and naturalization the alien, Andre Lan, a lawful resident of the United States, shall be held and considered to have resided in the United States for 5 years prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

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

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 97.

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

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

A-6023124, Taylor, Sidney Norman (formerly Tatem, alias Samuel Norman Taylor).

A-6725875, Laks, Joseph Lyndel.  
A-1781352, Fuhrmann, Michael.  
A-6868227, Triantafilos, Georgios (alias George Triantafilos).

A-6428636, Safani, Ezatollah Hashem.  
A-6428635, Safani, Fakire Moluk (nee Mahboubian).

A-6481412, Salzman, Salomon.  
A-6481325, Halzman, Necka or Necha (nee Hartmann).

A-6409553, Thout, Henri.  
A-6423544, Thout, Mathilde Lucienne (nee Four).

A-7560616, Van Sant, Helen Josefna (nee Helen Gavrilkina or Helen Josefna Smith).

A-6421714, Wattinne, Emmanuel Andre.  
A-6421712, Wattinne, Genevieve (nee Durbart).

A-6738893, Cohen, Theodore, or Theodor Cohen or Theodor Moscovitz.  
A-6738894, Cohen, Zeev.

A-6422172, Ramirez-Calvillo, Basilio.  
A-6763243, Ramirez-Munoz, Anastacia.  
A-6763249, Ramirez-Munoz, Francisco.

A-6763250, Ramirez-Munoz, Reynalda.  
A-9776746, Gawronski, Marian.  
A-6171825, Mercader, Antonio Jimenez, or Jimenez Mercador.

A-5991076, Schwarz, Marla or Werner (nee Reiner).

A-5991075, Schwarz, Morris, or Ceza Gabriel Werner.

A-5435491, Kroog, Fritz Heinrich Konrad, or Fred Henry Conrad Kroog or Fred Fischer.  
A-3638660, Cavaco, Francisco Da Silva, or Frank Silva.

A-1317193, Cohen, Eva.  
A-7041970, Cohen, James Irving.  
A-5709166, Cohen, Morris.

A-5622032, Daschek, Franz Ludwig.  
A-5622079, Daschek, Marie Antonia (nee Sustr).

A-4287504, De Castro, Joaquin Fernandes, or Luis Vedro or Jack Valaria.  
A-3282278, Dimos, Isidoros, or Isidoros Nicolaou Dimos.

A-2944819, Gerolimatos, Dionisios, or Denis Nicholas.

A-3699009, Goncalves, Antonio.  
A-5422278, Gonsalves, Maria (alias Maria Anna Celina Parent, alias Marie Anna Parent, alias Mrs. De Courville).

A-4325050, Jimoyjanis, George C., or Georgios Chris Jimoylanes or George Christ Jimos.

A-3261929, Katechis, Constantine Spiros.  
A-7029793, King-Yien, Laai.  
A-1073649, Klighich, Bronislaw.

A-3694825, Krol, Joseph, or Joseph Carl Krol.

A-4572952, Labdas, Demetrios, or James Constantine Lavdas.

A-3249920, Livanis, Michael Panagiotis, or Michael Peter Livanis.

A-3889829, Lombardi, Cluliano, or Dominic Lombarde.

A-1755458, Loussedes, Basilio Antonios (aliases William Anthony Loussedes, William Anthony Loussedos, Vassilios Lousidis).

A-2281926, Maglish, Efim Jim.  
A-2541839, Mandarakas, John, or John Mandas.

A-2923256, Moscos, Georgios Giannes, or George Moskos or Moschos.

A-7029794, Mo-Yien, Laai.  
A-2561962, Paglou, Panagiotis Christov (alias Panayiotis Christov Pagio alias Pete Paglou).

A-5750550, Palffy, Frank, or Ference Palffy or Frank P. Baker.

A-3722917, Papparizos, Regas Antonios, or Regas A. Papparizos.

A-7722859, Perez, Estelle Ruby Curtis (nee Goodalle, alias Goodall alias Estelle Ruby Curtis Martin).

A-7685398, Plesman, Alma Emelie Francoise (nee Berner).

A-7505700, Plesman, Cornells.  
A-3919787, Run, Wong Look, or Wong Luk Run or Wong Ding or Pee Wee or Run Luk Wong or Run L. Wong.

A-3225657, Suan, Aw Tee, or Hong Fong or Fong Hong.  
A-3776006, Sul-Laan, Loh, or Mrs. Laai Yi-Faal.

A-2185135, Yang, Ho Ching, or Yang Ho Ching.  
A-1894434, Yang, Von Sung (nee Von Sung Soung).

A-3076334, Yi-Faal, Laa.  
A-4352509, Aikaterines, Demetrios, or James M. Katerinis.

A-6748311, Ali, Kubaiyat, or Kalafi Ali.  
A-6606703, Bisenz, Rudolf, or Rudolf Bisentz.

A-6606704, Bisenz, Suzanne (nee Hoffmann).

A-4631507, Bufi, Giuseppe.  
A-2292029, Calamaras, Peter, or Panagiotis Calamaras.

A-5785879, Chow, Shu Ping.  
A-4004076, Coveris, Emanuel Stamatios.  
A-2245431, Gianiotis, George Gregorios, or John Kordonas.

A-4680895, Gifford, Joseph.

A-3269763, Hallas, Sotirios, or Sam Hallas or Sotirios Halas.

A-2966003, Kakouris, Matheos, or Mathaios Kakouris or Mike Coris.

A-3082607, Kantsos, Angelos Angoniou, or Angelo Anthony Kantsos.

A-1441262, Kriticos, Evangelos Georgious, or Angelos Kriticos.

A-6489656, Lybarger, Gladys Maud, or Gladys Marjorie Lybarger or Gladys Marjorie Turner or Gladys Marjorie Glend.

A-6948932, Pagoulatis, Spirionilaoas, or Nicholas Pagoulatis.

A-3111122, Palazzo, Berardino, or Berardino Palazzo Di Antonio.

A-2033686, Pinto, John.  
A-2363249, Said, Abdul, or Reefat Ullah.  
A-5990863, Scuglia, Domenico.

A-2073291, Sikoutris, Evengelos Nicolaus.  
A-3749650, Stef, Nicolae, or Nick Stef.  
A-3902033, Young, Chin Kung (alias George Chan, George Chin, Chin Gene Pong).

A-6965100, Iacono, John George Dello.  
A-7500627, Yamagiwa Hanako.  
A-7124032, Tsai, Mark, or Mark Chai.

A-7578919, Freel, Pansy Muriel, or Pamela Muriel Freel.

A-6377729, Sun, Dr. Kuei-shu.  
A-7284887, Didner, Samuel.  
A-2053412, Mrak, Joseph or Joe Mrak.

A-3683972, Folltis, Petros Andrea.  
A-6235601, Kia, Ghodsee Zaman (nee Alborz).

A-6079535, Wyss, Maria Luling or Maria Milagros Luling Wyss.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 7, after line 7, insert the following registration numbers and names:

"A-7203368, Andronico, Adolfo Paul.  
"A-7057136, Cognets, Ingeborg des or Ingeborg Dederig.

"A-1745860, Coumantaros, Spiro Stavros Nicolas.  
"A-7546054, Iliopoulos, Florida.

"A-6727197, Lambros, Alexandra Kalognomou nee Kalognomou.  
"A-62727197, Lambros, Anthony Ilias.

"A-4076425, Moatsos, George Nicholas.  
"A-4314344, Boatsos, Lily or Evangelia nee Hadjiargyris.

"A-7040189, Mohl, Sophie.  
"A-7040188, Mohl, Therese Margaret or Therese Mohl or Texese Mohl.

"A-6700887, Rodman, Sidra Velletrani nee Sidra Velletrani.  
"A-7779638, Yeh, Chang Shang-Wen or Chang Shang Wen.

"A-7779639, Yeh, Jun-Sun or Stephen Yeh or Jun-Sun Stephen Yeh."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### MRS. ELSE SAMSTAG YURCHAK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9334) for the relief of Mrs. Else Samstag Yurchak.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Mrs. Else Samstag Yurchak, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

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

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALONZO P. BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8563) for the relief of Alonzo P. Brown.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Alonzo P. Brown, Cherry Hill, Va., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States amounts paid to him as postmaster at the Cherry Hill (Va.) post office, during the period when he was not eligible to receive compensation from funds appropriated for the Post Office Department because the combined amount of his salary as postmaster and his salary as an employee in the municipal government of the District of Columbia exceeded the sum allowed by law. Any amounts heretofore credited to the said Alonzo P. Brown by the withholding of annuity payments under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, on account of such unauthorized payment to him shall be paid to him out of the civil-service retirement and disability fund. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States the payment of such amounts for services as postmaster shall be considered to have been authorized.

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.

JACOB F. RIEDEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2093) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to execute a quitclaim deed to property owned by Jacob F. Riedel.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to execute and deliver to Jacob F. Riedel a quitclaim deed of all that property lying south of Telegraph Road, Bowie District, Prince Georges County, Md., and particularly described as follows:

All that tract of land containing 35 acres of land, more or less, situated on both sides of the county road leading from Glenn Dale to Springfield and being the residue of the farm of the late Shadrach Beall and bounded quitrally as follows:

On the north side of the road it has for its east line a new road, to Mr. Richard Hall's line, thence west to Mrs. Dowling's line, which bounds it on the west to the county road, south of the county road the line starts from a dead cedar running along Mr. Knop's line (my old home) to Mr. Oscar Banner's corner, where it crosses and a little way down on the south side to Harrison's boundary, thence parallel with Mr. Banner's line, leaving a 30-foot avenue to the road leading to Glenn Dale, through the colored settlement then with Banner's on the east and Dr. Aunklin's on the northeast to the northeast to the county road.

Saving and excepting therefrom all that part thereof described in a deed from Jacob F. Riedel and others to the county commissioners of Prince Georges County, Md., dated January 25, 1933, and recorded in Liber 391, at folio 338, for the construction of a county road leading from Telegraph Road to Glenn Dale; and

Further saving and excepting therefrom all that part thereof conveyed by Jacob F. Riedel and wife to George Riedel by deed dated September 17, 1933, and recorded in Liber 397, at folio 333, containing nine and seventy-eight one-thousandths acres, more or less, as more particularly described in said deed; and

Further saving and excepting therefrom that part thereof lying north of said Telegraph Road which has heretofore been conveyed to the United States of America, containing seven and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, and being more particularly described in confirmatory deed from Jacob F. Riedel and Barbara Riedel, his wife, to the United States of America, dated July 13, 1936, and recorded in Liber 446, at folio 306, described as follows:

Beginning at a stone at the corner of the property of Mary S. Hall and others, the corner of the property now or formerly owned by John G. Hall and the northeast corner of this property, thence binding along the east side of a road as set out in a certain deed from Margaret A. Beall to Henrietta K. Hall, dated June 24, 1925, and recorded among the land records of Prince Georges County in Liber 233, at folio 464, being also along the property now or formerly owned by N. E. Ryon, south thirty-five degrees no minutes east one thousand and twenty-seven and eighteen one-hundredths feet to the north side of the Telegraph Road; thence along the north side of said road south forty degrees thirty-five minutes west three hundred feet; thence leaving said road and along the dividing line between this property and the property now or formerly owned by George H. Riedel north thirty-three degrees fifty-four minutes thirty seconds west one thousand two hundred and eighty and twenty-seven one-hundredths feet to the line of Mary S. Hall and others; thence along the line of the last mentioned property north eighty-eight degrees forty-five minutes east three hundred and twenty feet to the point of beginning. Said tract of land containing seven and forty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less.

Said property was conveyed by mistake to the United States of America by Jacob F. Riedel and Barbara Riedel, his wife, by deed dated February 3, 1936, and recorded in Liber 435, at folio 345, and by confirmatory deed dated July 13, 1936, and recorded in Liber 446, at folio 306.

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.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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. 237]

Angell	Gore	Magee
Barrett, Wyo.	Gwinn	Mason
Blackney	Hall	Monroney
Boggs, Del.	Leonard W.	Morrison
Brehm	Hare	Morton
Bulwinkle	Havenner	Murray, Wis.
Carlyle	Hinshaw	Nelson
Carroll	Hobbs	Nixon
Case, S. Dak.	Hoeven	O'Hara, Ill.
Chiperfield	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Neill
Cole, N. Y.	Irving	Pace
Davies, N.Y.	Jenkins	Patten
Dawson	Johnson	Pfeiffer
DeGraffenried	Jonas	William L.
D'Ewart	Kee	Phillips, Tenn.
Dingell	Keefe	Pickett
Eaton	King	Plumley
Eberharter	Latham	Powell
Engel, Mich.	Lodge	Quinn
Frazier	Lyle	Redden
Furcolo	McMillen, Ill.	Regan
Gillette	Macy	Sadowski

Scott, Hardie	Stefan	Wickersham
Scott,	Talle	Wier
Hugh D., Jr.	Towe	Williams
Smathers	Velde	Winstead
Smith, Kans.	Vinson	Wolcott
Smith, Ohio	Vorys	Wood
Stanley	Walsh	
Steed	White, Idaho	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 341 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, EXPANSION, REHABILITATION, CONVERSION, AND JOINT UTILIZATION OF FACILITIES NECESSARY FOR THE ADMINISTRATION AND TRAINING OF UNITS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House resolution (H. Res. 682) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8594) to provide for the acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, conversion, and joint utilization of facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, 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. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

And at this time I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported out of the Committee on Armed Services unanimously.

It is to provide for the acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, conversion, and joint utilization of facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States. The purpose of the Act is to make provision to purchase, transfer, lease, construct, expand, rehabilitate, and develop training operations and the maintenance of units of the Reserve components of the armed services. This legislation is a part of the war program. As I understand it, there is no opposition to the granting of the rule.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding there is no objection to this bill. The armed services, the National Guard, and

the Reserves are all in agreement in favoring this bill. I also understand that the Armed Services Committee was unanimously for this bill, as well as the Rules Committee.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8594) providing for the acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, conversion, and joint utilization of facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8594, with Mr. POAGE 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 rules, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House at this time has a two-fold purpose. One purpose is to build, convert, expand, or rehabilitate armories for the National Guard and the Reserve components of the armed services. The second purpose of the bill is to obtain the maximum joint utilization of these facilities necessary for the administration and training of our Reserve units.

Now how is the construction of armories accomplished under the terms of the bill? It may be done in three ways:

First. Armories may be constructed with 100 percent Federal funds. These would be under the control of the Secretary of Defense, and title to the facility would be in the United States.

Second. One hundred percent contributions may be made to the several States to expand, rehabilitate, or convert existing armories. Under this provision of the bill, the control of the armory will be established by an agreement entered into between the Secretary of Defense and the State concerned prior to the contribution being made. Title to the facility under this provision would be in the State concerned.

Third. Contributions up to 75 percent of the total cost of construction may be made to the several States for construction, rehabilitation, conversion, et cetera, of armories. The States must make up the balance of the cost under this provision of the bill. Control of the facility would be established by an agreement entered into by the Secretary of Defense

and the State concerned prior to making the contribution. Title to the facility would be in the State concerned.

Now that is all there is to the bill. Those three methods of building, converting or repairing armories take in every situation which can be imagined. For instance, if the State does not want to contribute, the Federal Government can build under the first provision of the bill. If expansion or repairs of an existing State armory are needed, it can be done under the second provision. If the State will contribute 25 percent, the Federal Government can put in 75 percent and build a new armory for the State.

Furthermore, I think the problem of control of the facility is well worked out in the bill. Before any money is contributed to a State, the Secretary of Defense and the State concerned work out the control of the facility in an agreement. This insures that joint utilization will be accomplished to the greatest possible extent.

Now when this bill was before the Armed Services Committee, there was an authorization amount in the bill for \$400,000,000, which was to be made available at a rate not in excess of \$50,000,000 per year. Since that time, however, the Korean situation has arisen and the committee is now ready to offer amendments to strike all the money out of the bill. We do not think that we should be authorizing the expenditure of funds for this purpose during a time when the Nation is involved in military action abroad.

However, Mr. Chairman, the Services do need some authorization for planning purposes in order that they can go ahead and make their plans for the future. Now we all hope that this Korean situation is going to be over in the not too distant future, and we all know that with our expanded National Guard and Reserve components we are going to have to have facilities to train new men and to keep our forces constantly trained and ready for combat.

The bill, as it will be amended, is merely an authorization bill with no money in it, and, as I have stated, the reason I am urging its passage is so that the Department of Defense will know that they have an authorization to build and expand facilities for the National Guard and the Reserve components when such time comes as it is necessary to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I would also invite the Members' attention to the fact that before anything can be accomplished under the terms of this bill the Secretary of Defense must come up to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress and let us know why and where they are going to build these armories and other facilities. In this way the Congress will keep their eyes on this building program.

This is a good bill. It is a bill which all of the Reserve components, the National Guard, and the Department of Defense are in favor of. It also has the blessing of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of the Members realize that our Reserve program was running behind schedule before the

Korean incident. The principal reason was the lack of training facilities and that is what this bill is for—to build up these training facilities so that the Reserves can go forward with their program. I repeat, the most serious obstacle at this time to the creation and maintenance of Reserve units is the nonavailability of armories and other facilities.

Without adequate safe storage, the necessary training equipment cannot be issued. Without essential training space and equipment, the training afforded is below standard. Without attractive facilities and equipment, the recruiting of enlisted personnel and the retention of their interest is most difficult. Consequently, the provision of adequate armories and training facilities for the Organized Reserve and the National Guard is of prime importance for the preservation of the national defense.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I say that at the present time when this country and the world are in a crisis we need training facilities to be used by the National Guard and Reserve components. You may say, well, the Guard is being called into active service. You may say that the Reserve components are being called into active service. This is all true but only to a limited extent. The Guard that is not being called into active service ought to be trained. It should be trained constantly. It ought to be placed in a well-trained condition for the time that it may be called into the active service. That is likewise true of your Reserve components. Some of them will have been called into service before they can use the facilities which can be arranged for under the terms of this bill, but that does not relieve us of the obligation of making available, within our ability, to those not in the active Federal service facilities for training purposes. Again I say this is an extremely important bill. It represents the thinking of the Reserve components over a long period of time, so I am naturally in favor of the passage of the bill.

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

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Would the gentleman tell the committee of the many months of effort put forth by the committee and also the broad investigation conducted by the Department of National Defense before we were asked to consider this bill?

Mr. BROOKS. I am happy that the gentleman has brought that matter up. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and his subcommittee had before them this same bill. The members of that committee worked hard on it.

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, that subcommittee worked very hard and accumulated a lot of valuable testimony for the use of our subcommittee and the members of that subcommittee are entitled to commendation, from the distinguished

chairman the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] right on down to all members on both sides for the valuable contribution which they have made in the drafting of this bill.

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

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this mean that under the legislation, if approved, new armories will be built in all communities where they are needed to house all of these different activities?

Mr. BROOKS. We hope that eventually the whole program for the construction of armories will be worked out in an orderly fashion. Heretofore armories have largely been built by the several States and have been for National Guard purposes. They have been built through contributions from municipalities and parochial or county governments. But it has not been on a standardized basis. This bill will permit a well-ordered program for the whole thing and eventually as we build up a reserve we hope, yes, to have available armories, whether owned by the State or owned by the United States available for the National Guard and for the Reserves. When I say "Reserves" I mean the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Reserves. We plan to use those facilities in the most efficient manner, so that if you have in one locality a Naval Reserve unit and a National Guard unit and an Air Force unit, those three units can get together on provisions for joint use of those same facilities, thereby saving the United States a great deal of money and saving the local government likewise a great deal of money.

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

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that this program will eliminate the necessity of having more than one armory in the same community because it will permit joint utilization by all Reserve units?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. We are now spending three to four million dollars a year for leases, for the use of armories, and we hope eventually by this great program here of joint utilization to eliminate the payment in large part of the rents which are now being paid for the use of these facilities.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I am very much in favor of this legislation. I do hope, however, that it will have the objective of the achievement that the gentleman has mentioned, because I know in the last few years there have been Navy armories and Army armories built in the same locality, in the same town. I think that is a great waste of money, because, undoubtedly, by coordination, they could, at least, reduce the total. They may have a larger armory but they would have a lesser expense for total outlay, and I hope that somebody under this bill will be a watchdog to see to it that that is not repeated in the future.

Mr. BROOKS. Without the provisions in this bill it might be possible, for instance, to have a National Guard armory, an Army armory, a naval armory, and a Marine armory, ad infinitum, in the same locality, providing duplication in so many aspects of the reserve work. We have to avoid that and eliminate it, and our committee is asking that continued reports be made to the committee so that they can check the program.

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it has always been a pleasure for me as leader of the House to work with and cooperate with the Committee on Armed Services. As we know, under the Legislative Reorganization Act the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs were incorporated into one committee now known as the Committee on Armed Services. Our friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is chairman of that committee, and prior to the reorganization plan he was chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Any bill that came out of the Committee on Naval Affairs was very carefully considered and was supported by Members on both sides of the aisle when the bill reached the floor of the House, and any bill coming out of the Committee on Armed Services, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] occupies the same situation and the same status. The committee always considers its legislation very well, and when it comes on the floor of the House the Members on both sides are well informed and in a position, and from the angle of knowledge and information they are able to advise their colleagues on other committees in a very effective way so that legislation coming from that committee very seldom encounters any serious opposition. As the situation existed 10 years ago, before World War II, in relation to the Committee on Naval Affairs, so did it also exist in relation to the Committee on Military Affairs.

I want to say a few words about a man who was a Member of this body then but who is not a Member now. He has a cloud hanging over him, but not in my mind. I believe that we should stick with our friends when they need us. The test of real friendship is when one is in distress or when one is undergoing trouble. That is when friendship undergoes its test and that is when true friendship asserts itself. There is one man that I served with who comes in this category, and I pick him out not to the exclusion of all others, but because of the predicament he is in now. And, with this bill before the House and the world in a similar situation today as it was 10 years ago, and let us hope it will not culminate in the war that happened in 1941, I want to refer to him, I introduced a resolution in this body at that time which brought us into the war.

I hope I shall never have to introduce another one. But if it is my duty to do so, I shall do it.

Ten years ago today the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs was our good friend Andrew Jackson May—Jack May, of Kentucky. He is a great American. The people of his district are justified in being proud of him. None of us know what we are going to encounter in our journey through life; also, in our opinions of our fellowmen, we should not overlook the entire picture of a person. We should look at a person's whole record in their journey through life. I can remember 10 years ago during those trying days when there were such tense legislative battles on the floor of the House, when there were honest differences of opinion, and as chairman of the then Committee on Military Affairs, Jack May, now former Congressman from Kentucky, was here courageously performing his duties. All of us who served with Jack—or Andy, as some others called him—remember him for the tireless man that he was—temperamental, it is true, but a man of fidelity to duty, a man possessed of unlimited courage. In those days, 10 years ago, just as the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, did then on the old Committee on Naval Affairs, and others on the Committee on Military Affairs, and as the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, is doing today, and as other members of the Committee on Armed Services are doing today—they rendered their duty as Americans ably and courageously, before and during World War II.

When he was chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, Jack May rendered outstanding service. He served his country ably and courageously.

Mr. Chairman, I could not let this occasion pass without commenting on this courageous legislator, this great American, as I am going to term him, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. May.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the distinguished majority leader took just a minute or two to speak words of commendation about Andrew Jackson May, former Member of the House of Representatives, who served faithfully, diligently, and untiringly as chairman of the old Committee on Military Affairs during the greatest war in the history of the world.

There is not a bad bone in his body. For many years I sat with Andy May. I know he was temperamental, impetuous, a bit high-strung, but he was a man who at all times cooperated with his colleagues on his committee and in the House. He rendered a great and honorable service to our Nation during World War II. I do not condone wrong. He may have been indiscreet at times. He might have picked one leaf out of the book. But I certainly think we all will agree with the majority leader when he says that you must look at the whole picture, or read the whole book, or judge a man by all the years he has lived and all the things he has done. Do not judge the whole by a part. I love Andrew Jackson May and I shall always love him.

Now, a word or two about this bill. Heretofore there have been many bills introduced into the Congress for the construction of armories. But it has

been next to impossible to get the civilian components of the Organized Reserves and the National Guard and the Military Establishment to agree on a bill. But I am happy to say that our committee has held extensive hearings and have ironed out the differences and have brought in this particular measure by unanimous report which I think meets with the approval, not only of the different component parts of the Reserves and the National Guard, but of the Department of Defense as well as the Bureau of the Budget. The bill authorizes \$400,000,000, not more than 50 percent of which is to be spent in one fiscal year for the construction, expansion, development of armories, and of training facilities for our Reserve forces.

I do not have to remind the Members of the House that at the height of the last global conflict we had 12,000,000 men and women in our armed services. Counting the rotation, there were perhaps eighteen or twenty million. Of course, we realize that only a small percentage of those 12,000,000 men and women were graduates of the military or naval academies or were even Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps officers.

It is impossible for a nation, even with our population and our great wealth, to maintain a huge standing army, navy, and air force that would be a perpetual drain on our economy and that perhaps would end in bankruptcy of the Nation.

So modern wars are won really by the Reserves or civilian components of the different branches of the services. Had we passed legislation similar to this a few years ago, I dare say you would not have heard all of this clamor at this hour for universal military training, which I am vehemently and unalterably against, because I do not want to see America Prussianized, and I do not like to see Members of this Congress, in an hour of peril, swept off their feet by hysteria and by the editorials that we read in the newspapers.

If we would build our Reserve forces into a great Organized Reserve, and we had six or seven million highly trained, valued, experienced men, who had gone through combat and who wanted to remain in the Reserve—in each one of the branches—the Navy was not too bad, the Army certainly was a sinner, and the Air Force was worse—almost completely ignored the reserved forces, to keep those men in training who wanted to be in training and to be ready in this hour. That is where we have fallen down. Do not blame the Congress. Blame the Department of Defense.

When we pass this bill and spend \$400,000,000 for the construction of armories and training facilities all over the country, and when we keep in the Reserves of our Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, all of whom are included in this bill, you will not have to Prussianize America. You will not have to militarize this Nation in order to have a highly trained, well-equipped, alert cadre group, capable of meeting any emergency at any time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the majority leader and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] said what they did today about our former chairman. I worked with Jack May. I know the contribution he made to his country in the days when it was not easy to secure the enactment of legislation in 1939 and 1940. There was a fight on almost every measure. He spent long hours and worked late into the night, and, in my opinion, rendered a very patriotic service during that crisis.

In regard to this measure, this study which we began in 1948 has been very, very extensive. I headed a subcommittee at that time. When we began to study this matter in regard to our armories and the contribution they would make to the national effort, there was a conglomeration of training. We discovered that the National Guard had something like \$600,000,000 worth of equipment. It was stored in basements, it was stored in old shacks, it was stored everywhere throughout the country. Also, the Navy had initiated and put into operation a very extensive program of building some very fine armories throughout the country. Also, many of the States had National Guard armories. Also, many of the municipalities had armories. So the committee immediately decided that some plan should be made to coordinate these different functions into a tight organization—as tight as possible. The committee at that time was giving over-all study to it, and we decided it was best for some agency of the Federal Government to make an over-all study.

It was agreed in the fall of 1948 that this should be turned over to an agency of the Government for an over-all survey throughout the United States. The Munitions Board at that time was given the job, and later on this civilian board which was appointed within the agency of the National Defense Establishment, I think they have done an excellent job. It was a very difficult and a complicated job. At that time there was a difference of opinion on the cooperation and coordination of the armory program. I felt that the Reserve units should have the best of facilities. We found, for instance, that a naval armory might have a very expensive piece of equipment, sometimes costing thousands and thousands of dollars, and the other Reserve components, the Air Force and the Army, would have to go at least 60 miles to receive training with similar equipment. That type of operation and training simply does not make good sense, and I want to compliment the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] which brought out the over-all bill as you have it before you today.

I think it is important that we start this program. I think we made the mistake in 1946 of not initiating some program which would stimulate interest in these boys, stimulate them to do a good

job. Today we have got another job before us, and many of them, as you and I know, are not properly trained. It is our responsibility to provide the facilities and equipment for them to train with. By doing this we render a great service not only to the States but to our national defense program.

I think it should be stated that the program that California has initiated and put into operation is one of the best jobs that has been done in the United States. They initiated their own primary program and today they have almost completed it. They will take the final step in their program this year and this will give them a complete program. If every State in the Union had such a program you would not have to worry today about our Reserve units not being trained and ready to go into operation anywhere in the world.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from Louisiana, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] who used to be a member of our committee and is tremendously interested in this whole program, deserve, I think, the thanks of the Members of the House for the valuable contributions they made.

The gentleman from North Carolina stated a moment ago that it was too bad that we failed to initiate this program in 1946. I think it needs a bit of clarification. We certainly want the country to know that it was not the fault of Congress or the fault of our Committee on the Armed Services. They wanted this program all along. It perhaps was due to difference of opinion among the different branches of the Reserve components as well as the Regular Military Establishment.

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

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman is correct in his analysis.

I want the House to know that this legislation has taken time. I hold here in my hand one of the most comprehensive studies that has yet been made of this subject. It gives the location of every armory in the United States. Numbers today I think are not so important, but at the present time we have 317 naval reserve training centers, Government-owned; we have 500 electronic warfare facilities and stations throughout the country at which these boys can get their training. National Guard State armories number 1,027; and State guard armories 518; state police 608, giving us the total of 2,025. Out of that there are only 1,087 adequate for training purposes, and 325 susceptible of expansion. That leaves a total of 1,388 necessary to be built if you carry out your training program based on the authorized present strength of all the reserve units in the National Guard to this date.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think perhaps the gentleman ought to mention that due to increases in pay, retirement benefits, and additional incentives to enlistment we will have no difficulty whatever in getting the youth of America to enlist in the National Guard Reserve.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman is correct, but they have got to have training and facilities with which to train. We are here authorizing the facilities as we should have done earlier so that they may have the training and carry out the program in the future.

I also want to compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] who has worked very diligently on this program. He initiated the program for the reserves of the country. I believe there was something like \$13,200,000 carried in the appropriation bill last year, and this year it is \$16,000,000.

This is sound legislation for the defense planning of our country.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

#### SHOWDOWN DEMANDED ON FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, the American people are deeply troubled by the failure of their Government's foreign policy. They justifiably believe that no nation or combination of nations can destroy the United States if the latter is properly led. But they are equally aware that the United States can commit suicide by overextending itself militarily in support of unlimited political commitments.

On July 19 I pointed out that the Korean tragedy was the inescapable outcome of a tortuous, contradictory and short-sighted foreign policy, if any such uncertain and confusing course can be called policy. Essentially we are in a red-hot war, cruelly expensive in blood and in treasure, primarily because of the absence of any intelligent, consistent foreign policy and military strategy to support it. Later, during the course of consideration of bills to set in motion the military mobilization of the United States, I asked the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee to inform the House whether or not the Government had as yet formulated a consistent foreign policy and corresponding military strategic plans. The House is still awaiting an answer.

The American people have a right to know what is the foreign policy of their Government, the right to assess that policy before they are called upon to shed their blood and spend their treasure in wars all over the world. There must be a truly national policy, openly and freely arrived at in traditional American fashion. No secret, personal Presidential substitute will do.

I am personally convinced that the administration has not had, and does not now have, a consistent foreign policy and military strategy to support it. Korea is painfully convincing proof of this. The only foreign policy that we

have actually had during the past 5 years has been a policy of secret, personal Presidential decision, moving from crisis to crisis, uncertain and contradictory as any purely personal and secret policy must be, and having no relation whatsoever to military and other elements necessary to support a successful foreign policy. What the United States must have if it is to survive in this world is a truly national policy, carefully thought out, understood and accepted, with all of its implications, by the American people.

If the administration is unable to formulate and propose such a policy, then the Congress and the people must do so themselves. As a first step here are some of the questions which the American people are asking, and to which Congress has a duty to demand the answers or to supply them itself:

#### I

What is the policy of the United States now as to Korea (a) if and when the North Koreans are forced back to the thirty-eighth parallel; (b) if the North Koreans succeed in driving our forces out of Korea?

What is the policy of the United States now as to Formosa (a) if a Soviet satellite—Communist China—should attack the island of Formosa; (b) if a Soviet satellite—Communist China—succeeds in conquering Formosa? Is it the policy of the United States now to go to war with the 450,000,000 people of Communist China in support of Formosa, Indo-China, or any other Asiatic country?

#### II

What is the policy of the United States now as to the following countries: (a) If attacked by Soviet satellite forces; (b) if conquered by Soviet satellite forces; (c) if attacked by Russian forces; (d) if conquered by Russian forces; (e) if taken over by internal Communist revolution: French Indo-China, population 25,000,000; Hong Kong, 1,000,000; British Malaya, 5,000,000; Indonesia, 70,000,000; Thailand, 17,000,000; Burma, 17,000,000; India, 337,000,000; Pakistan, 70,000,000; Tibet, 4,000,000; Iran, 18,000,000; Turkey, 19,000,000; Greece, 8,000,000; Yugoslavia, 16,000,000; Finland, 4,000,000; western Germany, 48,000,000?

#### III

What is the policy of the United States now if (a) Soviet satellite forces, or (b) Russian forces attack a North Atlantic Pact nation? Is it intended to make unlimited commitment of American ground forces in defense of Atlantic Pact nations?

The magnitude and difficulty of securing the above-mentioned countries from aggression is evident from a consideration of their populations. The total population of these Asiatic countries is over 700,000,000. Western Europe has a total population in excess of 250,000,000.

Americans are certainly entitled to demand immediate answers to these life-and-death questions. They have sufficient intelligence and good sense to be trusted with frank disclosure of the facts of life. They are fully aware that their manpower and resources are definitely limited by their relatively small population and territorial area. They have a right to know now what their Govern-

ment intends to do with the men and resources which it is now mobilizing. It is not enough merely to mobilize. Where and to what extent are American military forces to be committed? Americans want to know that now and should know it now. The rest of the world should know it.

We were caught by surprise in Korea. Six weeks have elapsed since that attack. We must not be caught by surprise again. We must know where we are going and what we are going to do. Our political plans and commitments must not exceed our military capacity.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas the American people are deeply disturbed by the disastrous failure of the foreign policy heretofore pursued by their Government and are apprehensive lest future blundering jeopardize their very national existence; and

Whereas the American people demand that there be an end of secret decisions and commitments made by personal Presidential determination on a day-to-day basis and from crisis to crisis without consultation with Congress or the American people; and

Whereas the American people demand that there be established a truly national policy, openly and freely arrived at in traditional American fashion, to the end that there may be general knowledge and acceptance of commitments made by their Government with all the implications of such commitments; and

Whereas the American people have a right to know what is the foreign policy of their Government and the right to assess that policy before they are called upon to shed their blood and spend their treasure in war, and in the absence of a satisfactory foreign policy, they have the right to formulate such foreign policy through their representatives in the Congress:

*Resolved, etc.—*

#### I

That the critical situation demands, as never before, a truly national policy, openly arrived at and satisfactory to the people of the United States, and further that secret determination of policy is wholly inconsistent with the institutions and traditions of a free people.

#### II

That the Congress requests the President to inform it specifically what is the foreign policy of the United States, if there be one, particularly as to the presently critical areas of the world.

#### III

That the President is hereby requested to furnish the Congress with answers to the following specific questions which are today being asked whenever Americans gather:

What is the policy of the United States now as to—

##### 1. Korea:

(a) If and when the North Koreans are forced back to the thirty-eighth parallel?

(b) If the North Koreans succeed in driving our forces out of Korea?

##### 2. Formosa:

(a) If a Soviet satellite (Communist China) should attack the island of Formosa?

(b) If a Soviet satellite (Communist China) succeeds in conquering Formosa?

3. Communist China: (a) Is it the policy of the United States to go to war with the 450,000,000 people of Communist China in support of Formosa, Indochina, or any other Asiatic country?

##### 4. French Indochina:

(a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack French Indochina?

(b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering French Indochina?

(c) If Russian forces should attack French Indochina?

(d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering French Indochina?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of French Indochina by internal revolution?

5. Hong Kong:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack Hong Kong?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering Hong Kong?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack Hong Kong?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering Hong Kong?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of Hong Kong by internal revolution?

6. British Malaya:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack British Malaya?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces should succeed in conquering British Malaya?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack British Malaya?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering British Malaya?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of British Malaya by internal revolution?

7. Thailand:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack Thailand?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering Thailand?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack Thailand?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering Thailand?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of Thailand by internal revolution?

8. Burma:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack Burma?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering Burma?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack Burma?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering Burma?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of Burma by internal revolution?

9. India:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack India?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering India?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack India?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering India?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of India by internal revolution?

10. Pakistan:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack Pakistan?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering Pakistan?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack Pakistan?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering Pakistan?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of Pakistan by internal revolution?

11. Tibet:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack Tibet?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering Tibet?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack Tibet?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering Tibet?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of Tibet by internal revolution?

12. Iran:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack Iran?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering Iran?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack Iran?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering Iran?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of Iran by internal revolution?

13. Turkey:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack Turkey?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering Turkey?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack Turkey?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering Turkey?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of Turkey by internal revolution?

14. Greece:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack Greece?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering Greece?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack Greece?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering Greece?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of Greece by internal revolution?

15. Yugoslavia:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack Yugoslavia?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering Yugoslavia?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack Yugoslavia?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering Yugoslavia?  
 (e) If Russian Communists should acquire control of Yugoslavia by internal revolution?

16. Finland:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack Finland?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering Finland?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack Finland?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering Finland?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of Finland by internal revolution?

17. Western Germany:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack western Germany?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering western Germany?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack western Germany?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering western Germany?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of western Germany by internal revolution?

18. North Atlantic Pact nations:  
 (a) If Soviet satellite forces should attack a North Atlantic Pact nation?  
 (b) If Soviet satellite forces succeed in conquering a North Atlantic Pact nation?  
 (c) If Russian forces should attack a North Atlantic Pact nation?  
 (d) If Russian forces should succeed in conquering a North Atlantic Pact nation?  
 (e) If Communists should acquire control of a North Atlantic Pact nation by internal revolution?  
 (f) For the defense of an Atlantic Pact nation or nations? Has it given, or does it intend to give, unlimited commitment of American ground forces in such event?

iv

*Be it further resolved*, That in the event of failure of the President to supply, within a reasonable time, the information heretofore requested, then the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint a select joint committee of the two Houses for the purpose of considering and recommending a national foreign policy designed to meet the vital questions pressing for decision by the American people. The membership of such committee shall consist of an equal number of Democrats and Republicans. Not more than one-half of the members of such select committee shall be members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate or the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas 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.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does not the gentleman believe that the foreign policy of the present administration has been the most misunderstandable of any foreign policy of any administration in the past?

Mr. COUDERT. I would say that the gentleman does not overstate the case. I will say that the American people have never been in such a state of utter confusion. I will say that America cannot expect to make its greatest strength available in self-defense unless the people are given to understand what their commitments are, what the limits of their commitments are, and have a truly established foreign policy resulting from free debate and open discussion.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], who has shown such great, active, and continuing interest in Reserve affairs.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have long hoped to see the enactment of legislation which will accomplish what this measure proposes. As a matter of fact, I think I introduced the first bill in the postwar period to provide for armories for the Reserve components; a bill very similar to the one now before us.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to compliment the committee. This is a hard-working and an earnest committee which has rendered valuable service to the Nation. It now offers the opportunity for us to have a coordinated approach to the serious need for armories for the Reserve components.

I do not think there is any valid argument against this bill. I think the reception which has been accorded it by the House demonstrates that. It involves no expenditures at this time. It simply provides an immediate framework on which we can plan a workable armory program for all of the Reserves. It will eliminate the present unsatisfactory and costly patchwork program.

It has been said that because of the Korean conflict we should postpone the enactment of this measure. Instead of that, I feel that the Korean conflict is possibly the strongest argument for this bill, because we have seen very clearly, Mr. Chairman, from the Korean conflict, that what we need is men in combat units, men who can speedily be used for emergencies wherever they are needed.

in the world. As a matter of fact, although the services are comparatively large, the number of men in combat units are comparatively few. For instance, the Army with 637,000 men, has only 10 divisions. We need more men in combat units, and men in combat units are available in the guard and in the Reserves.

Perhaps the guard and Reserves provide the best answer to our need for men who are ready for action upon very short notice. It is probable, Mr. Chairman, that Korea will happen elsewhere; it may happen many times, for the Communists will seek to bleed us whenever and wherever they can. We have to be ready for any emergency. This legislation is needed if the guard and the Reserves are to be combat ready.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I just want to say that with the background of a great many years in the Reserve I think that this bill is everything that the gentleman has mentioned, and even more. I think it is one of the most constructive measures for the general all-around defense, but at the same time the timing, if anything, is late rather than early. The committee deserves great commendation for having brought forth something very well worth while at this time.

Mr. SIKES. I want to go one step further. I think this. The guard and the Reserves offer the most economical answer to the need for men in combat units. I would like to point out, as I have before, that we get seven guardsmen for the price of one Regular. The same is true with respect to the other Reserve components, except that in most instances the costs of training are still less for the Reserves.

Actually we have taken care of most of the needs of the Reserve components. There remains this very material need which should be provided at this time. We have taken care of the pay situation. We have taken care of retirement provisions. We are now in the process of taking care of equipment needs. So we have provided most of the things they need, other than armories. The Reserve components obviously must have a satisfactory place to meet and a place to work if they are going to do their job adequately. Many units are now meeting in buildings which are unsatisfactory and which do not provide adequate security for supplies and equipment.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. To comment further along the line of what the distinguished gentleman said in reference to equipment, I would like to point out that we cannot provide expensive equipment such as electronics equipment, for example, and other costly and essential present-day equipment, unless they have a place in which to locate that equipment, and certainly we cannot train the Reserves adequately without the equip-

ment which is needed together with a place in which to store the equipment.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct.

I feel that the fine work done by the Reserve components fully justifies the enactment of this legislation. It will further strengthen a valuable and needed segment of our national defense.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I heartily concur in the remarks of my very able friends and colleague of the Committee on Armed Services relative to the bill H. R. 8594, which we now have before us, to provide for the acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, conversion, and joint utilization of facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States and for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, too long have we neglected the component parts of our Armed Forces of the United States, the National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, the United States Naval Reserve, the United States Marine Corps Reserve, the United States Air Force Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

This bill should have been passed about ten years ago. It is part of our over-all program to build our national defense, our Army, our Navy, our air power and Marine Corps and National Guard and Air National Guard. So this is a very important piece of legislation, and it is part of the program that will alert this Nation of ours to meet the demands that are being made and will be made upon us over the years that lie ahead.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. SHORT. I did not get whether the gentleman mentioned the Coast Guard, and I am sure if he did not, that he does not mean to overlook the Coast Guard.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman. I believe I did previously mention the Coast Guard Reserve, they are a most important branch of the service.

Mr. Chairman, too long we have neglected these Reserve units. It is about time that we recognize they are part of our national defense program. As I said, in building this great defense program it is my opinion we should build the greatest national defense that this country has ever known. We want to cooperate with all the nations of the world. We want to work with all the nations of the world, but as Jan Smuts, the great South African leader said, "Peace without the power to back it up becomes but an empty dream."

Mr. Chairman, we have been dreaming. Now we want to alert this Nation of ours to meet the needs and demands that may be made upon us in event we should again suddenly find ourselves in a world war emergency. So this program is very important and necessary. As already stated this legislation should

have been enacted 10 years ago, when we were trying to appease Japan, when we were shipping our coal and iron ore and our steel and our industrial equipment to Japan, and then suddenly the Japs dump tons of dynamite on our battleships and fortifications, wiping out 50 percent of our fleet and the lives of 3,300 Americans and we were walking around with wooden guns and dummy cannons. Instead of becoming practical realists after World War II, we again strolled down the pathway of pacifistic peace and idealism. We demobilized our Army and Navy and Air Corps and National Guard and our Reserves, thinking and dreaming that peace and stability had been returned to the world when we should have known you can't do business with the Russians.

But again we suddenly are plunged into an emergency—this Korean situation—and again find ourselves in a very desperate and critical position of unpreparedness. Let us not find ourselves in that position in the future, let us correct the iniquities that exist now and provide facilities to build up our National Guard, our Reserves, and our Coast Guard Reserves to meet the demands that will be made upon us.

I say to you that this legislation is very important legislation to build up the facilities to train the youth of America so that if they find themselves in the service they will have some education, training, and knowledge of warfare and will be prepared to take care of themselves when they are brought into service.

I sincerely hope that the House will pass this legislation overwhelmingly, because it is a part of our over-all defense program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Defense Facilities Act of 1950."*

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to make provision for—

(a) the acquisition by purchase, lease, or transfer, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, or conversion, of such facilities as may be necessary for the proper development, training, operation, and maintenance of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(b) the joint utilization of such facilities by units of two or more such Reserve components, and in time of war or national emergency by such units and other units of the Armed Forces of the United States or any other use by the Federal Government, to the greatest practicable extent in the interest of efficiency and economy.

SEC. 3. Subject to the provisions of section 4 of this act, the Secretary of Defense is authorized, after prior consultation with the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, in an aggregate amount not in excess of \$400,000,000, which shall be available for obligation purposes at a rate not in excess of \$50,000,000 in any fiscal year, to—

(a) acquire by purchase, lease, or transfer, to construct, expand, rehabilitate, or convert and equip such facilities as he shall deter-

mine to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act;

(b) contribute to any State such funds as he shall determine to be necessary to expand, rehabilitate, or convert facilities owned by such State to the extent required for the joint utilization of such facilities; and

(c) contribute to any State such funds for the acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, or conversion by such State of such additional facilities as he shall determine to have been made essential by any increase in strength of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States.

Sec. 4. (a) No expenditure or contribution shall be made for any facility pursuant to this act until it shall have been determined by the Secretary of Defense that—

(1) the number of units of Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States located or to be located in the community or area within which such facility is to be provided does not exceed the number which reasonably can be expected to be maintained at authorized strength, taking into account the number of persons residing in such community or area who are qualified for membership in such Reserve units; and

(2) the plan or program under which such facility is to be provided makes the maximum practicable provision for the joint utilization of such facilities.

(b) No unit of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States shall be withdrawn from any community or area, nor shall the location of any such unit be changed, pursuant to any authority conferred by this act, until the governor of the State within which such unit is situated shall have been consulted with regard to such withdrawal or change of location.

(c) Title to all real or personal property acquired under section 3 (a) of this act shall be vested in the United States. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, after prior consultation on matters of general policy and changes in general policy with the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, to administer, operate, maintain, and equip all facilities constructed, expanded, rehabilitated, or converted pursuant to section 3 (a) hereof and facilities otherwise acquired and being used for the purposes of this act, and may (1) permit any such facility to be used from time to time by persons or organizations other than members or units of the armed services under such leases or other agreements as the Secretary shall deem appropriate, and (2) cover the payments received under such leases or agreements into the Treasury to the credit of appropriation or appropriations from which the cost of maintenance including providing of utilities and services is paid, but the Secretary shall at no time permit any disposition or use to be made by such facilities which will interfere with their use for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, or in time of war or national emergency of other units of the Armed Forces of the United States or any other use by the Federal Government.

(d) Each contribution made pursuant to section 3 (b) or 3 (c) of this act shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense, after prior consultation with the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, shall deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That except as agreed at the time the contribution is made the facilities provided through contributions made pursuant to section 3 (c) of this act shall be subject to joint utilization only to the extent deemed practicable by the State concerned. No contribution shall be made under section 3 (c)

for any facility in an amount exceeding 75 percent of the cost of the additional or improved facilities to be constructed: *And provided further*, That the amount to be contributed by any State shall be exclusive of the cost or market value of any real estate which might be acquired by the United States from the State concerned for the purposes of section 3 (c) of this act.

(e) Each State which shall have acquired, constructed, expanded, rehabilitated, or converted any facility with any funds contributed under section 3 (b) and 3 (c) of this act may (1) permit such facility to be used from time to time by persons or organizations other than members or units of the armed services under such leases or other agreements as such State shall deem appropriate, and (2) apply the sums received under such leases or agreements to defray in whole or in part the cost of maintaining such facility, but, except as agreed at the time such contribution is made, at no time shall such State permit any disposition or use to be made of such facility which will interfere with its use for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, or in time of war or national emergency of other units of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of Defense may delegate all or any part of the authority conferred or the duties imposed upon him by this act, without relieving himself of the responsibility therefor, to such department, agency, officer, or officers of the Department of Defense as he may designate from time to time.

Sec. 6. All construction, expansion, rehabilitation, or conversion of facilities pursuant to the provisions of this act may be performed under the supervision of the Chief, Corps of Engineers, or the Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Sec. 7. As used in this act, the terms—

(a) "facility" includes any interest in land, any armory or other structure together with any improvement thereto, and any storage or other facility normally required for the administration and training of any unit of any Reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States;

(b) "State" includes (1) any State or Territory of the United States, any political subdivision thereof, any tax-supported agency therein, or any military unit situated therein; (2) Puerto Rico; and (3) the District of Columbia;

(c) "Reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States" shall include—

(1) the National Guard of the United States;

(2) the Air National Guard of the United States;

(3) the Organized Reserve Corps;

(4) the United States Naval Reserve;

(5) the United States Marine Corps Reserve;

(6) the United States Air Force Reserve; and

(7) the Coast Guard Reserve; and

(d) "joint utilization" shall mean the occupancy or use of any facility by units of two or more Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. When any act whereby any such appropriation is made so provides, such sum shall remain available until expended.

Mr. BROOKS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill and that it be printed at this point and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

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

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS: On page 2, line 14, following the comma after the word "Congress", strike the balance of line 14, all of lines 15 and 16, through the comma following the word "year."

And on page 8, strike all of section 8.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this committee amendment simply does one thing. It takes out the authorization of any stated amount of money. Originally the bill provided for \$400,000,000, but it was thought, in considering the needs on account of the actual fighting in Korea and the other needs of defense that are so urgent, it would be preferable for the time being to strike out the cash authorization.

I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. POAGE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8594) to provide for the acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, conversion, and joint utilization of facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 682, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RESCISSON OF CURTAILMENT OF CERTAIN POSTAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 667, the Chair designates the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of

the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, to control time for debate in opposition to the bill H. R. 8195.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8195) to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8195, rescinding the curtailment of certain postal services, with Mr. THOMAS 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 Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH] for 1 hour.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. How will those who favor this bill on this side secure time in general debate? It seems to be all concentrated on the Democratic side.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think it is; I think it is evenly divided.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman share his time?

Mr. WALSH. I certainly will.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman then yield 30 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service on this side?

Mr. WALSH. Let me complete my remarks; I just arrived on the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I was on my way to Wisconsin with my wife, after having obtained a live pair for the bill which was before the House on yesterday. I think an open statement as to my reasons for being away should be given to the House of Representatives. I had no idea that I would be required to be here. I had a previous commitment, given several weeks ago, to appear on the Town Meeting program. I took my wife up to Anderson, Ind., my home, at the completion of the session on Friday and left Sunday morning for Wisconsin. I was intercepted by a State police officer somewhere in Wisconsin and since then without sleep, and I guarantee without one bite of food, I am now here. So I will do my best to make a presentation of my views upon this bill that I have been so strongly supporting. I wish again to say that I am apologizing to the House for the inconvenience I have caused the Members.

I am also going to say that I will be in Wisconsin tonight at 7 o'clock their time, 9 o'clock Washington time, to appear on the Town Meeting program.

I am also going to do something else I do not like to do: I do not like to read a speech, but I prepared a speech a few days ago and I am going to read it rather than speak without notes.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 4 months we have witnessed the fall and decline of one of our most cherished institutions—the United States postal service. The opportunity presents itself to us today to restore the postal service to the high level of efficiency that heretofore we have taken for granted. The forthright passage of H. R. 8195 will be the first step on the road to recovery.

The postal cuts ordered by the directive of the Postmaster General on April 17, 1950, have failed miserably to accomplish any of the results hoped for in their publication. On the contrary, the curtailment of certain postal functions and the complete elimination of other services have been inconvenient to mail users, costly to business and the general public, and above and beyond those considerations, the cut-backs have been the greatest irritant of the last 2 decades. During that period our Nation engaged in a global war that was accompanied by all types of necessary restrictions on the home front. The citizens of this great republic willingly and cheerfully accepted these restrictions. I am certain they would do the same thing again, if called on to do so. But there is no rhyme or reason to these postal cut-backs. People who ordinarily would gladly sacrifice every possession in response to their patriotic impulses and in defense of our heritage are unwilling—and rightfully so—to tolerate bureaucratic interference in their lives, especially when there is no cause for such interference.

The postal service is one of the few remaining functions of the Federal Government available to every man, woman, and child in these United States. The curtailment order of the Postmaster General has, in effect, denied the benefits of good mail service to many of our people. The stipulation is laid down that a patron of the post office must live and conduct his business in certain well-defined areas to receive frequent and good mail service. But we all know that not all of our citizens can meet those rigid requirements. These cut-back orders were ill-advised, to say the least. They are particularly harsh on the small-business man, who must depend on multiple deliveries of his mail to stay in business.

A few short weeks ago, the Joint Congressional Economic Committee made its regular report. Here is what the report had to say about small-business profits:

In the last few years the rate of profits has declined the most for the small-sized business. \* \* \*

In the postwar boom, when most goods were scarce, there was an unlimited market for everyone's goods. Therefore, 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 giants. When this exceptional period of scarcity came to an end, big business was scarcely affected. The earning rates of the little concerns started downhill.

In my own home town, a city of fifty or sixty thousand people, we have a mail order house that does a tremendously large business. It is important to this concern to receive its mail promptly if it is going to stay in business. They have the reputation of

promptly answering their mail and sending out dresses and other wearing apparel to the people who buy from them through the mail service. We have other big companies in this Nation that have become great, who operate almost exclusively as mail order houses. The people have appealed to every Member of Congress because of this restriction.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the present inferior method of conducting the postal service has in no manner enhanced the position or possibilities of these small-business firms. Rather, I believe, the elimination of mail pickups, deliveries, and other services has further burdened these small businesses.

And speaking of business, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word to those critics of the bill under consideration who would insist the Post Office Department is a business and as such should show a profit. In the broadest interpretation of the term, the Post Office Department is not a business institution. It is a function of the Federal Government, originally designed and created to provide service to the American taxpayer. The service ideal has been the historical role of the Department from the days of Ben Franklin. Practically every Postmaster General since Franklin's day has reiterated that policy of service. The present incumbent of that position has seen fit to deviate from that historical role, for reasons probably best known to himself. I would not criticize the present policy of the Postmaster General if it could be shown that his attempted economies were accompanied by even a small degree of efficiency. I am not prepared to state what savings, if any, have been accomplished as a result of these postal cut-backs. I am prepared, however, to say that it is my observation that postal efficiency has been tossed out the window, as a result of the burden imposed on the Department by the order of April 17, 1950. The collection, sorting, transportation, and delivery of mails is a hit and miss proposition these days. I believe it was Dr. Robert L. Johnson, of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, who described the situation within the postal service in this manner: he stated, "the Post Office Department is trying to meet an atomic-age emergency with hand-cranking equipment and methods."

Mr. Chairman, I want to say right here to any people who may contend that the order of Postmaster General Donaldson of April 17 is in conjunction with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report that they are absolutely mistaken.

Every Member of Congress is concerned about the mounting defense needs of our Nation. Certainly, every effort should be made to trim the fat wherever it can be done without jeopardizing the inescapable needs of the time. I, for one, do not believe that cutting postal service is going to help in the least. As a matter of fact, the Post Office faces huge new burdens as the military prepares to send more and more of our boys to the battlefield. If the pattern of World War II is followed, our troops are going to be

stationed in distant and far-away places; at home our communications will be speeded up to assist in the vital production of arms, equipment, and the other necessary matériel. Both of these possibilities call for an efficient mail service. We do not have and we shall not have an efficient postal service as long as the present curtailment program remains in effect.

Mr. Chairman, the time for real action in the matter of restoring the postal service is right now. I sincerely hope that the bill sponsored by the gentleman from Louisiana will have the support of every Member. It would be positive proof in the grand manner of demonstrating to the taxpayers of this country that Congress is alert to the needs of the hour, and that we are anxious to do the job for which we were sent to Congress; namely, protect the privileges and benefits of American citizenship and improve on them wherever possible.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I hope the gentleman will not misinterpret this question but I would like to ask him if he has been influenced in the slightest in his action on this matter by the great number of postal employees who walked day and day and day up and down through the House Office Building urging Members to sign this petition?

Mr. WALSH. I have not been.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going out of town to make any speech tonight; I have to stay here on the job.

Mr. Chairman, I have not been impressed by the fact that a mail-order house wants this order rescinded; I would not be impressed by that. If anything, I would say, "Let us impose excess-profits taxes against those mail-order houses." You know, back during World War II the boys expected the people here at home to sacrifice. And the people here at home did sacrifice. They only had one mail delivery a day; they got by pretty good. We did not even have one mail service a day while overseas. If we got our mail once a week or once every 2 weeks, we were lucky. Now we are in a crisis again. The American people are sacrificing once more, but those boys over in Korea are sacrificing, too. They do not get one mail a day; they do not even get one mail in 3 weeks. Yet here we have people complaining because we are trying to save \$70,000,000 a year to buy those boys over there some ammunition to fight and protect themselves with. Why can we not sacrifice here in America? Seventy million dollars would buy lots of bullets. I remember the time during World War II that I would like to have had some bullets, and you Members who served in World War II would like to have had bullets and ammunition, too, at times. But we ran out. The trouble today in Korea is that they do not have enough ammunition; they do not have enough planes; they do not have enough tanks to fight with.

This \$70,000,000 saving that the Postmaster General has brought about would help our boys over there, and it is a measly sacrifice that we in America are asked to make. Everybody says they believe in economy. Well, that is nice to talk about. Why do you not vote for economy sometime? You voted for the Taber-Thomas amendment to cut the appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations reduced the appropriation for the Post Office Department and we told the Postmaster General to cut down his expenses. He did it. Now what are you doing? You are back here griping again. Why did you not vote him more money then? These people that have these petitions around here did not offer an amendment to increase the Post Office appropriations. It is your fault. And that is an executive branch of the Government. Here you are trying to tell the Postmaster General how to run his job. Why do you not tell General MacArthur who to send to the front lines? It is the same principle. Why do you not tell the Secretary of State who to put in the front office of the Department of State? It is the same principle. No, you want to come back here because of politics and cater to the masses of the voters; this is election year. Do you not have any guts? Why do you not bring about two mail deliveries a day to the rural sections if you want two in town? We would like to have better service in the rural areas, but we are satisfied with one, and if necessary, we want to sacrifice some more. We in the rural sections will do without for 2 or 3 days in order to take care of those boys overseas. Why do you people in town not sacrifice a little, too? Let us economize to the tune of \$70,000,000 by refusing to pass this bill. No one but your mail-order houses are griping. I have not had one letter from the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee complaining, and I have four towns in my district that are affected by the postal-service curtailment. My people in the great Volunteer State of Tennessee are willing to sacrifice. Why are not the people in Indiana willing, too?

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would like to say that I have not had a single letter about this except from the post-office employees, and their letters came from one side of the country to the other.

Mr. SUTTON. Oh, I had a man up here representing the NALC, from up in Illinois, who asked me to sign a petition and I would not do it, and then he came to Columbia, Tenn., and tried to campaign against me in my primaries. But, thanks to him, it helped me.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. Reference was made recently to the mail order houses. Is it not a fact that all they did was to rent lock boxes in the post office and send special messengers every time they wanted to get the mail?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman realize that nearly all of the temporary employees affected by this order for curtailment of service in the Post Office Department are veterans of World War II, many of them disabled and with families, and that they fought for an American way of life and services to which they had become accustomed.

Mr. SUTTON. Does the gentleman think that those few veterans are more important than the boys in Korea?

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of this bill there are certain facts which have been overlooked. There has been a good deal of oratory. Some people seem to think this is divided between the people who want economy and the people who do not.

Of course that is utterly absurd. Everybody wants economy, just as everybody is against sin. But we have no economy in this Government and we still have sin in the United States. So let us just dismiss that from the argument.

The point is that the Post Office Department is a very big business concern. It is, however, not run as a business concern, and ever since I have been on the committee I have said over and over again that I thought we must determine once and for all whether the Post Office Department is to be a service to the people, paid for by the taxpayers, or whether it is to be run as postal departments are run all over the civilized world, notably in England, Canada, and on the Continent of Europe, as a business that comes through the fiscal year in the black. We have never determined what we wanted to do.

Now we have the question of our penalty mail which is all lumped into the postal deficit, where I do not think, and never have thought that it belongs. The Postmaster General estimates this as \$150,000,000 per year. I think this estimate is definitely on the conservative side. We are ending the fiscal year just past with a deficit of \$551,129,528.

Mr. Chairman, there are many ways in which economies can be effected. They have notably been brought out by the reports of the Hoover Commission and the task force. The Hoover Commission suggested cuts which could be made which would amount to \$256,000,000.

Now what are we doing? We are coming up with a proposed cut which at best, and there is grave question as to whether this amount is correct, would amount to \$70,000,000. It has also been stated by others in a position to know that this cut, which will be caused by the Postmaster General's curtailment of service, will amount to \$20,000,000. So

you can take your choice. I venture to say that the cut will not amount to more than \$50,000,000.

In doing this, in curtailing in this way, we are going back to the horse-and-buggy age. It has been well said that maybe carrier pigeons would be less expensive. No doubt that is true. First of all, take your air mail. You can go anywhere by air in the United States in less than 12 hours. But when you post your air-mail letter it may sit in the box 12 hours and then may be received at the other end to sit there for another 12 hours. Does that make very good sense? I submit to you that it does not.

If we have to curtail service, as the first way to save, I think it is unfortunate. The Hoover Commission did not ask for this kind of curtailment. The Hoover Commission pointed out other ways in which to effect economies, ways which were more efficient and which would make for greater service. In my humble opinion, this whole thing is exactly like the man who would burn down his barn to get rid of mice. You are cutting off an infinitesimal amount of your deficit. You are curtailing service. You are putting business and the public—and I speak only for the public, because I come from a little rural district where we have no mail-order houses—as I say, you are putting business and the public to great inconvenience.

I would also suggest, if you want to raise money for the post office, that you stop charging 6 cents for air mail. That is putting the telegraph companies out of business. If you would raise the air-mail rate so that you might make a little money, that would be a better way. No one would object to paying 10 cents or perhaps a little more for air mail which really takes the place of a night letter.

You might also cut down on your parcel post, which is putting the express companies out of business.

Oh, there are a great many ways in which big savings can be effected. But the curtailment of service is not the way.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this unfair and arbitrary bill which would rescind the order of economy by the Postmaster General—I realize that it is probably a hopeless cause that I am leading against this legislation, but I am determined to make the most aggressive fight that I can within my own limited powers, because I am absolutely convinced that I am on the side of right and economy.

Many Members who are going to vote for this outrageous bill have told me that they know I am making a righteous fight, but that they are going to vote for the bill on the ground of political expediency, with an eye on their election in November. Other Members have advised me that they know I am right in my position in opposing this bill but that they

have promised the National Association of Letter Carriers that they would support the bill. They said to me yesterday and today that if they had not previously made a promise to this organization of the National Association of Letter Carriers, they would join with me in opposition to this measure.

I am against this bill because my honest convictions and the dictates of my conscience support my position. I realize that the officers of the National Association of Letter Carriers have waged a terrific campaign, a pressure campaign and a strong propaganda drive to prevail upon the Members of this House to sign the discharge petition and support this bill. They summoned letter carriers from all the States of the Union to come to Washington to pressure and lobby with Members to sign the discharge petition. Numerous Members told me that they signed the discharge petition as a result of this campaign.

As one Member of Congress, I do not tremble with fear or shake in my boots whenever William C. Doherty, national president of the Association of Letter Carriers, raises the whip. I know something about his pressure tactics, and I am not afraid to resist them when I think his cause is unjust or unfair.

Do you know that it is being boasted around the corridors and in the cloak-rooms that whenever the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service or the House Committee on Rules refuses to do the bidding of William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, all that Doherty has to do is to get the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH] to file a discharge petition, and then 218 Members will sign same so as to discharge the committee in question.

This is, indeed, an unfortunate situation and we are witnessing a sad, shabby spectacle today. If in the future, in order to remain in Congress, I must do violence to my conscience and must surrender my convictions, and must be voted by a highly organized pressure group or a group of selfish lobbyists against my best judgment, then I do not care to stay in Congress any longer under such conditions and circumstances.

Now, what are the facts about the background of this order of the Postmaster General? First, on March 21, 1950, the House Appropriations Committee in its report on the omnibus appropriation bill, told the Postmaster General that he must effect economies; that the committee believed there was considerable room for reducing expenditures and said that the committee had discussed with the Postmaster General a proposal for certain economies. The Appropriations Committee in its report stated that a sizable savings could be made by a reduction of mail deliveries in many areas, particularly in those areas serving residential areas exclusively. As a result of this recommendation of the Appropriations Committee and because the appropriation of the Post Office Department had been reduced by the House Appropriations Committee, the Postmaster General issued this order on April 17. What happened then after the order was issued? The order

provided it would not become fully operative until July 1—the main part of this order was not put into operation until the 1st of last July—but just as soon as the order was issued the National Association of Letter Carriers got busy and created hysteria by a campaign of misinformation and misrepresentation. President Doherty made uncomplimentary and undignified remarks about the Postmaster General and said that the postal service had been raped by this order. Then 40 bills were introduced within a week or 10 days after this order was issued on April 17, calling for the rescinding of this order, even before it was put into operation. The bill we are considering today was introduced only 8 days after the order of the Postmaster General was issued.

I want to include in my remarks the order of the Postmaster General. It is a sound order. It is a fair order. It is one for economy.

[Reprint of notice which appeared in the Postal Bulletin of April 18, 1950]

ORDER OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL  
READJUSTMENTS OF SERVICE

(Order No. 42946; dated April 17, 1950)

The postal service of today has become a complex enterprise serving an ever-increasing population. In 1930, the population of the country was 123,000,000 and the revenues of the postal service were \$705,500,000. By 1940, the population had increased to 131,600,000 and the revenues were \$767,000,000. In 1950, the population has increased to more than 150,000,000 and the postal revenues are approximately \$1,600,000,000. This shows a constantly expanding use of the postal services by business and by people in all walks of life.

This Department is exerting every effort to provide for the public the best possible postal service at the least possible cost. We are taking advantage of every known device or program that is suitable in the operation of the postal service, to improve the service, better the working conditions of the postal people, and reduce the operating costs.

For years the Post Office Department has carried on what is known today as management improvement programs. Its post offices have been inspected annually and surveys have been made from time to time as the need thereof developed in both departmental and field activities. These surveys and studies have been made on a Nation-wide basis as well as for the purpose of solving the problems in specific postal units. Mechanical equipment has been installed to the extent that its use today in post offices and transportation terminals probably exceeds that of commercial enterprises such as the railway express and other transportation agencies.

Splendid progress has been made and the productive effort of the employees has been increased as indicated by the accomplishments in the fiscal year 1949, compared with the fiscal year 1939. During that period, the revenues increased more than 110.72 percent, the number of pieces handled increased 64.70 percent, the weight of the mails increased more than 104.73 percent while the increase in the number of employees was less than 48.43 percent.

About 96 percent of all expenditures in the operation of the postal service is for salaries and transportation costs. We in the Department have no control over either. Salaries are fixed by the Congress, and transportation rates are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The remaining 4 percent of expenditures covers rentals, equipment, supplies, and miscellaneous costs.

The additional cost for increased salaries provided for by law since July 1, 1945, approximates \$740,000,000. Additional costs for transportation of mail by rail and by air since July 1, 1945, approximate \$125,000,000. These and other increased costs in rental for post-office quarters and cost for equipment and supplies have brought our total additional annual expenses since July 1, 1945, to the amazing sum of approximately \$900,000,000.

There has been a great increase in the mailing of newspapers and magazines, generally referred to as second-class mail, and of advertising matter, generally referred to as third-class mail. There has also been a great increase in the volume of fourth-class mail (parcel post) due to increases in express rates.

Our paramount problem today lies in the handling of this great volume of mail with a lack of proper facilities. In all of the large centers of the country, and to a lesser extent in the smaller cities, there is a lack of workroom space, of platform space, of railroad terminal facilities, and of adequate transportation facilities.

Briefly stated, the revenues, expenditures, and operating deficit expressed in even dollars and stated on an accrual basis for the fiscal year 1949 are as follows:

Audited revenues.....	\$1,571,851,202
Audited expenditures.....	2,149,322,128
Less payments for prior years.....	147,013,101
Payments for 1949....	2,002,309,027
Add unpaid obligations for 1949.....	120,671,703
Payments and unpaid obligations for 1949.....	2,122,980,730
Operating deficit.....	551,129,528

The revenues derived from postage on first-class matter have been sufficient to pay the cost of handling, and the income from the postal-savings system has been sufficient to pay for its maintenance. On all other classes of mail and on all other services rendered by the Department, the revenues fall far short of the cost of handling.

I have repeatedly recommended an upward revision of the rate structure. Legislation providing for limited increases in rates is now before the Congress. However, the increases established in the legislation now pending, if approved, will be wholly insufficient to make up a deficit of \$551,000,000.

Regardless of the causes of the deficiency and the suggested remedies for eliminating the major portion of such loss, the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress are naturally influenced by this factor when determining the amounts to be appropriated each year for the operation of the postal service. This item is a part of the over-all deficit in the national budget, and when it amounts to more than one-half billion dollars, it represents a substantial part of that deficit.

The Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives in its report of March 21, 1950 (Rept. No. 1797), on the general appropriation bill for 1951, with particular reference to the appropriation for the Post Office Department, stated:

"The volume of mail handled has continued to rise through the year 1950, and the Department estimates a continued rise in 1951. However, the committee feels that the amount allowed in this bill should suffice to operate the Department through the fiscal year 1951 except in cases where increased costs may subsequently occur due to legislative or regulatory action beyond the control of the Post Office Department, and in those cases the committee must insist that every possible effort be made by the De-

partment to absorb additional costs of this nature.

"The Post Office Department has made some progress in the past year in handling an additional workload with fewer employees. It should be pointed out for the first time in modern history the Post Office Department contemplates a reduction in the number of employees on its rolls. At the end of the fiscal year 1950, the Department anticipates having 504,755 employees as compared with 517,690 at the close of the fiscal year 1949. The committee believes that there is considerable room for further improvement in the operations of the postal service from a budgetary standpoint, even though there may still be a slight increase in the volume of postal operations.

"The committee has discussed with the Postmaster General certain proposals for effecting economies, and realizes that probably all of the suggestions made will provoke some complaints from one source or another. Nevertheless the financial condition of the United States Treasury is such that every step possible must be taken to save money.

"The committee believes that sizable savings could be made by a reduction of the number of deliveries per day to many areas, particularly on those routes serving residential areas exclusively. Residential areas receive from one to three deliveries a day; rural patrons receive one delivery a day. The committee urges the Postmaster General to provide for the rearrangement of city delivery service so as to reduce the number of deliveries wherever possible."

The Committee on Appropriations recommended the following amounts for the postal service for the fiscal year 1951:

General administration.....	\$16,000,000
Postal operations.....	1,786,000,000
Transportation of mails.....	400,000,000
Claims.....	5,500,000

Total, fiscal year 1951... 2,207,500,000

The actual expenditures for the fiscal year 1950 will be more than \$2,240,000,000.

With respect to postal operations, the Committee on Appropriations stated:

"The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,786,000,000, a reduction of \$24,921,000 in the amount of the estimate. This amount should suffice to render adequate service without requiring the Department to come in later for deficiency requests. This appropriation contains items that were formerly scattered through 31 other titles, and its adoption should considerably lessen the administrative work of the Department. It covers the operations of all local post offices, including salaries, rent, supplies, equipment, and local transportation and delivery of mail."

There is constant pressure from many sources for reductions in the cost of the postal service in order to grant relief to the taxpayers who are called upon to make up from general taxation the difference between our revenues and our expenses. Therefore, in view of the fact that the funds available for the remainder of the current fiscal year, and the anticipated appropriations for the next fiscal year, are not sufficient to permit the continuance of our present service standards, it is necessary to direct a readjustment of our services.

The readjustments, which will be outlined in special orders issued by the operating bureaus, are calculated to meet the reasonable requirements of business and the reasonable requirements of our citizens for service to their homes. Every effort should be made to maintain to the fullest extent possible the existing high-speed service in the handling of air mail, first-class mail, and daily newspapers and to restrict the expenditures for the handling of the low revenue-producing mails and service to daylight hours and to shorter periods. In many in-

stances, this will eliminate premium payments to employees for night work.

General notice should be given to the public immediately that steps will be taken to readjust the delivery schedules providing service to their homes. Postmasters should be careful to explain that while the Department appreciates that all citizens would prefer to have deliveries of mail made to their places of residence during the early morning hours, the necessity to prescribe one delivery to all strictly residential areas makes it impossible to grant this convenience. A large percentage of the patrons will receive mail at their homes in the afternoon under the one-trip delivery arrangement.

Postmasters should also give ample notice to the public, particularly to the large users of the mails, of changes in service schedules affecting window service and the hours during which low revenue-producing mails will be accepted in the post office. Thirty days, notice should be given of such changes in order that the citizens generally and business organizations may arrange to accommodate their operations to the new post-office schedules.

Now, I wish to refer to a statement by the Postmaster General. It was given to me by him on August 11, 1950, last Friday, and he advised me that I could put it in the RECORD, because it is the truth and the whole truth about this situation. It shows that 85 percent of all mail in residential areas is and always has been delivered on the first trip. It shows that there will be a savings of \$70,000,000 per year as a result of the order and that the Postmaster General has received hundreds upon hundreds of letters commending him for the order.

What were the conditions during World War II? Seventy-five percent of the residential areas had only one delivery a day at one period or another during World War II because of the shortage of manpower. Did you hear any complaint or criticism about that? Not one word.

What is the further situation today? Over one-half of the people today have no delivery at all or only one delivery of mail a day or one delivery every other day. In only about 11 percent of the post offices do we have city mail delivery service. There are over 23,000,000 people who live in towns who have to walk to the post office to get their mail because there is no city delivery. There are over 32,000,000 people who live on rural routes and star routes who get their mail every day or every other day, because in a great many areas there is only triweekly rural delivery service. There are 5,000 city carriers who give only one delivery a day. They serve about 6,000,000 people. So, Mr. Chairman, over half of the people already have either no city delivery or only one delivery or less a day.

Now, let us see whether this order is wise, whether it is economical. The order is not causing any complaint from the general public; all the complaints you get are inspired by propaganda and by pressure from the National Association of Letter Carriers.

What does this order do about saving money? The statement from the Postmaster General says this order will save \$70,000,000.

Do you know that over 85 percent of the mail is delivered in the first delivery and that heretofore when you had two deliveries in the residential areas the only material practically delivered in the second delivery in the afternoon consisted of circular mail, third- and fourth-class mail?

Mr. Chairman, there has not been a single classified civil-service regular or substitute employee who has lost his job as a result of this order; the only ones who have been affected are temporary employees who have no civil-service status and who have no regular employment or regular hours.

Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Members, at this point I set forth in full the statement of the Postmaster General of August 11, 1950:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,  
Washington, D. C.

Subject: H. R. 8195.

On April 17, 1950, I promulgated an order, No. 42946, which was directed to postmasters, all field postal officials, and employees, on readjustment of postal service.

This order contained instructions to make readjustments of certain postal activities to become effective on or before July 1, 1950, which is estimated to reduce postal expenditures by approximately \$70,000,000 on an annual basis. It directed that postmasters should give ample notice to the public concerning these service changes in order that all patrons could be advised and could adjust their transactions with the postal service on that basis.

There was no public dissemination of this order. It was printed in the Postal Bulletin which is distributed to all post offices throughout the country. Within 48 hours after the order was published in the Postal Bulletin, a campaign was started by the national officers of one postal group in an effort to defeat the program for economy in the operation of the postal service. Much misrepresentation was made concerning the effect of this order. The dissemination of these misrepresentations, through bulletins and on the radio, was evidently calculated to mislead the public into believing that their postal service would be seriously impaired. It was urged that the public make complaints to Members of Congress and, no doubt, many complaints were received by Members of Congress as a result of this campaign of misrepresentation, even before service adjustments had been made at any post office in the country.

As a result of this, resolutions were introduced in the House to require the Postmaster General to revoke this order and to restore the postal service to its status prior to the issuance of the order. Most or all of these resolutions were introduced before the service changes had been made in the larger post offices throughout the country. H. R. 8195, in effect, directs that my order of April 17, 1950, be revoked.

Practically all of the complaints that were made to Members of Congress and to the Post Office Department contained objections to the reduction of carrier deliveries in residential sections of cities from two to one per day. Of the complaints received in the Post Office Department concerning the reduction in the number of delivery trips to residential areas, approximately 99 percent were obviously provoked and came from persons and from offices where such delivery service had not been reduced at the time the complaint was made. Other complaints that were made after the service had been adjusted did not show that any particular harm had been done to the complainant, or that a vital or necessary postal service had been withdrawn from the patron. The unpro-

oked complaints have been very few in number and it is indicative of the fact that some patrons of the postal service have become so used to taking everything for granted, that they protest at the first sign of what seems to be an invasion of their rights and privileges and which so often is no more serious than a slight inconvenience.

On the other hand, I have received hundreds upon hundreds of commendatory letters from business people and from housewives residing in residential areas who feel that there is necessity for reducing expenditures that are not considered essential or vital in the interest of national economy. These commendatory letters were received prior to the invasion of the Republic of Korea and since that invasion it is all the more imperative that the savings be made in the operation of the postal service where this can be done without seriously impairing essential service to the public. I do not consider that the service curtailments ordered by me under date of April 17 have taken from the patrons of the postal service any essential service, and I feel that they should cooperate in accepting a little less of this non-essential service in the interest of the taxpayer.

On an average 85 percent of all mail is and always has been delivered on the first trip in residential areas.

There are 41,464 post offices in the United States and its possessions, and city-delivery service has been inaugurated at 4,651 post offices. Therefore, there are 36,813 post offices where no city-delivery service is performed. The total population of these communities where no city-delivery service has been established is approximately 23,000,000 and these patrons must call at the post office to get their mail. The rural delivery and star-route service delivers mail to another 32,000,000 people. There is a maximum of one delivery each weekday to these patrons and in many cases the delivery service is on a triweekly basis. There are approximately 5,000 city-delivery routes served by mounted carriers where only one delivery per day has been provided. They serve a population of approximately 6,000,000 people.

Many people living in suburban areas have no delivery service because the particular subdivisions do not meet delivery requirements. They must go to post offices or stations of post offices to obtain their mail. In addition to this, there are countless numbers of patrons who obtain their service through post-office boxes and are, therefore, not affected by this order. Practically half of the population of this country either has no delivery service or has been receiving delivery not more frequently than once a day.

With the exception of eliminating one trip on Saturdays, there has been no reduction in the delivery of business districts. It must be remembered that we serve the business districts three times a day, and in addition to this serve their residences once each day, and prior to the service curtailments had been serving their residences twice each day.

There are approximately 90,000 regular carriers and not more than 60 percent of the carriers serve residential areas. The other carriers are assigned to delivery service in business areas, to the collection service, and to the delivery of parcel post. The service adjustments do not adversely affect any civil service regular postal employee. No classified substitute employee was or will be dismissed from the service incident to these service readjustments. The Department did have on the rolls thousands of temporary or part-time employees who have no civil-service status and who are employed on a temporary basis and who knew at the time of accepting their employment that such was on a temporary basis. Therefore, the order will in no way, so far as security of position is concerned, affect postal employees with full civil-service status but it has resulted

in taking from our rolls temporary or part-time employees.

These service adjustments have been in effect now for more than 30 days and communications from postmasters throughout the country clearly indicate that such adjustments meet with the approval of a vast majority of the patrons and that there have been no serious impairments of the postal service rendered the public. Since these service adjustments have been placed into effect, the complaints have been practically nil.

These service readjustments are in effect throughout the country and a sizable sum of money will be saved without seriously impairing the service to the public. It is more apparent now than ever that no action should be taken to prevent the saving of millions of dollars, especially at a time when Congress will be called upon to appropriate billions of dollars in the interest of our national defense.

J. M. DONALDSON,  
Postmaster General.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the Members to give this matter their serious consideration. Just because a Member signed the discharge petition does not obligate him to vote for this bill. One hundred and twenty Members who signed the discharge petition voted for the Taber-Thomas amendment reducing the appropriations for nondefense agencies by 10 percent to the omnibus appropriation bill. I voted for that amendment and I am proud I did. This is the first test in the House for Members who stand for economy in expenditures of nondefense agencies since the Korean war. Now I am going to ask for a "yea" and "nay" vote on this bill. I want the Members to stand up and be counted; I want everyone to go on record. You will find out when you vote for this bill that the people back home, the taxpayers, will be looking at your record and will be thinking about your vote and will consider it in November, in my opinion. Can any Member tell me how with any sense of justice, fairness, and economy he can vote against a sound order to save \$70,000,000? Such an attitude I cannot understand.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I refuse to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield I will tell him.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I refuse to yield, I do not have the time to yield to anyone.

Are you going to substitute your judgment for that of the Postmaster General on the administrative operations of the Post Office Department? Oh, I have never seen so many experts on postal matters and operations as I have seen today in this House. Mr. Chairman, to my mind, we have the greatest, the ablest, the most efficient Postmaster General in the history of our country. He is a career employee; he has served the postal service of 42 years. He started out as a letter carrier, and he worked as a clerk, as an inspector, as Chief Inspector, as First Assistant Postmaster General, and now as Postmaster General. He knows the service from every angle; he knows what he is doing; he knows that this economy order is not crippling any essential mail service today. So I appeal

to the Members to give this matter their careful consideration and then vote for economy. I have every confidence and trust in the wisdom, the good judgment, and the fairness of our distinguished and capable Postmaster General.

Let me say this to you, I expected some of my liberal friends on the right in my own Democratic Party to sign this discharge petition and vote for this bill because liberals are always liberal with the taxpayers' money, but I was surprised and disappointed to find so many of my friends on the left, you have been howling and screaming to the mountain tops and who are supporting this bill today. It was a great shock to me. Why, my friends on the left, you have been howling and screaming to the mountain tops about economy, about bureaucrats, about cutting down expenditures—I had expected that you would stand as firm and strong as the Rock of Gibraltar behind this order saving \$70,000,000.

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

Mr. RICH. Who is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I am talking about those who are supporting the bill today, who have howled and screamed heretofore for economy and yet now when they have a chance and an opportunity to vote for economy in a nondefense agency they will not back up the order of the Postmaster General in the interest of economy. I appeal to them to stand by this order which will save \$70,000,000. I think it is high time that my friends on my right and my left vote for economy in nondefense departments just like they talk.

Mr. Chairman, you may think it is all right to go ahead and vote for this bill because the National Association of Letter Carriers wants it. You may say that the people back home are indifferent about this and that they do not care about saving \$70,000,000 by this order but, Mr. Chairman, the people back home are waking up. They want their money spent for efficient and economical operations of the Government. They are willing to pay higher taxes for the conduct of the war; they are willing to bear the necessary burdens and make the sacrifices to win the war, but they are against the reckless expenditure of money in our nondefense, nonmilitary establishments. So am I. I for one am ready to cut to the bone all nondefense expenditures in our Government today but I am ready, eager, and willing to vote for any appropriation necessary for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Chairman, this is a real test today on whether or not you favor economy. Why, it is said that this order of the Postmaster General will impede the war effort. That is poppycock. It has nothing to do with the war effort. The Postmaster General is right. We know he is right. Let us back him up. What business has Congress trying to take over the administrative responsibilities of the Postmaster General?

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand hundreds and hundreds of letters that have been sent commending the Postmaster General for his bold, courageous stand in favor of economy. These let-

ters were given to me by the Postmaster General. This is but a few of the letters that the Postmaster General has received. I wish I had the opportunity and time to read each one of them. These letters come from taxpayers all over the United States. They praise him to the sky and say: "We are for you because you had the intestinal fortitude to try to save money for our Government."

The Post Office Department has a deficit of \$551,000,000 for the past fiscal year. Are you going to say: "Mr. Postmaster General we know you are right, yet at the same time because some special group asked us to vote for this bill rescinding the order, we are not going along with you." I hope you will vote this bill down.

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

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in the hope that I may shed a little light rather than heat on this matter. I feel we should look at the facts.

The facts are that if some of the champions of economy, from whom we have heard today, had put through the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service the legislation recommended to it by the Hoover Commission we would have reduced the cost of operating the Post Office Department, we would have eliminated most of the Department's deficit, its cost of operation would have been reduced by about \$256,000,000 a year directly and, if they had put through the Hoover Commission legislation and modernized the Post Office Department, we could have saved a great deal more money and obtained more efficiency in the postal service.

The facts are the reduction in post-office service was made before the Korean situation developed.

The facts are that the Congress of the United States appropriated more money for bullets than have been spent by the national defense for bullets.

The facts are that the Post Office Department, the one agency of Government that renders the greatest service to the people, should not be the only agency of the Government which is expected to operate in the black. There is the Department of Agriculture, for instance, and I represent a great agricultural district, wherein about 88 percent of its cost is borne by the taxpayer.

The facts are, of course, if you want to get down to facts, that this order was put in effect last April or May, and if the Congress does not do anything about it—I am rather reliably informed it is the plan of the administration to rescind the order before the November election. So why kid yourselves and talk about the people on the left-hand side of the aisle?

The facts are that if they would quit paying post-office funds out for unwarranted subsidies to the airlines they would not have such a big deficit.

The facts are if they would require penalty mail to bear its fair proportion of the cost of operating the Post Office

Department, they would not have such a big deficit.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The facts are that the substantial cut in the appropriation for the Post Office Department for 1951 was made by the executive establishment—the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. CANFIELD. To the amount of \$42,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is entirely correct.

Mr. CANFIELD. And only \$28,000,000 by the Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The facts are that this reduction in postal service to the people was ordered after the Budget Bureau and the House of Representatives refused to give to the Post Office Department, or the Postmaster General, all the appropriations wanted for the fiscal year beginning last July 1, and had no effect whatsoever on the fiscal year ending last June 30, the year in which the cuts were made.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio is the last man that I would have expected to take the position which he has just expressed on this floor. The gentleman sometimes plays politics for fun. But, this is not fun; this is serious business. Here this House is in the act of, in effect, creating new jobs to do unessential work that costs the Government \$70,000,000. Mr. Chairman, the membership of this House should be ashamed of itself for playing politics on a matter of this nature here at a time when the country is confronted with a foe that threatens to dominate the world.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the facts are that the signers of this petition are 133 Democrats, 84 Republicans, and 1 American Labor Party for a total of 218 Members of the House. But, I do not like to be accused by anybody here of being one of those fellows who is interested in trying to keep this country from doing its duty at any time, whether it is because of the Korean situation or because it is a matter of politics. I think the opposition to this bill has been brought about because the administration does not want it. This is a squandering and spending administration. This ruling of the Postmaster General is a mighty poor ruling for economy. But, that is not the reason I am opposed to this legislation. I am opposed to this legislation just because it is going to require the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Doughton] to raise a whole lot more money to carry on this Government, unless we stop some of the spending that is going on. You know, they have got a lot of dollars, the dollars that they took away from us a year ago, and

that is the gold that they would not allow us to have, and I am going to give Mr. DOUGHTON the imitation gold dollars to help pay the national debt. We are \$550,000,000 in the red in running the Post Office Department. Natural for the Democrats. I want to see the Post Office Department put on a good, sound basis, and the only way to do it is that every time you get an opportunity to save, economize, and if the Postmaster General sees fit to cut out deliveries, that is up to him; he directs the Post Office Department. I am not in sympathy generally with the idea of the Postmaster General. The civil service in the Post Office Department is a farce, but I believe the thing is so serious in this country that I am going to do my duty whether I believe that the Postmaster General is doing a good job here or not.

The fact of the matter is, as was said here a while ago, the boys at the front do not get one mail a day, and they are sacrificing their lives to win a war that the President says we are not in. But, what we to do? We are to economize every place we can, and the only way to economize is to eliminate a lot of unnecessary spending. So, I believe that while a lot of people would like to have two mails a day they can forego that now, and I want them to forego it. Naturally, I think that they would like to have two mails a day, and a lot of these post-office employees would like to have their jobs. My gracious, a lot of fellows would like to have jobs. The Post Office Department does not need to take them on now. So, let us economize to the extent that we are going to try to save the jobs and let them go out in some other branch of employment in this country, whether it be in business or agriculture, and work. I want to tell you, the great trouble with this country now is that people do not want to work; they want make-believe jobs so that they do not have to work. They want Government subsidies, they want something for nothing, and I am against that, because I believe in work.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. How many deliveries to your office have been cut? Why did not the Postmaster General cut the deliveries to Members of Congress?

Mr. RICH. Well, he can cut all the deliveries to the Members of Congress and we would be a whole lot better off if we did not get so much mail. We do a lot of things that we are honestly convinced we ought to do rather than do something because we have a lot of mail from people back home, that a lot of these post-office employees that are lobbying around here are trying to get us to do. And, if there is any lobbying in this country that ought to be sat upon it is this post-office lobby. I think they are a bunch of fellows that do not want anything but something for themselves. They do not care what the cost. They do not care how much we go in debt. The post-office lobby is strong, it is a lobby for anything they can get, and get it they will by coercion, by intimidation,

or by any method at their command. They are well paid and have good permanent jobs. If the Government goes broke they have a great part to that end. Let me tell you what the predictions were for the Department many years ago.

One hundred years ago Charles A. Dana, famous journalist and later editor of the New York Sun, writing of the general post office in Washington, called attention to the evils which might arise over a course of years. At that time he wrote in part:

Indeed, no man, who is not blind to what passes before every eye, can fail to perceive the degree of influence which the Post Office Department already has in every canvass, nor how keen is the stimulus which partisans find in the hope of keeping or obtaining possession of its patronage. If the pernicious tendency of centralization as exhibited in this Department and that of the custom-house, is balanced and overcome by the influence of other more democratic institutions, it is certainly strong enough and active enough to cause serious anxiety to the thoughtful patriot. With so great a number of offices in the gift of the Federal Executive and with the habit of turning out political opponents from all places, lowest as well as highest, in order to make way for political friends on every change in the party hue of the administration, there has arisen a large body of men whose business is the pursuit of office, gamblers in politics, speculators in principle, seeking the triumph of this or that party solely for the sake of the public spoils, and at the easy sacrifice of every consideration of the public welfare. Thus a large amount of profligacy and corruption is kept in existence and exercises a baneful influence upon the political morality of the land, while the public service suffers from frequent changes in its agents, no degree of capacity or experience being secure against proscription. As a remedy against these growing evils of Executive influence in the elections and these pretorian bands of office seekers and jobbers, it has been proposed to render the office of postmaster elective by the people of each locality. This reform would strike at the very root of the evil, for it would make the place dependent on capacity and the esteem of the aspirant's acquaintances and fellow citizens, and not on the favor of a distant official, looking for a shrewd political agent or bent on rewarding some political service quite as much as on securing an honest and efficient discharge of public duty.

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

Mr. RICH. My time has expired, but I am against this bill at this time, in this manner, for the best interest of country and people.

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

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my very good and able friend, ROBERT RICH; however, I expect to vote for this bill.

I did want to comment on some of the remarks made about politics—politics. Well now, really, is not that a laugh, because some of the people who have been talking about politics, when their own backyard is affected, are certainly right on the ball to get a bill through. I want to call to the attention of the House that there was \$2,222,000,000 in counterpart funds unexpended in the ECA as of December 31, 1949. But many of these same gentlemen voted \$3,100,000,000

more, which gives ECA \$5,300,000,000 for this coming year. I also want to call to the attention of the House that we have between four billion and four billion seven hundred and fifty million dollars tied up in surplus foods, why we do not have places to store those surplus foods, which we have already purchased yet another \$2,000,000,000 was voted to buy more foodstuff, but when it comes to looking after our own backyard, and our own people, then we find these same gentlemen condemning any legislation that will be beneficial to all of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for the bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CROOK] 5 minutes.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful that we here in America do not have to have all our consciences molded over the same last. I believe we will get further in this question were we to temper ourselves a bit and get away from some of the animosity and be realistic in the matter.

Mr. Chairman, we in the large metropolitan and industrial centers, where we work around the clock 24 hours per day, have had a gross injustice rendered by the cutback in postal service. This reduction in postal service was encouraged by the failure of this Congress to make adequate appropriation to provide the usual service we have been privileged for many years, and it was wrapped in what some Members called economy, but it has been false economy.

The lifeblood of industry, business, and commerce has been sadly impaired by such action. Now certain advocates proclaim the Korean war makes it essential that we not return to our normal mail service. Such argument is as full of holes as a sieve.

If there were ever a time that mail delivery should be expedited, it is in time of war and grave emergencies. The war situation is just a poor alibi. Concerted efforts by the apostles of the economy drive hung a crepe on the Post Office Department and postal service long before the ruthless aggressors launched their campaign in Korea. This is an unadulterated fact, and no one can truthfully deny it.

In this age of speed, when man outflies the eagle, mail is flown across the skies at terrific speed for quick delivery in the channels of commerce, industry, and business, only to meet with horse-and-buggy age delivery on the ground. What a sordid vanity fair, my friends. Long years of neglect in building adequate post offices to provide facilities conducive to handling the mails in our fast-growing municipalities pyramid our difficulties. Many of our post offices, for lack of space, have grown constipated with the stacks of mail, working conditions made almost impossible, and letter carriers denied the privilege of living like other people, can frequently be seen eating their dinner on a street curbstone.

Postal delivery was given inception to render a service for the dissemination of information, and, as we all know, service costs money. The sources of revenue

for such service are either appropriation or established rates on the various classes of mail delivered. Frankly, I wish to say that some users of the mail have never met their proportional cost of the service rendered them, and, too frequently, they have been the first to criticize the deficit in the Post Office Department.

Whenever the Congress is willing to appropriate money for the subsidies allowed the airlines, railroads, and the cost of that portion of floor space in Federal buildings not used by the post office branches, instead of charging it against the Post Office Department, and every person, firm, or corporation is willing to pay his or its fair share of postal rates, there will be no deficit in the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department is the most decentralized agency of Government; it is about the most efficiently operated, and every employee thereof renders very efficient service, despite the conditions under which he is compelled to work. Every home in America is the beneficiary of the letter carriers' dedicated and determined efforts to render commendable service.

I am an advocate of economy in Government, but not false economy as we now have in reduced postal service. The many coauthors of legislation to restore our normal postal services, and all the Members of this Congress that signed the discharge petition to liberate this measure, H. R. 8195, from the Rules Committee, in the absence of malice toward none, propose to stop nothing short of restoration of our former postal service for our American people and the economy of our Nation. To cripple our long-established postal service in this modern age of speed is highly unjustifiable and just does not make sense.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, in taking a position against H. R. 8195, I do so not against our faithful employees of the postal service, but because I feel that if we are really interested, as Members of Congress, in economy, this is one way by which we may proceed in a very sound way and not injure anyone. My support of the postal employees will show that I have at all times supported all legislation to promote their welfare.

May I state, Mr. Chairman, that I took it upon myself to write 8 of the first-class offices in various sections within the 12 counties of my congressional district to get the reaction of the postmasters on the Postmaster General's order, feeling that these postmasters were in the best position to say whether the Postmaster General was right in his action. I am going to give you the benefit of some of the replies I have received. All of them are similar.

From this letter, dated July 7, 1950, I quote:

My frank opinion is that the patrons in residential sections are satisfied with one delivery each day, as I have had no complaints at all so far. We still have two deliveries per day in business sections.

This letter is dated June 17, 1950:

My personal opinion of the matter is that the carriers are not put to any undue hardships, and the residential areas are getting one complete delivery a day and the business sections are getting two. In the past, I think probably some of the residential areas only got but one delivery a day.

At the present time this office is saving approximately \$80 a week under the new set-up.

Here is another letter dated July 15, 1950:

I wish to advise that I have had complaints from three patrons regarding the curtailment of delivery service at my office.

This postmaster writes under date of July 18, 1950:

The reaction of the patrons of this office to the Postmaster General's order curtailing delivery service has been very favorable. Not a single complaint has been filed protesting the single delivery in the residential sections served by the carriers.

If we continue the present arrangement, the annual saving should be about \$2,000 to \$2,200.

A complete analysis of these letters from postmasters in seven first-class offices in my district, and I contend that they would be representative of the entire country, would represent an average annual savings of approximately \$2,000 per year in every first-class post office throughout the country. I feel that in opposing this bill I am voting in the interest of the post-office service as well as the postal employees.

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

Mr. DEANE. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wonder if the gentleman knows that throughout the country the postmasters have an association, and many weeks ago they met and agreed, practically unanimously, to support the edict of the Postmaster General?

Mr. DEANE. I wonder if I may reply to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] if this action did not follow the pressure from organizations urging the postmasters to take such position. I am advised, I might state to the gentleman, that one State association after another has gone on record approving the action of the Postmaster General.

I feel from the direct replies from the individual postmasters such as I have, that if each Member of Congress would write to their own particular districts, they would determine that the replies that I have received are representative of the entire country.

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

Mr. DEANE. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. I am advised that we pay \$160,000,000 in subsidies to newspapers and other publishers. If that is true, we could take away some of that subsidy and restore this service at no additional cost.

Mr. DEANE. The gentleman, of course, is making a sound statement. Furthermore, the other body should proceed to act upon the postage rate increase bill. It seems that the Postmaster General is being criticized for actions that the Congress itself should take. I admire the Postmaster General for taking the position he did.

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

Mr. DEANE. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Does the gentleman know that a great many of the signers of the discharge petition voted to recommit the bill, to increase rates to make this very service self-sustaining, just recently?

Mr. DEANE. That is true. I recall also, Mr. Chairman, that the Bureau of the Budget cut the Post Office budget as submitted by Postmaster General Donaldson in the amount of \$42,000,000. In turn, the House followed the recommendation of the Appropriation Committee and cut the Post Office Department budget by another \$28,000,000; then followed the Thomas-Taber amendment representing another cut in the Post Office Department budget by \$200,000,000. That means, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee that the Postmaster General was directed by this House to operate on a budget for the coming fiscal year with a budget of \$270,000,000 less than for the fiscal year ending June 1950, and despite greatly increased services which we Members have and continue to demand.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we are not dealing fair with one of the most sincere and able gentlemen that has ever served as Postmaster General and I trust that he will stand firm on the position that he has taken.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCKLEY].

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, while we realize, of course, that there is a great economy drive on, yet I do not believe that it should be practiced solely on the postal service. In some sense of the word probably the Postal Committee is to blame for not raising the rates on mail-order houses such as Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward, of Chicago. Those people operate for a profit, and they are making millions and millions of dollars at the cost of the poor, underclad, and undershod letter carrier.

I resent very much some of the remarks that our chairman made about Bill Doherty. I think he is a fine, capable, and distinguished gentleman; I think that his work for the letter carriers has been effective, and I think that they have secured some of the things to which they are entitled as a result of his great efforts. I believe that we should pick up the burden in our committee and raise the rates to where they belong.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois on the statement that he has just made about Bill Doherty. Bill Doherty is a fine, upstanding American citizen fitted in all respects to lead the postal employees he so ably represents. He understands how to properly intercede for them under our Constitution and laws.

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

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish the gentleman would say just about a word about all

this talk of this bill being at the instigation of the post-office employees. It is all nonsense. I have not had more mail on any issue than I have had on this petition to rescind the curtailment of deliveries, and it has come from the rank and file of the people back home, general protests.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I wish to commend the gentleman for what he said about Mr. Doherty and I also want to say that if it were not for these post-office employee organizations who would speak for the postal employees? Certainly not a lot of Members on the floor of this House.

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. The great corporations of this country have their lawyers, their superintendents, their foremen, and they are all well-organized, but when it comes to somebody speaking a decent and civil word for the laboring man his championship often seems unwelcomed; I do not think it is fair, and I know it is not square, and I know it is not right. I think that the labor organizations of this country should and will be recommended by people who know what they have done. We do not like this talk about the leaders of these labor organizations; they are decent, honorable gentlemen; they represent the people of their organizations the way they should be represented. I have the highest respect for the organizers of the letter carriers. It is the greatest and most efficient part of our Government. I say that Bill Doherty and all of his men deserve the highest honor and the greatest respect.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas yield to me briefly for an observation?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman. I am going to vote for this bill. We had two deliveries of mail a day in Brooklyn before the turn of the century, before I was born. Since the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] injected the word "politics" when he spoke a few moments ago, and since, of course, I very seldom get into political debates on this floor, I should like to call attention to some hocus-pocus that has been going on here this afternoon. You have the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] getting up here today and talking favorably on the bill now before the House which affects only the temporary or extra employees of the Post Office Department. Yet on the 10th day of May of this year on roll call No. 161, the Jensen amendment to the omnibus appropriation bill—do you remember? Our friends from the other

side of the aisle voted to cut 1 out of every 10 of the permanent employees from the rolls of the Post Office Department. Is that not double talk?

Mr. GOSSETT. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I am continually amazed at so many of my Republican colleagues who talk one way and vote another way. I am going to be interested in observing how some of the so-called Republican leaders vote on this bill.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If the gentleman will refer to the roll call of yesterday he will find out how the Republican leaders voted on it.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, there is more involved in this bill than \$70,000,000. There is a principle involved that is as fundamental as Americanism itself. During the 12 years I have been in the Congress we have damned and cursed bureaucrats because they refused to economize or to be efficient in their departments. Now, the first time one has the courage to stand up and invoke efficiency and promote economy we turn around and try to kick him in the pants.

If you believe in economy you will vote against this bill. If you believe in efficiency you will vote against this bill. If you believe in the integrity of the American Congress you will vote against the bill. If you want to reduce the size and cost of the Federal Government you will vote against this bill. A vote for this bill is a complete surrender to a short-sighted, selfish, minority pressure group, or to its assumed bosses, to wit, the National Association of Letter Carriers.

Let me tell you how our potential enemies intend to destroy this country. It is through infiltration and the dissipation of our economic strength. They work for a breakdown of the home front which will inevitably occur if we continue to live beyond our means. Our enemies are counting on our moral bankruptcy and our economic ruin making us ripe for defeat. If we continue to encourage the growth of bureaucracy, if we pass such bills as this, the day will come when we will be an easy prey to those who would destroy us. Here is the issue and I want you to listen, you folks who are hypocritical and demagoging on this thing. If you want to continue to demagogue and pussyfoot and compromise this country into a national graveyard, then, you go ahead and vote for such a bill as this. If we pass this sort of legislation we cannot ever again with good faith and good grace demand economy and efficiency in the executive branch of the Government. If this sort of legislation is to be our policy, we might just as well inscribe across the face of this civilization that inscription which Dante's Inferno wrote over the gates of hell: "Abandon hope, all ye who enter here."

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I suppose all of you have been deluged as I have been with protests occasioned by the issuing of the directive order by the Postmaster General severely curtailing delivery service throughout the United States. This directive order was as of April 18, 1950. The issuing of this order by the Postmaster General about-faces upon the traditional policy of our Government in not recognizing the fact that the Postal Department was established as a service department and that it was never intended to be operated upon a pay-as-you-go basis. The postal service should not be used as a revenue producing agency. It should be conducted as an organization for service only. There is no denying the fact that this great governmental agency has done more to develop this Nation than any one other governmental agency. Notwithstanding the known accomplishments of the Postal Department, the Postmaster General arbitrarily issued this sweeping and drastic order.

Now let us analyze how consistent the Postmaster General has been in dealing with the railroads who are, through mail contracts, given substantial mail subsidies when, as a matter of fact, they are paid for over 580,000,000 cubic-foot miles for transportation of the mails; when in reality, they carry a little over 300,000,000 cubic-foot miles of mails. In other words, a little over 55 percent of the space paid for by the Postal Department, is used. Probably the policy of the Postal Department is best illustrated by the testimony given by John Hardy, General Superintendent, Railway Mail Service, Post Office Department, under oath in the Georgia & Florida Railroad against United States Government case. I quote Mr. Hardy:

I might add that the most—probably the determining factor in my decision was the fact that the railroad company pleaded that we continue the service because of the financial benefits that were accruing to the railroad, and that has been one of the policies of the Department, that in considering any curtailment or discontinuance of rail service, is to first make inquiry of the railroad company as to what effect upon the finances of the operation of their railroad any such curtailment would have, and we are invariably governed in our decision by the plea of the railroad in response to our inquiry.

Mr. Hardy, in this declaration under oath, stated the policy of the Department relative to railway mail contracts; that the determining factor was the effect of the canceling or curtailing of the contracts upon the railroad company's finances. The question of whether or not the railroad company was giving dollar for dollar service was entirely secondary. Contrast that with the treatment given the public in the Postmaster General's order of April 18. Contrast the attitude of the Postmaster General and his method of procedure to the other heads of our important Government agencies. They do not contin-

ually come before the Congress with a theme song "We must do something to wipe out the deficit in our Department." The only Department of our Government that is asked to wipe out a deficit is the Postal Department.

Contrast the one-a-day delivery service being given mail users of this great Nation to the service rendered by postal officials in foreign countries. A survey of European countries indicates that all of these countries, despite their economic hardships, have been receiving two and three deliveries a day. The following table shows the results of this survey:

Country:	Number of deliveries per day
Belgium:	
Large cities .....	3
Smaller cities .....	2
Germany.....	2
Great Britain:	
London.....	3
Other cities.....	2
Holland.....	3
Ireland.....	3
Sweden:	
Stockholm.....	3
Other cities.....	2
Switzerland.....	2
Austria.....	2

Even in India, there are two deliveries per day. I would like to observe at this time that most of the countries mentioned in the above table have been and are receiving material help from the United States. It seems to me that there is, indeed, a great deal of irony in this situation.

The paper deficit of \$551,000,000 of the Postal Department has direct relationship to the directive order issued by the Postmaster General April 18. In reality, this deficit is fictitious and, as such, should not be taken seriously by Members considering the directive order. The truth of the matter is that the Postal Department renders innumerable services to the other departments of our Government for which it is not paid. In addition, the Postal Department in reality grants innumerable subsidies to airline companies and to railroads handling the mail, all of which is included in this so-called deficit. In 1930, legislation was passed—it was commonly known as the Kelly Act—which made it mandatory that the Postmaster General must report to the Comptroller General of the United States certain services. I am including in the RECORD at this point a letter from Mr. V. C. Burke, Acting Postmaster General, addressed to the Comptroller General of the United States, dated December 9, 1949, in which a few of the services are listed.

DECEMBER 9, 1949.

THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COMPTROLLER GENERAL: Pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 9, 1930 (39 U. S. C. 793), embodied in section 18.7, Postal Laws and Regulations of 1948, the amounts set forth below with respect to certain mailings during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949, as determined under our present system of estimating, are certified to you in order that they may be separately

classified on the books of the General Accounting Office:

(a) The estimated amount which would have been collected at regular rates of postage on matter mailed during the year by officers of the Government (other than those of the Post Office Department) under the penalty privilege, including registry fees:

Postage.....	\$54,209,127
Registry fees, including surcharges .....	21,951,827
Total .....	<u>76,160,954</u>

(b) The estimated amount which would have been collected at regular rates of postage on matter mailed during the year by—

1. Members of Congress under the franking privilege .....	1,027,692
2. By others under the franking privilege .....	53,588
Total .....	<u>1,081,280</u>

(c) The estimated amount which would have been collected during the year at regular rates of postage on publications going free in the county .....

803,695

(d) The estimated amount which would have been collected at regular rates of postage on matter mailed free to the blind during the year—

108,548

(e) The estimated difference between the postage revenue collected during the year on mailings of newspapers and periodicals published by and in the interests of religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, and fraternal organizations, and that which would have been collected at zone rates of postage .....

480,490

(f) The estimated excess during the year of the cost of aircraft service over the postage revenues derived from air mail—

41,483,696

Grand total..... 120,118,663

It has not been the practice to include in item (f) the total cost of handling and transporting air mail. Under the system of estimating which is the same as used in prior years, the cost of the items considered amount to \$132,910,908 for the fiscal year 1949. This estimate includes only payments to air carriers, personnel costs at air-mail field, and the extra transportation cost involved in getting mail to and from air-mail fields. Preliminary figures for the fiscal year 1949 indicate that the total cost of handling and transporting air mail, as determined by cost ascertainment procedure, amounted to \$164,552,000. The combined revenue from foreign and domestic air mail including air parcel post was \$91,427,212.

Sincerely yours,

V. C. BURKE,

Acting Postmaster General.

The large items are penalty mail, over \$76,000,000; franking privilege, over \$1,000,000; publications free in county, over \$800,000. More than \$108,000 on matter mailed free to the blind. Mail

on newspapers and periodicals and in the interests of religious, educational, scientific, and so forth, \$480,000. Estimated excess during the year of the cost of aircraft service, \$41,000,000, making a total of more than \$120,000,000 reported by the Postmaster General. For these services the postal department received no credit and the cost of the services are included in the \$551,000,000 deficit.

I want it distinctly understood that I do not criticize the services mentioned above and the costs of them but I do criticize the method of bookkeeping whereby the postal department is compelled to render these services gratis to the other departments of government. In addition to the above-mentioned services reported by the Postmaster General we have subsidies direct and indirect granted to the railroad companies and others. The estimates on the subsidies to railroad carriers vary from \$70,000,000 to \$100,000,000. It is conservative to say that the amount involved in these subsidies is a very considerable sum of money. In the items in the report and the mail subsidies, we have more than \$200,000,000. I am not in a position to say how much more is involved in other indirect subsidies.

I would suggest to the Members of this Congress that they read the testimony given by William Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate and likewise the testimony of Jerome J. Keating, secretary of the National Association of Letter Carriers before the Senate Finance Subcommittee. The testimony is a full and complete case intelligently presented.

I urge you, my colleagues, to vote for this rescinding measure because the directive order is doing a grave injustice to the mail users of the United States and, likewise, is manifestly unfair to a multitude of loyal postal employees.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I would like, if I could in the 5 minutes I have, to discuss with you the issue that is before this committee. I do not believe any of us have any monopoly on the desire to serve our country well or a monopoly on the patriotism that motivates our services here. But, I think there is an opportunity for the members of the committee to pause and reflect upon what you are attempting to do here. So many of us, when we talk about economy, as has been demonstrated here, want to talk about something that we have done somewhere else, or something that we could do tomorrow or should have done yesterday. But, the issue before us is how we are going to vote on this particular bill which it is estimated will cost in the neighborhood of \$70,000,000.

Now, let me say to you that in this bill you are not only ordering the Postmaster General to restore two deliveries a day,

but you are saying to him that you shall restore 16 other nonessential services he has ordered curtailed in order to save money. The truth of the matter is that the Members of this House brought about this situation when they voted for the appropriation bill. The Bureau of the Budget ordered a reduction of \$42,000,000, and this House ratified that action and upped it \$28,000,000 and said to the Postmaster General, "You shall spend \$70,000,000 less than you did the year before." Now what are you going to say to the Postmaster General? Are you going to say, "Oh, we did not intend for you to reduce services in our districts; we wanted you to cut where it did not hurt us." Now, that is what you are fixing to do with this bill. You are fixing to say to the Postmaster General, "Go out and restore the two mail deliveries a day where most of the votes are; restore the after-hours services, help the third- and fourth-class mail, which is causing the huge deficit in the postal service, and then let the taxpayers who receive none of the benefit of these nonessential services receive the benefit."

Let me say to you further, you are going to say to the Postmaster General, "Go out and reduce the services somewhere else," and those of you who have rural routes in your districts and fourth-class post offices, I want you to listen. The Postmaster General has no other recourse except to reduce the service in the fourth-class post offices and on rural routes, where the services are already limited.

Now, in a moment, I am going to offer a couple of amendments, and we will see whether or not we mean what we say. One amendment will provide that any action taken by the Postmaster General under this bill shall not reduce essential services in any other part of the Post Office Department, and the other amendment will authorize the appropriation of money to pay for it. Now, if you believe in this sort of thing, be honest and say, "All right, we are willing to appropriate \$70,000,000."

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear the gentleman say, as a member of the committee, he is going to offer this amendment. I had offered a similar amendment, and I shall support the gentleman's amendment because it is an honest approach. If we want this service, let us appropriate the money.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentleman.

When this situation arose, there was no emergency in Korea. I realize some Members may have made a commitment saying that we ought to restore these services. But back in my home town 2 weeks ago a company of marines were shipped to the California coast and they will soon leave for Korea. Those people back there are concerned why we are not busy providing allowances for their dependents and they are going to wonder why we are so concerned about restoring some services that are not needed in this time of stress. I firmly believe that we owe it to the people of this Nation to cut out every nonessential cost of this

Government. I know that the people who live in the district I am privileged to represent are willing to make every sacrifice necessary to preserve our economy and I believe that the people of America feel the same way.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I would like to put a question to the gentleman who preceded the gentleman now in the well of the House. Does he know why the Bureau of the Budget cut \$42,000,000 off the 1951 request? I will tell you why.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Oh, no; you asked me.

Mr. CANFIELD. Did the gentleman not refuse to yield to me a moment ago?

Mr. THORNBERRY. You asked me and I am going to answer—because the Bureau of the Budget decided on its responsibility that these services could be done without. And let me say to the gentleman that he ratified it and came in and cut it \$28,000,000 more.

Mr. CANFIELD. The testimony of Department officials before our subcommittee was that the Bureau of the Budget held they had overestimated their requirements for 1951.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota yield to me briefly?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman. A while ago in the short space of time I had to interpolate a word or so I overlooked mentioning the fact that an examination of roll call 161 on May 10, on the so-called Jensen amendment, which guts the Post Office Department permanently, reveals that there were only four gentlemen from across the aisle—and if I am incorrect in this statement, I would like to be corrected—there were only four gentlemen from across the aisle who voted against the Jensen amendment. Further, the same people across the aisle who today arise and so sanctimoniously say they favor this legislation all voted in favor of the Thomas-Taber amendment to the omnibus appropriation bill—and I think you understand what that would do to appropriations for the Post Office Department in the present fiscal year.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As long as the gentleman from Minnesota is so generous in yielding his time, I would like to point out—and I have the official figures in my hand—that it is true that \$42,000,000 was cut from the original budget request of the Post Office Department by the Bureau of the Budget, and the House of Representatives cut it \$28,107,000 more. Then the estimated cut of the Thomas-Taber amendment is \$200,000,000 and the estimated cut by the limitation of the post office rehiring under the Jensen amendment is \$125,000,000. So that is a total of \$395,000,000 cut off the original budget request of the Post Office Department, which is about 18 percent. If we want to be honest, and

if we want to restore this service, we will go as far as supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], and authorize to be appropriated such funds as are necessary. Then you can honestly vote for the bill.

But if we do not vote for the funds to authorize the services, then it is hypocritical to vote for the bill and not give them the money to pay for the services.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that I disturbed the equilibrium of my very distinguished friend from Brooklyn, whom I greatly admire, but the Jensen amendment has nothing to do with the legislation we are considering here today.

Mr. ROONEY. It does not? It does not concern the services to be rendered by the Post Office Department? I have heard enough from the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. This is an attempt to muddy up the waters and confuse the issue, and it is certainly out of order at this time.

Mr. ROONEY. I am terribly sorry that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania does not understand the situation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to clarify some of the debate that has taken place on this particular question. The contribution of the gentleman from California of course has helped me very much. I think the argument thus far shows very clearly the fallacy of both the Jensen amendment and the Taber amendment, particularly when we realize that as the Post Office Department does more business in second-, third-, and fourth-class mail, the deficit increases.

The same is true of the penny post card. Every time you send a penny post card in your campaign it costs the Government 1.7 cents, in addition to the one cent you pay.

I was somewhat disturbed about the willingness of the chairman of the committee to abdicate the responsibility of the committee. This action was never brought before the committee, except in the way of action to rescind the order of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General should have anticipated a problem of this kind and consulted with the entire committee. Whether he consulted with the chairman or not, I do not know.

I want to make one other observation in regard to the disposition of the general public. In my district, which is principally an urban district, the post-office employees have sent out a post card. I think it was fairly worded. They asked this simple question: Do you want the mail service restored? Out of nearly 750 replies there were less than 10 who say, according to my office count, that we should continue to curtail service. The other 740 say we should restore it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Mc-CARTHY] has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would like to take this time to comment on the Taber-Thomas and Jensen amendments. Those two amendments, as we all recall, provided for equalizing cuts for all Government agencies of the executive branch, with certain exceptions. Now then, should they become law, can anyone tell me why the single-revenue-producing agency, the Post Office Department, should have to undergo the handicap of an additional cut over and beyond? What we are attempting to do here is to prevent the Post Office Department from being singled out for cuts over and beyond those cuts given to any other agency.

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

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Chairman, the hundreds of letters I have received from individuals and business concerns protesting against the postal curtailment order of the Postmaster General compels me to add my voice to the many for placing postal deliveries back to normal. It is especially important with so many being called into the armed services that delivery be made twice daily and other services restored. Letters mean a lot to the mothers of the boys who are overseas and a day's difference may mean a good night's rest to millions of those mothers.

I do not feel that it has been expedient to cut back service in such a drastic manner. One service in the post office showing a profit is the first-class mail. The people who pay the price for first-class service are deserving of two deliveries a day. This means if the service is important enough to them to pay the additional cost and with first-class service showing a profit it is unfair to curtail these deliveries.

The public needs these so that it will not hamper the efficient operation of business. Whether it means a saving as referred to is a question. People tell me this is the most drastic and destructive order ever issued by the Post Office Department. The ideal of service has been eliminated.

The efficiency of the individual postal employee has been seriously impaired because he has entirely too much mail to handle. One trip routes are not efficient nor economical and are inhumane.

I do not hesitate to say that this order has demoralized the whole postal service and has caused the American people much concern.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana said at the beginning of this debate that there was no rhyme or reason to the curtailment

order of the Postmaster General. Let us look at that for a few moments to see whether there is any rhyme or reason to it.

The Post Office Department last year operated at a deficit of \$551,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations reduced the budget estimate of the Post Office Department and called on the Postmaster General to make cuts in the service. We endorsed that by passing the omnibus appropriation bill with this reduced appropriation. Then we demanded still further cuts by passing the Taber-Thomas amendment and the Jensen amendment. The Postmaster General found himself in the position of the housewife who was given money with which to buy hamburgers and was told she had to buy steaks.

Further complicating the Postmaster General's position and his problem, we passed H. R. 4495, which gave every postal employee a raise of from \$120 to \$420 per year, which added \$150,000,000 annually to the Postmaster General's headache. Not being content with this, the House has passed, over the President's veto, H. R. 87, which, if it is passed by the other body, would add another \$23,000,000 to the headache of the Postmaster General. To say that the Postmaster General had a practical problem is a masterpiece of understatement. What could he do? He either had to get more revenue or he had to cut down expenses. He first tried to get more money through the enactment of H. R. 2945. The House passed that bill which would give \$130,000,000 extra revenue to the Post Office Department.

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

Mr. HERLONG. Not at this time.

This would raise \$130,000,000 more for the Post Office Department. That legislation is bottled up in the other body at this time.

I might add that the bill only passed the House by a narrow margin, and that 79 of the number who signed this discharge petition No. 31 also voted to recommit that bill for added revenue for the Post Office Department. It does not seem likely at this late date that this additional revenue is going to be coming in. Certainly, to count on it at this time would be counting your chickens before they are hatched. The Postmaster General was directed to reduce deliveries wherever possible. We did that. Where was it possible? Would it be in the rural delivery service, where they get only one delivery a day now? Could this saving be effected by eliminating the third- and fourth-class post offices where there is no city delivery service now? Incidentally, only 11 percent of our post offices have this city delivery service. Or he could eliminate one of two daily deliveries in the residential areas of cities and towns where city delivery service is now provided. It seems to me that the choice that the Postmaster had was to either cut from the fat or cut from the bone, and he chose wisely to cut from the fat.

Now, there are lot of "economy, but's" in this Congress. Many Members say: "I am for economy, but do not economize with my people, do not economize on me;

cut somewhere else." I feel confident that the same people who oppose this cut would oppose any other curtailment order or any other saving that the Postmaster General tried to put into effect anywhere else.

The people who are sponsoring this legislation say in effect that the Post Office is a service institution and that no curtailment is necessary; that the people are willing to pay for this service. Maybe they are, but you certainly did not think so a few weeks ago when you voted on this appropriation bill and for the Taber-Thomas amendment. What I want to know is, have the people at home changed in these few weeks? Have they decided now that they do not want economy?

I have heard attempts to justify this legislation by saying that it is in the interests of national defense. Pure sophistry. There is not a single Member of Congress but who has ingenuity enough to twist any project in which he is interested around to show that it is in the interests of national defense. Actually the logical argument is the other way—because every dollar we add to the expense of operating here at home takes a dollar away from the amount we need to prepare to defend ourselves.

We hear pleas for giving the people better service. I wonder whether the people are really concerned about this, or whether they have been influenced by letter carriers to write their Congressman? I wonder, too, if the picture has been accurately presented to them.

One lady wrote me that she couldn't see why I wanted to reduce her postman's pay—that he was not making enough to live on now. Well, in the first place, he is making more than the school teacher who is teaching her children—and in the second place, his salary is not being reduced. He gets the same pay, and has better hours than he previously had.

Another complained that she couldn't get service at the post office at certain hours because of this curtailment order.

I checked into that particular post office and found that the hours of that post office had not been changed in 5 years, either before or after this curtailment. This is just a part of the campaign of misinformation and sabotage that has been carried on by some postal employees. And why? Simply because the postal employees' union leaders want to have more dues-paying members; and we might as well face the fact, because that is just what it is.

This order has not caused the lay-off of one single solitary classified civil-service employee. It has laid off enough part-time nonclassified temporary substitutes to save \$70,000,000 a year. They have not lost any security, and would be much better off from a financial and security position to be working full time at some other work.

What do the rank and file of postal employees think of this order? I have talked to some of them personally and have voluntary letters from them where they state that they like the present system better, and wonder why it was not done long ago. They also said that over 90 percent of the employees felt the

same way, but that they were directed on the action they should take by their Washington representative, again so they will have more dues-paying members from among these nonclassified temporary substitutes.

When I first felt the desire to become a Member of Congress I suppose I was not much different from anyone else. I thought that here I would become associated as a colleague with men and women whose foremost objective would be what is best for our country. I expected, of course, that there would be disagreements as to what was best for our country, but I did believe that when the chips were down and when our country found itself confronted with an emergency such as we are now facing, that practical politics would be cast aside at least for the duration of the emergency. I often wonder now, since I am here, if the most important thing in the eyes of the average Member of Congress is not what happens to the United States or what happens to the world, but what will be the result of the next election.

I listened with interest to Members giving their conclusions under the guise of facts. My conclusion from that is that the facts are that there is an election next November.

I wonder how long it will be before we realize that what happens to you and to me in the next election is not nearly as important as what happens to our country?

Our political lives should not even be considered in the same breath as the very lives of our boys in Korea.

Let us not take any necessary dollars away from them in order that we may have business, comforts, conveniences, and, yes, luxuries, as usual here here at home.

It is a very small sacrifice for the people in 4,500 cities and towns to give up one of two mail deliveries a day in a part of those cities and towns. I for one believe that our people are ready and willing to make that small contribution.

**Mr. CORBETT.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

**Mr. SADLAK.** Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and esteem for my colleague on the committee who just preceded me, but I disagree with him unqualifiedly.

Mr. Chairman, the Postmaster General under date of April 17, 1950, issued the most drastic, far-reaching order ever issued by any Postmaster General. We passed through two major wars without having any such orders issued. The strongest lines of defense in America today are lines of communication and transportation. It is necessary to maintain strong lines of communication and transportation if we are going to be successful in meeting the economic challenge of this century. It is vital to the safety and security of the Nation that we have fast, dependable means of communication if we are to succeed in our war effort.

The gentleman who preceded me mentioned that most of the letters he has received have been favorable, that the writers liked the service they are receiving

and that the only complaints he had were from letter carriers.

I would like at this time to read a letter which was not, I am sure, induced by a letter carrier. It is a short letter from West Hartford, Conn., in my district. This is a copy of the letter addressed to the Postmaster General and it reads as follows:

Enclosed is the cover from a package shipped from Saks Fifth Avenue, New York, to me at the above address. As you will observe, the package was postmarked 2 p. m., June 23, in New York and 1:30 p. m., June 28, in Hartford. It was delivered between 8 and 9 o'clock last night. It appears to me that 5 days and 6 hours is an unreasonable time for the delivery of a special-delivery package from New York to West Hartford.

I am sure that no letter carrier had to induce this gentleman to write a letter of that kind.

It was also pointed out by one of those who made inquiry previously that a lock box should be obtained at the post office in order that delivery may be effected. I have before me a letter which states:

We have tried to get a box at the post office to get our mail at regular intervals. None was to be had since this curtailment.

Mr. Chairman, the order issued by the Postmaster General curtailed the handling of the mail in every single function. It radically reduced the hours of collection. It limited the hours of distribution of certain classes of mail to an extreme degree. It abolished the directory service section. It limited the hours of service at windows and over the platforms. It curtailed deliveries in residential areas from two trips to one trip a day. The order issued hastily by the Postmaster General has resulted in chaos and has weakened the dependability of our postal service. There have been many complaints from people all over the United States.

From Boise, Idaho, a factory representative for machine tools and accessories filed the following protest:

Since the curtailment has taken effect we have had a number of calls on our orders sent direct from the manufacturer to customer. The customers have been used to receiving shipments in a certain number of days from a designated shipping point and now it takes several days longer.

During our all-out effort to meet the present military situation a delay of several days in the shipment of tool parts could well result in the loss of days and days of productive effort. The loss of days and days of productive effort could result, and probably would result, in the loss of thousands of lives.

In the present crisis we should have excellent service to preserve the morale of our troops and of people on the home front. Our military leaders have told us that the greatest single factor in maintaining morale is the mail call. The Army gives priority to the shipment of mail. Unfortunately the Postmaster General does not feel that mail is very important.

Many units of the National Guard, including the Forty-third of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont have been activated. The members of this outstanding military organization and each of the loved ones being left behind are

very much interested in maintaining as close touch as possible. This can only be done in most instances through letter writing. The acknowledged day and more of delay in the letter exchange now existing because of the curtailment order should be removed now to provide a much-needed boost in the morale of the soldiers and their families and relatives.

I am sure many of my colleagues have seen the picture that has been printed in many of the papers throughout the United States on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday that depicted GI's with but a single thought:

Hoping for a letter from home, battle-grimed and weary Yanks answer mail call on the fighting front in South Korea.

You saw there the picture of those young men waiting for a letter from home. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] talked about the mail call. I am sure he remembers the great boost in morale for him, and for me and for many of our colleagues in the last war when they received mail from home. We should not permit a delay of even 1 day in the delivery of this GI mail. There should be no delay whatsoever in the mail going out to those boys or in their mail coming back to us.

Under the curtailed system now in effect if a letter is mailed in Brooklyn, N. Y., in many localities, at 7 p. m., it is not picked up until sometime the next morning and will not be delivered in New York City until 2 days later. This type of service is disgraceful in our modern day and age. A letter mailed in the evening stays in the mail box for 16 hours before being picked up. It takes almost 24 hours to get the mail out of the city. If it is an air-mail letter it is placed upon an airplane and hurriedly flown across the country in 12 hours and then it lies in the post office until the next day before it is delivered. We are living in an atomic age, but the Post Office Department since the order of April 17 has gone back to the stone age.

In the vicinity of Chicago and Los Angeles, the Post Office Department has been spending millions of dollars on experiments using a helicopter to take the mail from Chicago and Los Angeles to surrounding cities. The mail is deposited at the airport by the regular airlines, is then picked up by helicopter and flown to the surrounding towns. For the purpose of illustration, the helicopter arrives in the city of Harvey, Ill., at 11 a. m. The mail then lies in the Harvey Post Office until the next day when it is delivered. It is absurd to spend millions of dollars using helicopters to speed the transmission of mail and then, because of the silly order of the Postmaster General, have that mail spend hours lying around the post office. Just as good service could be provided by sending the mail from Chicago to Harvey by horseback.

The problems created by the Postmaster General's orders on the individual businessmen are described by the operator of a tool manufacturing concern in New Britain, Conn., as follows:

We deal with industrial firms, receiving their requests for quotation by mail, and also return our bids on these quotations by

mail. Many of these requests are for rush orders, and we receive them late, and therefore, we are late in returning important mail, which is highly essential to our business. We also order material for the work which we do by mail, and a serious and definite delay has been noted in the delivery of our material. Due to the delays caused by the postal curtailment, we have been forced to make lengthy and costly phone calls regarding matters which formerly were well taken care of by daily mailing. It took a period of years for our postal service to reach its high peak of efficiency, and in a progressive Nation such as ours, it seems a shameful error, and a terrific step backward, to put a curtailment on the mail service.

There have been many, many complaints from mail users all over the country relative to the losses they sustained because of the present method now in use in the Post Office Department in holding third-class mail until they get around to it.

An operator of a market at Waterbury, Conn., complains:

Our firm looks forward to our morning dailies to secure market prices. These prices should be received at the earliest possible date and time. Advertising material sent to our customers, which is third-class mail, is never received at the proper time when the sale date expires.

There have been hundreds and hundreds of incidents brought to our attention—complaints on the part of mail users over the curtailed service. Complaints about the curtailment of delivery represent only a small portion of it. The elimination of directory service, an inferior collection service, and delayed distribution are the results of the orders of the Postmaster General.

In Chicago the failure of a great number of individuals to respond to a call from the draft board was attributed to the elimination of directory service; 300 were called only 182 showed up. The most interesting comment on the low estate to which the postal service has sunk because of the order of the Postmaster General is carried in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune of Friday, July 21. I was particularly interested in one specific comment in this editorial wherein the editor declared:

The postal service is one of the very oldest services our Government has furnished to our people. The public was conditioned to good postal service. So efficient was the service that the courts came to hold that proof of posting a letter in the mail was actually proof of delivery.

The present Postmaster General's economy order, however, has spiked the Department's long-established reputation for good service. The service today is just plain lousy. Post-office officials and letter carriers know this as well as the public; and as a result they have suffered a loss of morale. To be told to do just a half-way job after being bred in the tradition of tip-top service is not good for the morale of any outfit.

From a great many quarters complaints are pouring in and demands for restoration of the Post Office Department's former high standards of service. There may possibly be a slight economy insofar as the actual cost of running the Department is concerned. But from the public's standpoint there is no economy, not when you consider the hardships and actual money losses to business places and the inconveniences that affect everybody.

Of course, we are interested in economy; we feel that there should be economy in the postal service. Investigations have established the fact that the Post Office Department is guilty of many uneconomical practices. Failure to replace equipment and the use of outdated specifications cost the American people a world of money. Improper organization has been demonstrated by the Hoover Commission to result in greatly increased administrative costs. In this fast-moving world of ours, in this highly competitive world where we are only 1 day away from all other continents, it is vital to our very existence that we maintain the very finest communication, the most rapid and the most dependable that we can possibly have.

The curtailment of the mail service put into effect by the Postmaster General was not a curtailment of a luxury. It was a curtailment of a vital service paid for by the users and paid a second time by all taxpayers. It was short-sighted, poorly considered, and has cost the American people and American business a great deal more money than the small amount of savings that allegedly have been effected. Bombs dropped on the post offices of the United States could not have had a more demoralizing effect on the postal employees than this directive of the Postmaster General. The order should be immediately rescinded.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I think that we should get this debate back on solid ground. We are dealing with a service; the postal service. It has never paid its own way; it has never been expected to pay its own way. Here we now come in to wring out of the bodies of the people who work for the Post Office Department additional services in order to help balance the Post Office budget that never should be balanced.

There are two theories that I, for one, have always worked on in connection with the postal service. One is that it is a service and, as the gentleman from New York said sometime ago, it is here to serve the American people just as the Department of Commerce or the Department of Agriculture. I do not hear any crocodile tears being shed for the great losses that this country sustains through the support prices on agriculture. I have voted for subsidies and will continue to vote for support prices because I feel it is in the interest of the economy of this country. I believe that that is part of our over-all economy, and so is the matter of communication a part of our over-all economy. We have a good form of communication and we should preserve it in this country. Second. There is no relation between the salaries paid postal employees and the so-called postal deficit. The Postmaster has no control over rates and services. We in Congress have that responsibility. Members in opposition have tried to wrap the American flag around it with the plea that the war is on. The order was issued long before the war took

place, and that argument has no part in this particular forum. I want to pay my compliments to the men and women who work in the Post Office Department, who have done a valiant job in making it the great service that typifies the American system. It is the one branch of Government that comes close to the people, and those who work in the postal service deserve our thanks and not our condemnation. Sure, we gave them a few raises in salary, and I do not know yet that we have caught up with the lag that took place for so many years in which they were underpaid. I want to pay my compliments to the gentlemen who represented the several groups of postal employees. I have found them courteous; I have found them persuasive, but I have never found them domineering. They are not in the same category as those who come in here representing the Farm Bureau or the NAM or many of the other groups who maintain lobbies here in Washington. No one has shed crocodile tears about those gentlemen. We come here and we accept responsibility for the job, and I am certain that all of us do the job according to our own conscience. I resent the inference that people weaken to pressures. Perhaps those who make these charges know more about weakening to pressure than I do. I do not weaken to pressure.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman deal very briefly with the subject of collections and other post-office services? That has not been touched on.

Mr. MILLER of California. We put on the Post Office Department a large amount of service for which they are not credited such as public-building administration, for example. They sell war-savings bonds, they have been called upon to do everything. The postal service has grown up like Topsy, without having any real beginning, it has become a catch-all service. Today those people who are making a profit out of the Post Office Department are not paying their full share of the costs of operations that help render them that profit.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As to the weakness the gentleman referred to, yesterday when there was a division vote there were 146 noes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Just a minute. I yielded for a question.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But on a roll call there were only 81.

Mr. MILLER of California. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve as a Member of this body for a little more than 5

years. In my humble judgment this is the most iniquitous bill that has come before the House during that time.

In the first place, the bill is wrong in principle. Our founding forefathers very wisely provided for three separate and independent branches of the Government. Each branch has its own responsibilities and its duties. The Post Office Department is a part of the executive branch of the Government and is entrusted with the responsibility of administering the postal service. In this bill the Congress would step out of its legitimate sphere of action and assume the prerogatives and duties of the Post Office Department. Such a policy will inevitably result in inefficiency, chaos, and confusion.

In the second place, the bill suffers from the defect of faulty draftsmanship. After providing that the order of the Postmaster General dated April 18, 1950, curtailing delivery and other essential postal services shall be rescinded, it further provides, "The Postmaster General is hereby directed to maintain such services on the basis existing immediately prior to the issuance of such order until otherwise provided by Congress." This language would freeze the postal service until the Congress sees fit to act again. The Post Office Department could neither curtail nor enlarge the service regardless of circumstances. During every previous war, the domestic postal service has been severely curtailed, but in the struggle in which we are now engaged and in which we are fighting for our very existence, the Post Office Department would be saddled with a law requiring a fixed and unchangeable service.

In the third place, this bill cannot be defended on its merits. The Members of this Congress have long prated of economy and the reduction of Federal expenditures. Perhaps I am too credulous, but I believed that at least a majority of the Members meant what they were saying and were not talking for political gain.

The national debt of this country is now \$258,000,000,000. The estimated deficit for this fiscal year is \$5,000,000,000, which will be increased to \$15,000,000,000 or \$20,000,000,000 by additional defense expenditures. Five hundred and fifty-five million dollars of this deficit arises from the operations of the Post Office Department which should be conducted on a self-sustaining basis. In view of this unhappy situation, the Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, of which I have the honor of being the chairman, instructed the Postmaster General that he must eliminate nonessential services and modernize the equipment of the Post Office Department in an effort to cut expenditures and reduce the deficit. In our report published on March 21 of this year, we said:

The committee has discussed with the Postmaster General certain proposals for effecting economies, and realizes that probably all of the suggestions made will provoke some complaints from one source or another. Nevertheless the financial condition of the United States Treasury is such

that every step possible must be taken to save money.

The committee believes that sizable savings could be made by a reduction of the number of deliveries per day to many areas particularly on those routes serving residential areas exclusively. Residential areas receive from one to three deliveries a day; rural patrons receive one delivery a day. The committee urges the Postmaster General to provide for the rearrangement of city delivery service so as to reduce the number of deliveries wherever possible. The committee does not insist that one delivery a day would suffice in certain extremely congested areas, but it does not believe that the opportunity to retrench on postal expenditures should be jeopardized by failure to take any action in this respect. The Post Office Department through the past few years has conducted an extensive program to adjust rural routes and such a program applied to city delivery would certainly not be out of reason.

The committee believes that considerable savings could be made by the installation of mechanical devices and methods of handling mail in many of its operations. A mechanical sorting machine is now in operation at the Chicago post office for the primary sorting of outgoing mail. This machine is working out very well. However, there is no indication of any great desire on the part of the Department to purchase and install similar machines in other offices. There are also many other machines of a less expensive type which would undoubtedly be of considerable assistance to the Department in handling its work. The committee believes that immediate steps should be taken by the Department to survey its needs for such equipment and make installations of same, particularly in the larger offices throughout the country where the volume of mail handled would be sufficient to justify such installation and eventually result in a saving of money as well as decreasing the actual handling problem. The Department has been too reticent in adopting improved methods, and the committee insists that immediate change be made in this policy. It is suggested that careful consideration be given by the Department to the question of employing industrial engineers for a thorough survey of the Department's equipment and methods.

Not a word of protest to that report was raised by any member of the subcommittee or of the Appropriations Committee, or of the House, but to the contrary the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] offered an amendment on the floor of the House to restore some of the funds stricken from the Post Office budget, which was defeated by an overwhelming majority.

Please note that our committee did not undertake to dictate to the Postmaster General how he should run his Department, but suggested that he give consideration to the reduction of the number of deliveries of mail and to the installation of modern devices and methods of handling the mail. The Postmaster General took the committee at its word and issued his order of April 18, 1950. If the Congress rescinds that order in the face of this background, any department head who in the future attempts to economize in his department would be a dolt and a fool.

The order of the Postmaster General is fair and reasonable in every respect. Its purpose is to eliminate nonessential services. It cannot be contended that two mail deliveries a day are essential for a part of the residences of the Nation when a majority of the residences re-

ceive only one, and a large number receive no deliveries whatever. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to justify the discrimination in favor of those previously receiving two deliveries in the face of our present critical fiscal situation.

Mr. Chairman, I say with all the earnestness which I possess that the time has come when, if we would save this Nation from bankruptcy and ruin, we must rid the Federal payrolls of all nonessential employees. This order, however, does not go that far. Not one regular postal employee has lost or will lose his position because of this curtailment of service. Some who had hoped to obtain employment may be disappointed because it has resulted in a freeze on personnel, but many who are supporting this bill recently voted for the Jensen amendment to the general appropriations bill which would have put a personnel freeze on all Government departments.

There has been no clamor from the people in opposition to this curtailment of service. I am advised by the Postmaster General that the communications commending his action far exceed those condemning it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, last, but by no means least, this bill should be considered in the light of the present Korean crisis. Apparently we do not realize the gravity of the situation which we face. Last week we passed a bill authorizing the President of the United States to control the entire economy of this Nation. This bill proposes to take away from a member of his Cabinet the authority to control his own department. Such action would be ludicrous and would make the Congress the laughing stock of the entire Nation.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In our committee this was not the only department that was cut to the bone. All of the other departments were cut to the bone and the other departments were given the same instructions.

Mr. GARY. That is true.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman believe that the nations abroad who are receiving money from the United States through the ECA fund should have more mail deliveries than we do?

Mr. GARY. I am not regulating, nor is the United States Government regulating the mail of foreign countries. What mail they receive, I do not know, but whatever it is they are paying for it out of their own funds, not with United States Government funds. United States Government funds are not used for that purpose.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But they are used indirectly for that purpose, and we are sacrificing to meet the deficiencies that they cannot meet, and we are not giving the service to the American public.

Mr. GARY. I have heard no public clamor over the curtailment of this serv-

ice. Most of them commend the Post Office Department for the order issued.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wish to say, if I may be permitted, that I feel the House of Representatives should show some sense of responsibility this afternoon, and that we should not go on record in favor of fastening an additional expense of \$50,000,000 or \$70,000,000, or whatever it may be on the Government at this time.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I believe the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] said that this was simply a method of recruiting by the postal carriers association of members. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Florida that no temporary employee of the postal service has ever been a member of the National Postal Carriers Association; and that they have lost not one member through the Postmaster General's curtailment order. There are 103,000 members of that association, and 75 percent of them are World War I and World War II veterans, and we certainly cannot call their patriotism into question.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. A great deal has been said here about the mobilization effort with respect to the Korean emergency as a reason why we should vote against this measure. Is it not a fact that there is no fact adduced today which indicates that this will in any way interfere with the mobilization effort, in view of the fact that this order was made long before the Korean emergency, and that it is just being dragged in by the hair to endeavor to intimidate so many of us who have been working hard to see that this emergency is fully met?

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman's comment requires no answer. I want to take just a few moments to point out here that—No. 1—it is entirely proper that we here today are considering a rescission of curtailment orders of the Postmaster General. Time after time the Postmaster General and his assistants have come before our committee and pointed out to us that we were the board of directors for the Post Office Department. Time after time our advice has been sought on matters of some embarrassment or importance. However, no member of the committee was consulted on this matter. No one had any advance information that this curtailment order was coming; we simply read in the papers, as did the other Members of the House, that beginning as of a certain date the orders were out that services would be discontinued.

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

Mr. CORBETT. Not until I finish my statement.

So here and now I want to point out that this Congress and this Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has every right to set the policies for the Department, that it should have been consulted; that it has a right now to say what services shall be extended to the people of these United States. It is not the business of an executive officer to tell us or the people how their money shall be spent.

There has been no demand from the American people, not even a hint of it, that their postal services should be cut out. You gentlemen are hearing the wrong echoes. What they want cut out is the hundreds of millions of dollars for spoiled potatoes, eggs, and milk; what they want cut out is the terrific quantities of tax money going for peanuts, and wheat, and cotton and storage of all kinds; what they want cut out is money for gambling casinos, bubble gum and throwing away money down rat holes. That is what they want cut out, not services for our own people to which they are entitled.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the New York Times editorially says:

This is not real economy.

I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Times of August 1, 1950, with two-column spread headlines saying: "Faster mail service here urged—Cuts called damaging to business."

Here is the first paragraph of that article:

A series of steps to improve postal service here was outlined yesterday by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York. The recommendations grew from a survey of 500 companies, which showed that recent curtailments in postal service have had a disruptive effect on business in the city.

I have in my hand a letter from one of the largest manufacturing establishments in my congressional district, the Botany Mills, of Passaic, New Jersey, employing thousands of men, and having millions of dollars in contracts with the Federal Government for the supply of cloth for uniforms for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. This is a letter of August 2 that Col. Charles F. H. Johnson, president of these mills, wrote to Postmaster Anthony V. Gross, of Passaic:

Confirming my phone talk with you of this morning, this is the straw that breaks the camel's back. Progressively the postal service has become very costly and very inefficient. A letter dated July 26 and mailed on that date to 140 Cedar Street, New York, was received August 1. Swell service but not unusual. Progressively we have been getting worse and worse service, whether it is in our business or in our home deliveries, and frankly, it smells to heaven.

Now, I want to call as a witness Mr. Jesse M. Donaldson, who, appearing before our Subcommittee on Appropriations on November 23, 1945, asked for the

return of the two-delivery system bogged down during the war first because the people of the United States were clamoring for it; and, second, because he testified that the post offices of the country were becoming congested with mail.

I said to him when he was before our committee this year shortly after his order:

I take it from this testimony, Mr. Donaldson, that in 1945 you and Mr. Uttley and others in the Post Office Department were insisting on the restoration of the very type of delivery service that you have now ordered curtailed. Is that right?

His answer was:

My opinion has not changed since I gave that testimony.

And my comment was: "I believe that."

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in closing this debate that we all recognize that the issue has been exaggerated far beyond its real importance. There is involved here something which has been estimated from \$15,000,000 to \$70,000,000. I certainly subscribe to the belief that \$15,000,000 is probably a higher amount than will actually be saved by this order. I wonder if we, for the saving of some fifteen or twenty millions, will deprive business of good service and deprive the people of a fine communication to their loved ones? We do all of this when the people are willing to pay for the kind of service they have always received and I hope that this Congress has the raw courage and good sense to stand up here today and vote to tell the Postmaster General that the people's Representatives are still the organization deciding what services shall be rendered by the people's Government to the people.

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that recently we passed the point 4 program saying that we are going to render service all over the world.

Mr. CORBETT. Let me say that practically every nation in the world receiving ECA help from us has better and more frequent mail delivery than this great country that is going out to police and rehabilitate economically and do everything for all of the countries that want something.

Mr. GAVIN. But when it comes to rendering a service to the American people well, then, we hear objection after objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) the order of the Postmaster General, dated April 18, 1950, curtailing delivery and other essential postal services is hereby rescinded, and (b) the Postmaster General is hereby directed to maintain such services on the basis existing immediately prior to the issuance of such order until otherwise provided by the Congress.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THORNBERRY:  
After line 8 insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Essential postal services other than those curtailed by the order of the Postmaster General, dated April 18, 1950, shall not be curtailed or terminated by reason of the enactment of this act.

"Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to which I referred when we were speaking in general debate. The first part of the amendment offers a section 2 to the bill and provides that the Postmaster General in carrying out rescission of the order shall not curtail any other essential services. I pointed out a while ago that those of us with rural routes and fourth-class post offices would be affected if the Postmaster General were required to eliminate not only the two-a-day delivery service but the 16 other nonessential services eliminated by the order. In the appropriation bill we told him he would have to cut \$70,000,000 from the operation of the Post Office Department. If he has to restore the service cut out by this order, then he will have to go somewhere else to obtain the reduction of \$70,000,000 which the Members of this House have already ordered.

This amendment simply says that "When you rescind the order you cannot eliminate any essential function of the Post Office Department."

The other section of the amendment states that we are hereby authorizing an appropriation of sufficient funds to pay for this bill.

You might as well be honest about this matter. If you are going to say to the Postmaster General that he has to rescind the order, then you ought to be willing to say that he shall have the funds to do it. As far as I am concerned, I do not think we have any business ordering him to rescind the original order. Our first duty during these days is to cut nonessential spending to the bone so that we can send bullets, guns, tanks, and airplanes to our men in Korea. I think the amendment is in order and I hope it will be adopted.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GULL. I called Mr. Donaldson today and I said: "Mr. Donaldson, if we pass this bill where do you get the money?" He says, "You will have to appropriate it."

Mr. THORNBERRY. The gentleman is correct and that is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that the language in the second part of the gentleman's proposed amendment is entirely superfluous and unnecessary because at the present time the Appropriations Committee already has full and unlimited authorization to appropriate whatever money that in its discretion is

required for the operations of the Post Office Department?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Let me say that the committee does have the authority, but this House passed a bill in which we reduced the Post Office Department \$70,000,000. Let the Members of the House who now want to back up at least be honest enough to say we are willing to appropriate the money which this bill will cost.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman certainly understands that he is not appropriating money under the second part of his amendment. He is merely authorizing an expenditure, which authorization is already in the law.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I understand that, and I think the gentleman understands it. I want the House to go on record and say: "We not only ask you to rescind the order but we are in favor of appropriating the money."

That is exactly the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. That is unusual and unnecessary. The amendment is intended to kill the bill. I am likewise opposed to the gentleman's amendment insofar as the first part of it is concerned. I do not believe that the huge subsidies for airmail pay should be included in the Post Office Department budget. The gentleman's amendment would lend some color of authority and support to the proposition that such subsidies should be continued through the Post Office Department budget. Further, the first part of the gentleman's amendment would freeze the funds for all other functions of the department and not allow funds to restore the curtailed services.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I do not think the amendment says that. It simply says "shall not eliminate any other essential function."

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, he means that if this House is willing to approve this legislation to restore the so-called curtailment of mail service, that it go on record as saying that we are authorizing, thereby meaning we want the appropriation of these funds to pay for it; is that it?

Mr. THORNBERRY. That is exactly right.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Can the gentleman give me any information as to the amount that was requested for the Post Office Department by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. THORNBERRY. As I remember, it was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2,777,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. And how much did the Bureau of the Budget allow?

Mr. THORNBERRY. The Bureau of the Budget cut it \$42,000,000 and then the Committee on Appropriations cut it \$28,000,000 more.

Mr. FOGARTY. And then how much of a cut was the Thomas-Taber amendment on top of that?

Mr. THORNBERRY. \$200,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. On top of the other?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. They cut them \$200,000,000?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. What effect would the Jensen amendment have on the postal service?

Mr. THORNBERRY. According to the figure furnished me \$125,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. And that was by a vote of this House.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Yes.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Has the gentleman's amendment been put before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. THORNBERRY. The gentleman remembers that I wanted to offer the amendment in committee and the majority of the committee, of which the gentleman is a member, refused to even give me the courtesy of offering the amendment.

Mr. SADLAK. Of course, the gentleman from Connecticut is not the chairman of the committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I am not talking about the chairman; I am talking about the majority of the committee that refused to give me an opportunity to present the amendment.

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JACOBS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I have been all afternoon wondering just what we are talking about or whether, in fact, most of us know what we are talking about. On April 17, 1950, this order that everyone has been talking about in this debate was issued. It is dated April 17. If you will look at your bill you will see that it provides that the order of the Postmaster General dated April 18, 1950, be rescinded.

Now, that might give us some insight as to how carefully and meticulously this bill was considered, and if that is an indication of the care with which this bill was studied and considered, then I think it is the strongest argument that could be offered here as to why it should be recommitted for further consideration.

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

Mr. JACOBS. For a question or comment?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. A brief comment. I might state that the majority of the committee refused to let us even consider the bill, refused to let us have hearings, refused to let the Postmaster General come before us and explain the order, over my protest and that

of the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman. Let me go further: I submit to the Members of this House as a lawyer, an opinion in which I have rather profound convictions. We are, as the gentleman from Virginia well said, forcing an administrative officer to rescind an order which no reasonable man who has listened to the facts can say that we did not force upon that officer by virtue of appropriations. But we are also freezing the operation of the Post Office Department until we give consent for him to make any further changes. It is, ladies and gentlemen, the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard.

Now pardon me a moment if I say to you that there is something far more sacred involved in this than the \$70,000,000 or the \$200,000,000 or \$395,000,000 that we are talking about. We have a government of checks and balances.

Here we are trying to take over the executive department of this Government. The Congress tried to do this in the administration of Abraham Lincoln, tried to take over by an executive committee, to usurp the functions of the executive, and that has happened in many, many instances of parliamentary history. It happened in my State in 1940 when there was a legislature of one political party and a Governor of the opposite political party.

They attempted to strip the Governor of his executive functions and he resisted that attempt just as Mr. Lincoln resisted. They were both called dictators. They were not dictators; they were good, patriotic, public servants who stood up and fought for the prerogatives of the Executive under our system of checks and balances. I am not going to question the motive of any man or woman on this floor. Every Member of the House of Representatives is the keeper of his own conscience. But I say to you it is clear this bill did not have the careful consideration that a bill of this kind is entitled to. He who runs can read the bill and see that if we are going to do our duty as constitutional officers of the greatest parliamentary body that man has ever known you are going to vote to recommit this bill. It is unconstitutional and it is unconscionable.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. CORBETT. I object.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman who preceded me made the remarks he did, because I believe he pointed up one of the crucial issues in this debate. The gentleman said, as you recall, something to the effect that this is an awful thing to be voting to force the head of the department to rescind an order which would attempt to establish certain economies in his department. The point which I can make more clearly than I can by quoting the gentleman is just this: if economies were ordered by the Committee on Appropriations, and if the Congress wants economies in the Post Office De-

partment, why then did the Postmaster General pick out the most essential service in the Post Office for his curtailment order? Why is it, if you please, that he did not recommend to the Senate of the United States, where the bill is languishing in committee, that they end the political control of the Post Office Department by the majority party in this Government? Why did they not recommend that there be certain economies and efficiencies in the operation of handling the mail? Why did he not recommend this—and I want you to get this fact, gentlemen, because it is not generally known—the Postmaster General not only has the power, but the law which created the parcel post system in this country makes it mandatory for the Postmaster General to maintain rates on parcel post at at least the break-even point. He has consistently failed to do so. We are at this moment carrying in the Post Office Department so-called deficits of over \$100,000,000 for penalty mail and we are carrying something between twenty-five to one hundred million dollars of actual freight subsidies for the railroads and \$47,000,000 of subsidies on the operation of foreign air mail and \$37,000,000 of subsidies on domestic air mail. We are providing in the buildings throughout the United States no end of services to all other agencies of the Government chargeable to the Post Office Department.

I am going to say this to you—I believe that the Postmaster General's order was the worst possible thing done in the worst possible way. If economy had to be established as a result of decreased appropriations, curtailment anywhere would have been better than at the actual point of delivery. I say to you this, which cannot be proved, but it is a mighty strange thing that every time we cut an appropriation for a department, they economize at a place where the public will scream the loudest. For example, they took the men off the locks when the appropriation was cut for the Army Engineers. They picked on the investigators of the Treasury Department when their funds were cut. All along the line we have the same old trick of bureaucratic pressure.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say in opposing this motion that the House is working its will and we are sending word to the Post Office Department that if the money is not forthcoming to do all of the things that might be done, then they at least ought to economize where economy is in order and not take it out on the taxpayers who are paying the freight.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Jacobs].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 71, noes 109.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JACOBS and Mr. CORBETT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82, noes 132.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the committee. I have refrained from saying anything on the subject, but it seems that we have all inadvertently misrepresented the situation. Everyone refers to the fact that we are \$500,000,000 in the red in the Post Office Department. That is entirely untrue, and those Members who use such figures ought to be sure of their ground before they talk about the subject.

If the cost of postage in the State Department were taken out—there is no reason why the Post Office Department should pay that postage because when we appropriate for the State Department we might as well put in a provision for postage; and the same thing is true about the Agriculture Department and the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, the Interior Department, and the Congress of the United States. There is no reason why our franked mail should be charged up to the Post Office Department, but that is what happens. You say it does not amount to much. One Member recently rose and said: "I resent the idea that we send out much mail; I do not send out over a ton a month." Why should the costs of superintending the public buildings in the city of Washington be charged to the Post Office Department? And the subsidies to railroads, steamship lines, and the commercial air service are also charged to the Post Office Department. When you take those cats and dogs out of the situation you have \$383,000,000 that is now charged up to the Post Office Department. That leaves less than \$150,000,000 deficit, and Postmaster Generals have said for years that they considered a deficit of \$150,000,000 a part of the public service rendered by the Post Office Department.

So while you are curtailing the delivery of mail it does not affect my country, because if we get mail once a week we are doing well; and we do not want your newspapers any oftener than we have to take them. But if we are taking a daily newspaper in the East we want two a day because they change their policy between issues. I have practiced law for 50 years but according to what I have heard here I probably do not know anything about law. If this is right I will be the first one to admit it. I am thinking about the rising young lawyers in this House, those for whose display of legal acumen I had great respect. They say that we have no right to legislate for the Post Office Department—that we are interfering with an executive department. I say to you we have the right to legislate for any department, and that the executive department carries out the orders of this Congress. Is not that the law? But we should not interfere because these constitutional lawyers from Indiana and Virginia say we should not.

In congested areas in the East, the people demand a mail service that they have been having in the past. The West understands their needs and will support them in their needed mail service.

Western Representatives are not selfish and see the needs of the whole Nation and as well as their own.

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

Mr. BURDICK. Was I referring to the gentleman?

Mr. JACOBS. I am the one who made the speech.

Mr. BURDICK. I did not refer to the gentleman by name.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment very much like the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY]. I made the statement previously that I was going to support his amendment. After studying his amendment and mine I find this difference between them: My amendment strikes out the language in line 8 of the bill "until otherwise provided by the Congress."

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] brought out the fact that this language would freeze all services on the basis existing immediately prior to the issuance of this order on April 18. I do not want to freeze completely every administrative discretionary act of the Postmaster General. I think we are all agreed upon that.

The balance of my amendment, which is not in order at this time because it strikes out language, would strike out the words appearing in line 8 and at the end of line 7 add the following: "and such funds as are necessary to accomplish the purpose of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated."

I believe my language is better because it does not freeze the administrative discretion of the Postmaster General and it accomplishes the same purpose as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] seeks to accomplish. If his amendment is defeated I shall offer my amendment, if I am recognized. I am sure it will accomplish what we want to do.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Will the gentleman add to his amendment the words "and this act shall not go into effect until such appropriations have been made"?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will not add that. I do not consider it is within my province to add that language. If the gentleman wishes to offer an amendment after mine is voted upon he is at liberty to do so.

I believe the Appropriations Committee will take into consideration the justice of reconsidering this matter of Congress reasserting that it wants this additional service and I believe the members of that committee will follow the will of the Congress. I might point out, if we want to be honest on this matter, we either want two services a day or we do not want them.

At the present time we must admit that a combination of cuts as the result of the Budget Bureau, the action of the House, the Thomas-Taber amendment,

and the Jensen amendment have brought about a total cut of \$395,000,000 out of a total request for \$2,277,000,000. This action, however, has not been taken in the other body, which has cut \$70,000,000 only.

The appropriation bill now must go to conference. As a matter of fact, it is in conference and the cut will undoubtedly be somewhere between \$70,000,000 which the other body has cut and the potential \$395,000,000 which the House has cut. I do not know just how much it will be but if it is over \$70,000,000 we are taking away from the Postmaster General the necessary funds to restore this service.

So, if we want to be honest we will, along with the passage of this bill, also authorize the appropriation of such funds as are necessary, be they whatever they may. There have been various estimates from \$25,000,000 to \$70,000,000. It will be necessary to do that to restore these services and we will be doing in an orderly fashion that which the House wishes to accomplish.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Several references today have been made to a deficit in the Post Office Department. Are there not other departments which have deficits?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sure there are.

Mr. CLEMENTE. For a similar period the Commerce Department has a deficit of \$667,000,000, the Department of Agriculture a deficit of \$474,000,000, and the Interior Department a deficit of \$459,000,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is correct. All of the departments incur deficits as far as I know. That is because we want to render certain services to the people of the Nation and they must run at a deficit. I am personally in favor of putting the Post Office Department as nearly as possible on the basis of self-sustainment, because I believe that the subsidies offered at this time to newspapers, to magazines, to catalogs, to all kinds of second- and third-class mail, should be borne by the people who incur the expense.

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

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the decision that we each have to make today on this measure is not an easy one. It is a very difficult decision for some of us to make from a political standpoint because, unlike the gentleman from North Dakota many of us have hundreds of postal workers living and working in our districts.

Nor it is an easy decision to make in terms of human conscience. Economy has been defined as something which everybody wants to achieve at somebody else's expense; so it is that the human thing to do is to resist economies which cut home, which affect us or our own districts. When the order of the Postmaster General was issued in April, I was very much opposed to the cuts in service. It appeared to me that there was an element of personal pique

in the way the cuts were enforced. I thought that the arbitrary issuance of the order without consultation with the appropriate committee of the House was not the way to effect such economies. I deplore the unemployment which came as a result of the cuts, and in general it seemed to me that the order and the way the order was effected evidenced a cavalier disregard for the public interest.

Then overnight, Mr. Chairman, something happened 7,000 miles west of San Francisco that changed a lot of previous concepts. The Communist aggression in South Korea shed an entirely new light on the order of the Postmaster General and on many other things transpiring in government. Issues that loomed large on the horizon on the 24th of June suddenly assumed new and insignificant proportions on the morning of the 25th. Virtual mobilization of our resources was started immediately after the attack. Men were called from their homes and from their families to go into combat 7,000 miles away from home or into camps for training. Defense requirements have multiplied; billions of dollars which we did not anticipate we would be called upon to spend are now very real matters confronting us immediately. Other billions of dollars will undoubtedly be required before we see the end of this business to which we have committed ourselves. I venture to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the people of this country, the American citizens of this land, are today more concerned with what is happening to their American males in Korea than they are worried about twice-a-day delivery of the domestic mail here at home. The American people are rightfully demanding immediate cessation of all expenditures which do not bear directly upon the essential and basic defense of this country, and for that reason, and in spite of the fact that I have opposed the cuts, opposed them at the time they were made, I expect to oppose this bill and its passage today. I am sure that the Americans in my district, postal workers, businessmen, and housewives alike will applaud an honest stand and assume their share of the national sacrifice which we must make. The debate today has convinced me that the cuts should stand in the interest of economy at home and the welfare of our fighting men into whose hands we must deliver an ever-increasing volume of weapons and equipment.

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

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to get into this.

Mr. VURSELL. I object.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the Chair understand on this amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. CORBETT. And all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, the point was made here on the floor that the Korean situation would suffer in the event we rescinded this order of the Postmaster General. I had a letter from a mother the other day who spoke of 12 letters which she had sent to her soldier son. They had been unopened and had been returned to her with the address marked "unknown." I say to you, in view of that and many other letters which are not getting through from the parents to the soldiers and from the soldiers to the parents, we owe it to the people of the United States to oppose this order and pass this resolution today to tell the Postmaster General that he had better get busy and think about the people of this country so that we will have an opportunity to exchange mail with our fighting sons.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. What would they do if we held a referendum among the troops?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. What would they do? They would tell us to take this order and throw it out the window.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to yield his time to Mrs. St. GEORGE.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two points I want to make clear.

First of all, emphasis has been placed this afternoon on the curtailment of mail delivery service as though that were the only service that has been affected by Postmaster General Donaldson's decree of April 18. Let it be kept in mind that several other vital services, including mail collections and directory service, have likewise been hamstrung.

It is argued here, and some Members of the House seem to favor the curtailment order because it is claimed there is no effect upon rural delivery. Rural service, always notoriously slow because carriers usually leave early in the morning and there is but one delivery per day, is indirectly affected by virtue of drastically curtailed overnight collections and handling of mail in cities and towns, destined for delivery to farmers.

Much has been said about the saving of money as a result of this curtailment order. Appearing before an appropriations subcommittee in May of this year, the Postmaster General estimated the annual saving would not exceed \$25,000,000. It is contended here this afternoon the saving will reach \$70,000,000. What is the truth? I am convinced it is more

accurate to take the testimony given before the subcommittee rather than a glowing statement issued here today, perhaps intended to influence this action of the House.

And right here I want to reiterate what I have said on other occasions: That in my opinion the original curtailment order was issued in an attempt to bludgeon Congress into appropriating all of the money demanded by the Post Office Department.

Yes, I am for economy in government, but I am not for the kind of economy that curtails a vital service, used by all the people of this country, while foreign countries to which we ladle out billions of dollars, have better mail service than we here in the United States under the Postmaster General's curtailment edict.

Of course, there is a deficit in the Post Office Department and there always will be as long as the handling of hundreds of tons of congressional and other franked mail is charged each year to the postal service; as long as subsidies for airlines and railroads are charged to the postal service; as long as costs of maintaining offices for Internal Revenue bureaus, space for Federal courts, triple A offices, recruiting offices, and so forth, are charged to the postal service.

On March 7, 1949, Postmaster General Donaldson appeared before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and was questioned concerning payments to the railroads for the transportation of mail. I quote an excerpt from his testimony:

Now, with reference to the space for transporting mails by full carlots or by 15 feet or 30 feet or 45 feet, or what not, I think our investigation indicated that we used about half of the space that we paid for.

Would not it be plain business sense for the Postmaster General to get what he pays for with the taxpayers' dollars before he slaps the same taxpayers with a denial of even the kind of mail service they help provide foreigners?

Incidentally, what Member of the House, who supports this curtailment order, has taken the floor today to complain because of the four or five mail deliveries he gets at his office each day? And what about that Sunday mail delivery to every Member's office? How about the mail collections from the House and Senate Office Buildings that are made until late at night? Can it be the Postmaster General simply overlooked Members of Congress when he put his curtailment order into effect with respect to the garden variety of our citizens? Or is it possible that politics, about which we have been hearing so much on this occasion, played a hand in providing special favors to Members of Congress?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about the statements that have been leveled here today against the representatives of the various postal workers' organizations. I have found these men to be courteous and fair at all times. I have agreed with them on some issues and disagreed with them on others. They have a perfect right and a duty, not only to speak for their mem-

bers but whatever they believe for the common good of this country.

I resent the attempts that have been made to impugn their motives or mine in support of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, the fundamental weakness here, it seems to me, is that there was no hearing given to the Postmaster General. I usually do not believe in deciding a matter, especially of this moment, without a hearing. Unless we give the Postmaster General a hearing, I do not know how we are going to determine whether or not this order was justified.

I wish I had a little more time because I would like to make an argument on this. But I will conclude by saying that my mind is still open although at this time I definitely intend to vote against H. R. 8195, but I hope that someone may be able to say something which will give me some more light on the subject as to why I should support it, but I do not see how I can support it in good conscience at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, we, on this side, feel that in no wise does this amendment seriously upset the meaning or spirit of the rescission order. The majority of us who have considered it at least find the amendment quite acceptable and therefore we do not oppose its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to discuss this legislation in 1 minute. I rise at this time because the recommendations of the Hoover Commission as related to the Post Office Department have been mentioned. The recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service should be kept straight.

I had the honor to be the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for a period of 2 years during the Eightieth Congress.

For the benefit of Members who are apparently not familiar with the work of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses as related to the postal service, I should like to make a few observations.

During the Eightieth Congress our committee, working together, made numerous recommendations for greater efficiency and economy in the Post Office Department operations. I should add they were all on a nonpartisan basis. It is not strange these recommendations were adopted in the Hoover report on the postal service. It should be observed a number of the recommendations did not require legislation but could be handled by Executive order.

During the Eighty-first Congress our committee has approved all legislation referred to it carrying out Hoover Commission recommendations except a bill relating to confirmation of postmaster

appointments, which is a Senate prerogative. This legislation, if approved, would not save a lot of money. In any event it is a prerogative of the Senate to pass on this legislation first. The reorganization proposal suggested by the Hoover Commission is being handled by Executive order. It does not require legislation.

I should add one thing more. Our committee made recommendations for the saving of a good many more millions of dollars than were in the Hoover Commission report. Many of them are still pending and under consideration in the Post Office Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I feel in good conscience entitled to support this legislation, for the following reasons: The order to curtail mail service in city residential areas, like my district, was made in April of this year, long before Korea was in conflict, and was made solely on the grounds of what the Postmaster General considered to be a necessary economy. The people in my district, not alone the post-office employees, in my opinion, overwhelmingly want this residential delivery service restored and are ready to pay for it. I will support an amendment to provide the authorization for appropriations for this reason—and the same people, as soon as the mobilization effort requires it, will just as cheerfully give up this service as they did during the war.

This is neither a moral nor a policy issue. It is a straight issue of personal convenience. I am convinced that the people in the big cities want the residential delivery service restored and are willing to pay for it. They ought to have it, and when the mobilization effort requires that they should not have it, they will just as cheerfully forego it.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take up more of the committee's time, but I do want to explain my vote, because I shall not support this amendment. The reason I say that is because there seems to be quite a few of my very dear colleagues who follow these votes very closely, and therefore I think it is just to give them my reason.

The reason I cannot support this amendment is that if I believe the only way to economize in the Post Office Department were to curtail mail service, I would certainly vote against the resolution. I do not believe that. My studies in the Department and my work in the committee have convinced me that there are many more efficient ways and greater economies that can be effected, notably in the parcel post.

It is written in the law of the land that parcel post has got to pay its way and that the Postmaster General shall see that it does pay its way. This law has never been observed in any possible respect.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. That concerned the Subcommittee on Appropriations very much, because he has been remiss in not applying for a proper rate.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. And that law is written on the statute books.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, as I understand the gentlewoman's position, it is not necessary for us to authorize any additional funds, because the Postmaster General already has sufficient funds to put this order back into effect, without asking for any more?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. In effect, but not entirely. What I wanted to convey was that there are other economies, and more pressing ones, that could be effected without this very small one.

Mr. KEATING. Which, if put into effect, would not effect the appropriation of any additional funds?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Quite correct. Another thing, they would not curtail a very vital service, not only to the people at home but to our boys who appreciate mail now more than ever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, mention has been made of the fact that the Postmaster General, before he issued this order, did not consult with members of the House Appropriation Committee dealing with the Post Office Department funds.

May I read to you the opening remarks of the very distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. GARY, of Virginia, when he examined Mr. Donaldson early in April, shortly after his order was issued:

Mr. GARY. Before considering those estimates, however, I want to take this opportunity of commending the Postmaster General for his recent order, which is designed to save some money in the operations of the Post Office Department.

Frankness compels me to say, Mr. Postmaster General, that I think the timing was a little bad, and I was somewhat embarrassed because of the fact that no mention was made to this committee of the fact that the order was to be issued.

The first intimation I had of it came from the chairman of another committee in the Congress, and then when the newspapers called me up and requested a statement with reference to the matter, I had not seen the order. I knew nothing about it, and it was a little embarrassing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] is recognized.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a crucial vote on this amendment. I speak in opposition to the amendment for that reason. I say that because the amendment does two things, both of which are unnecessary under the laws that now exist, in my opinion.

In the first place, the power is now in existence to make these appropriations. In the second place, it is contrary to public interest and contrary to the duties of the Department to shut off any services that are fundamentally necessary. I think the amendment suggested is dangerous to those who would like to see this bill pass, for this reason: The Congress last year, and in this year, in

cutting the appropriation of the Post Office Department, found that it should operate with less money, and expressed itself in that regard, and we have an expression of congressional intent. If the Members relied upon the Hoover reports, or whatever it was they relied upon, proper studies were made in the committee. If this amendment goes into the bill, saying that we are going to appropriate \$70,000,000 more, votes will be lost on the final passage, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 93, noes 70.

Mr. WERDEL and Mr. ROONEY demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. ROONEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 120, noes 104.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

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

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GUILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill and I would like to state at the outset that I am one of those who signed the petition.

I found myself in the position of having a lot of letters from my friends at home who wrote and said: "BEN, we thank you for signing the petition to get it before the House."

I want you to know that I signed that petition because there was some controversy and also on the day I signed the petition the so-called police affair in Korea had just started. Also I was informed that the reductions in service only saved the people of these United States \$15,000,000 a year. As great a sum of money as that is it was only a drop in the bucket compared with the \$500,000,000 the Department suffered as a deficit in the fiscal year ending in June 1950.

Mr. Chairman, this morning I thought I would find out a few things myself, so I called up Mr. Donaldson and asked him if he would be kind enough to speak with me about this present situation. He assured me that the saving would not be \$15,000,000 but \$70,000,000. People back home tell me: "We want to pay for this war as we go but, for God's sake, cut out unnecessary expenses."

Seventy million dollars a year is not hay. I do not understand for the life of me whether it be the Republicans or whether it be the Democrats, or whether it be Mr. Donaldson who wish to make

these savings. The point is, the money is to be saved. Now, I have never had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Jesse Donaldson in my life but here is a man who has offered us a chance to save \$70,000,000, yet we are in here wrangling over this issue when we need the \$70,000,000 for other purposes. When you break down \$70,000,000 into a few tanks, shells, and bazookas, when you think of \$70,000,000 for the war effort, I do not think anybody in this House can honestly vote to spend it on something as nonessential as an extra mail delivery a day.

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

Mr. GULL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. May I make the observation that I have just been informed that today the Committee on Armed Services reduced an appropriation \$50,000,000 for the building of training installations for our fighting men.

Mr. GULL. Gentlemen, I want to say one other thing. I do not think there is a single ex-serviceman sitting in this House, in this gallery, or on a postal route in my home town, who thanked me for signing this petition, but who will say, "BEN, you are exactly right."

I want to go a little bit further there. That \$70,000,000 we can save. And, I am particularly in favor of saving the \$200,000,000 that it cost last year on second-class mail, and some \$135,000,000 on third-class mail, and also \$105,000,000 on fourth-class mail. But, here is a start. Let us carry on and let us save this \$70,000,000.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, some personalities have been brought into the debate today which I think are hardly necessary. Reference has been made to the national president of the letter carriers association, Mr. Doherty, relative to this legislation.

I regard Mr. Doherty as a very high grade gentleman in the postal organization and, of course, expect him to represent the men in his organization to the best of his ability.

On this piece of legislation, however, I disagree with him. I am against the bill and do not believe it should be enacted into law.

I should like also to say that I have the highest regard for the postal employees in all branches of the service. They are intelligent, patriotic citizens. No group of Federal employees in America, in my judgment, outrank them or do their jobs better.

During the past 8 years, because of their fine record of service, Members of Congress have expressed their appreciation by passing much legislation beneficial to them. During the past 8 years I have served in the Congress, much of the time on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have constantly supported legislation in their interest including some four or five salary raises, the broadening and increasing of their retirement benefits and much other legislation. These men know and appreciate what this Congress has done.

Mr. Chairman, I believe if they were seated in the Congress instead of us as Members of this body, with all the facts

before them, they would not approve this legislation.

In fact, I have made some investigation over the phone and by letter in my district, contacting some of the employees in an effort to find out how much of a hardship, if any, is being thrown upon the letter carriers since the order of the Postmaster General took effect July 1.

Those whom I have contacted tell me that the new order is working out very well and that it throws little or no hardship on the classified letter carriers and that probably only a few hours during the week may be lost by some non-classified substitute. In fact, I have been told by postal employees they prefer the new working order.

Mr. Chairman, another thing that makes me think the postal employees are pretty well satisfied is that I have received less than a dozen letters from postal employees asking me to support this bill out of 15 counties, and only three letters from the public in favor of it.

I believe the fair thing to do is to defeat or defer this legislation for the remainder of this year. That will give more time to determine whether it is wise to continue it and we fervently hope that the war clouds will clear up, that victory will come to American armies in Korea before the end of the year and possible dangers of other wars will have subsided.

Mr. Chairman, this would give time to give a fair try-out to the Postmaster General's order which has cut back some of the service. I think my past record in the interest of the postal employees proves my desire to be fair in dealing with legislation affecting them. If, during the rest of this year this cut-back order is not justified under trial and error, I will be the first one to introduce or support legislation of the type we have before us today, next January.

The only sacrifice those living in the towns in my district are called upon to make—if it is any sacrifice—is to receive only one delivery of mail to their residences a day instead of two.

They, with all of the other citizens in the United States, on the other hand, secure the benefit of this Government saving of \$70,000,000 a year.

I am sure that in these serious times the people would rather have one delivery a day instead of two and make this \$70,000,000 saving so desperately needed in these chaotic times.

Let us look at it another way. The farmers who are fortunate enough to live on a rural route never get but one mail delivery a day.

Is there any more reason why those who live in the towns and cities should have two deliveries a day than the farmer?

Mr. Chairman, we are now in a war and our soldiers are fighting and dying in Korea. They are lucky if they get their mail once in 2 or 3 weeks. They are fighting to protect the liberty of all the people in the towns and countryside of this Nation. You have read in the press that they have been woefully short in equipment. By reason of not having proper equipment many of them have

lost their lives. Seventy million dollars would help alleviate the situation we are now in in Korea and billions of dollars more will be necessary in the manufacture of planes, guns, tanks, munitions, and so forth, before the defenders of our country will be properly supplied with the equipment that is necessary to give them the best opportunity to protect their life and defend our country.

Mr. Chairman, dozens of times on the floor of the House in the debates throughout the past year I have urged that on the home front we should cut out every expense not necessary and use the money to build up the military equipment of our Nation, due to the chaotic conditions now existing throughout the world.

We need this \$70,000,000 and we need many billions more in building up our defenses to protect the freedom and liberty of all of us. I cannot, in good conscience, support this legislation.

Talk about sacrifices here at home. The real sacrifices that are being made are by the boys who are fighting and dying in Korea this very day. Radio commentators this morning state that 60,000 heavily armed northern Korean Communists are massed to make the final drive to push our soldiers into the ocean at Pusan. Our men are still outnumbered, still out-gunned, yet this Congress is frittering away its time debating whether or not some few people should have two mail deliveries or one a day in our towns and cities.

Let us defeat this legislation, save this \$70,000,000, and use it for the manufacture of guns, tanks, and ammunitions for the defense of our country and to save American lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: Strike out all of the language in line 8 and insert a period after the word "order" in line 7.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my presenting this amendment is to clear up the language which I believe freezes administration discretion of the Postmaster General as of the date immediately prior to the issuance of the order, particularly in view of the fact that the words "and other essential postal service is hereby rescinded" include about 16 different minor services which it may or may not be administratively wise to change. It is a clarifying amendment and I offer it for the purpose of making the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas and mine agree in intent.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman have any figures with respect to the cost of these other services that he has mentioned?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have no figures. That has already been agreed to by the House. I am merely clarifying the fact

that it will give the Postmaster General administrative discretion to do these minor things if he wants to, without awaiting the direction of the Congress.

Mr. REES. Does he realize the thing we are talking about today is a question of the delivery of mail and that that is only a part of the service involved in this resolution we have before us this afternoon?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. REES. Those matters have not been discussed at all.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The House will have an opportunity of voting on the question of whether we want the Postmaster General to restore this service or not. I think there is a clear-cut and honest issue now that appropriations have been authorized for the restoration of this service and the Members may vote according to their consciences on whether they want to adopt the restoration in an orderly way.

Mr. REES. In other words, you are cutting out part of the restoration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, all sorts of figures have been bandied about the Chamber today, indicating the saving which might result in the operations of the Post Office Department by this curtailment order. When Mr. Vincent Burke, the Deputy Postmaster General, was before our Subcommittee on Appropriations, dealing with the Post Office Department funds on April 27, 1950. I read from page 443 of the subcommittee hearings:

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Burke, I am sure that the Postmaster General, and you also, have in mind, too, the fact that this order is now the subject of inquiry on the part of the Senate committee, and I just want to read briefly some testimony adduced at the hearings held on Tuesday, April 25, when Senator NEELY, questioning the Postmaster General, said:

"Do you not think there ought to have been some attempt to ascertain how much, if any, would be saved?"

"Mr. DONALDSON. We have a fair idea.

"Senator NEELY. Would you say \$25,000,000?"

"Mr. DONALDSON. No; I would say something around \$20,000,000 may be saved by this procedure.

"Senator NEELY. I have endeavored to obtain some estimates during the last 2 days. Twenty-five million dollars was the highest, and \$15,000,000 was the lowest that it was estimated would be saved.

"Mr. DONALDSON. That is right."

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, we have been hearing a lot of talk about \$70,000,000 and so forth.

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes; and we have been hearing talk about \$200,000,000.

Mr. KEATING. Is there anything in the RECORD about \$70,000,000?

Mr. CANFIELD. I have read to the gentleman from the RECORD.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does not the gentleman know as a matter of fact that he is reading the best guess as of last April?

It has been testified to here on the floor, and when I say testified to, I mean by a number of gentlemen—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GULL] and others a few minutes ago. One of the gentlemen stated that he had talked personally with the Postmaster General.

Mr. CANFIELD. It is obvious that he is revising his figures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I regret I was not allocated time to speak earlier in the day on this bill.

I do not think there is need to become unduly excited with regard to this proposal. The order you offer to rescind is an Executive order approved by the administration.

I regret so much feeling has been engendered over this proposal at a time when there are so many serious problems to be considered that involve the safety and security of our country.

Let me say I respect the Postmaster General, but I hold no particular brief for him. He certainly does not need any defense from me. I have differed from him on a number of occasions.

He has been praised from one end of this country to the other by representatives of postal employees, and by many representative organizations, and by Members of this Congress for the reason he is one of the few persons in high places in Government and because he came up from the ranks and is really a career employee. I have heard him lauded in high places by people who are today criticizing him.

I want it known too, I have high regard for the fine service being rendered by those employed in the Postal Department and for those who represent them. We are for them. They are every one fine patriotic persons. They render faithful and courteous service everywhere you find them.

If this order is causing undue hardship for those employed in service, or if they are required to work too long hours, then that situation should be remedied. I don't want to economize at the expense of postal workers. That is false economy as everyone knows. If \$70,000,000 can be saved, let us do it. We need it for the war effort. The argument here today is that the legislation is for the benefit of people who, before April 17, received two deliveries of mail per day and now receive one delivery every day. I think it is fair, as has been suggested, that a great segment of our people, in fact most of them, have always received only one delivery, and are glad to have it. People in rural districts get one delivery. Those in small towns get one if they go to the post office, otherwise not at all. Many people in this great country get mail only two or three times per week. People in the business district continue to have mail two or three times per day.

Mr. Chairman, there is little suggestion here that this legislation is for the benefit of the employees. The Postmaster General insists no regular postal employee has lost his job by reason of this order. I hope that is correct.

It is claimed \$70,000,000 is being saved by reason of this order. This is a con-

siderable amount of money that can be applied against a terrific obligation we are assuming these days. It is said more can be saved in other places in the Post Office Department. I agree. I have insisted on many occasions that millions more can be saved, without impairing the service, and have pointed the way to do it. I shall continue to do so. We are not in very good shape to talk about saving money for the taxpayers of this country and then support this legislation, until we have at least given the order a fair trial. Wait at least until the first of next year and then look it over again.

Mr. Chairman, these are serious times. They call for a lot of sacrifices. This order calls only for some inconvenience. I think those whose mail is cut to one delivery a day will be glad to go along if they understand the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address one statement to the Members on the Republican side of the aisle. I do not see how any member of the Republican Party who believes in economy can vote against this \$70,000,000 saving. To my good friends of my own party, I would like to know how any Democrat in the House can vote against an order by a Cabinet officer of the Democratic Party.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. JACOBS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me so that I can clarify the remarks I made a moment ago while the gentleman from Texas was speaking. I was in error in regard to the Armed Services Committee having reduced appropriation requests for the Defense Establishment \$50,000,000.

I want to advise the House that this House today, when it passed the bill H. R. 8594, struck out section 3, the following language of authorization:

In the aggregate amount, not in excess of \$400,000,000, which shall be available for obligation purposes at the rate of not in excess of \$50,000,000 in any fiscal year.

This refers to the acquisition, purchase, and lease of property, and so forth.

This House today eliminated the authorization of \$50,000,000 for training facilities for men for the armed services. That is what you did, folks. Now, in a few moments you are going to have a chance to spend that \$70,000,000 some other way, and it is going to be interesting to see who wants to and who does not. I question no one's motives, but I warn someone is liable to make some interesting reading in the way of contrasts.

Mr. SUTTON. If this House does pass this bill, I hope the other body will defeat it. Then, if the other body does not defeat it, I hope that the President will veto it, because I think it is unfair legislation. It is not the right time for it.

We are in a crisis right now. We need to save this \$70,000,000 to buy munitions. We do not need but one service of mail a day.

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

Mr. SUTTON. Yes; I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would like to say to my very good friend the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee who inquired how any Democrat could vote to overrule a member of the Cabinet, that the Postmaster General testified this was going to save \$15,000,000. Then he was cut \$25,000,000 by the Appropriations Committee, so he said, "I will slap the Congress down. I will show them they cannot do that to me." I for one will vote to overrule him, because the people through their elected representatives in Congress are running this country and some of the Cabinet officers need to know it.

Mr. SUTTON. In answer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], I would like to say that he is a very competent and efficient legislator but the Postmaster General is supposed to be running the Post Office Department of the United States. I admire my friend from Ohio greatly. If we are going to run the Post Office Department, why have a Cabinet position of Postmaster General?

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that some of the people who are supporting this legislation do not know what they are talking about. I will personally assume responsibility for it. Fortunately, all of the members of my committee have not run out on the instructions they gave to the Postmaster General. We instructed the Postmaster General to do this. He is carrying out the instructions of our committee. I take credit for it and not the blame.

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

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] is recognized to close debate.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, in closing this debate, let us get one thing clear, and that is that the amount of money involved is probably less than fifteen or twenty million dollars. We have reports from the Deputy Postmaster General that they are not beginning to save the money they thought they would. The postmaster of the city of Washington is finding out that the money expected is not being saved. This curtailment order might properly be named "curtailment of postal income" as well as "curtailment of service." Most of the volume that is being cut down is very important and very serious, and the net effect may be a reduction of postal revenue. I say to you, as the gentleman earlier said, this is a matter of policy. I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] that it will probably not become the law; but the House of Representatives has the prime duty of telling the people of the United States that they too want adequate and proper postal service, as they have always had.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In reply to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], I think perhaps he does not know so much what he is talking about either. As I remember, he has changed his mind about this since his primary.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to make this observation. The order was in effect from the 18th of April until the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1950. The fact is that not a dime was returned to the Treasury by the Post Office Department at the end of the fiscal year 1950 as a result of the alleged saving.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let us restore the postal service to the people of the United States, so that it can continue to be progressively better.

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

Mr. CORBETT. If I have any time remaining.

Mr. GARY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio to produce proof of the statement he has just made.

Mr. CORBETT. He can do it later, we hope; and I hope that on tomorrow this bill will pass by an overwhelming majority of the House.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this resolution. Even though the appropriation for the Post Office Department is substantially above last year, the Postmaster General has instituted these wholly unnecessary cuts in service to the public. He has admitted in committee hearings that the effect of his order is to cause mail to pile up in the post offices, thereby impeding distribution and frequently delaying deliveries substantially. Some complaints coming to me say that mail is delayed from 2 up to 5 days, since this order went into effect. Many working people are unable to transact their business at the post office, since windows have been closed during off hours.

The only way to deal with such arbitrary administrative action is through legislation. The people want action on the Hoover Commission recommendations to eliminate waste and politics from the Post Office Department. These would save more than 10 times the amount the Postmaster General claims he can save by reducing the postal service to the lamplight days, contrary to the Hoover Commission recommendations.

No additional appropriation should be necessary if this resolution is adopted. In order to sustain his position, the Postmaster General has apparently been

stating to Members of Congress who talked with him that he expected to save \$70,000,000 by this curtailment order. There is no shred of evidence in the testimony which he gave before the Appropriations Committee to support any such figure. In fact, he denied that such a cut would save as much as \$25,000,000 and said it would not exceed \$20,000,000. The total Post Office Department appropriation for 1951 is \$2,207,500,000. Hence, the saving here proposed is, at best, only a fraction of 1 percent of the budget. But it is made at the very point where the general public will be most seriously inconvenienced. The Postmaster General should not be allowed by Congress to succeed in diverting attention from his opportunity and responsibility for effecting real savings running into hundreds of millions of dollars through the scheme which he has so skillfully devised. His purpose is obvious. By stirring up such a storm of protest as has been aroused by this curtailment of service in the larger metropolitan communities, he can dramatically demonstrate the dire results of any reduction in the appropriation which he requests and thereby try to put a damper on the demands for real economies of a substantial character in the administration of his office.

So far as I am concerned, I propose to oppose this plan through support of this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, on July 30, I joined with 14 of my colleagues in a statement of our views on the current situation in which our country found itself as a result of international developments, particularly in Korea. At that time, with my full support and approval, we said:

Recognizing that taxes today are at an abnormally high rate, first emphasis must be placed upon a diversion of present non-defense spending to meet defense needs. Spending for activities of Government that in ordinary times may be desirable must give way to the greater and immediate needs of the national security. This requires the elimination of all spending not essential to the basic civilian and defense requirements of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that statement was sound on July 30. I believe it is equally sound today. I intend to do my part to carry out its theme. I shall vote against this bill.

Perhaps there have been some individual cases of hardship, both among patrons of the mail service and among the postal employees. But such individual cases ought not cause this legislative body to throw up its collective hands in resignation and thus give up all that has been or may be accomplished by the Postmaster General's order.

I do not know whether this order was designed or has been administered in such a way as to embarrass our efforts toward economy. But I do know that this Congress—every Member of this Congress—will have suffered a real and substantial defeat if this bill passes today. We shall have knuckled under in one of the all-too-rare cases of application of economy in Government. How long will it be before the Congress will again muster the courage to take any

action that may be the subject of a barrage of mail and telegrams from certain groups among our constituents?

I join with those who have expressed admiration for the personnel of the postal service. My oldest brother is one of them. But they are not at issue here. The real issue is the responsibility of this Congress in a time of grave financial and international stress.

Many of those who talk about economy at other times and for other people and purposes have done their best to differentiate this extra proposed spending from other proposed spending. They repeat the shopworn and threadbare phrases of "not real economy" and "false economy." The only real difference is that in this particular instance the economy attempt has directly and quickly affected quite a number of people back home who have made themselves heard by the Members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, we have had too much of this "economy for the other fellow." Too much abstract talk of economy, without enough actual practice. I intend to face up to my responsibility as I see it; I intend to vote against this buck-passing bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMAS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8195) to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services, pursuant to House Resolution No. 667 he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this bill may go over until tomorrow.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, have we passed the stage where we can demand a separate vote on any amendment?

The SPEAKER. Nothing has been done with respect to amendments. The previous question has been ordered on the bill and all amendments thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee that further proceedings on this bill go over until tomorrow?

There was no objection.

#### PROHIBITING TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, and on behalf of Mr. SMITH of Virginia, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 807, Rept. No. 2918),

which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### DISSEMINATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND ENGINEERING INFORMATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 808, Rept. No. 2919), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 868) to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### IMPROVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF MARKETING FACILITIES FOR PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 809, Rept. No. 2920), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9141), to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. 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 Agriculture, 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.

#### AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 810, Rept. No. 2921), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9313) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949. 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 Agriculture, 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.

#### CODIFICATION OF TITLE 21, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 811, Rept. No. 2922), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9158) to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs." 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 the Judiciary, 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.

#### EMERGENCY SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. McSWENEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 812, Rept. No. 2923), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2317) to authorize grants to the States for surveying their need for elementary and secondary school facilities and for planning State-wide programs of school construction; and to authorize grants for emergency school construction to school districts overburdened with enrollments resulting from defense and other Federal activities, and for other purposes, and all points

of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. 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, and such motion to recommit may contain instructions germane to the bill or committee substitute.

#### INCREASED STATIONERY ALLOWANCE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 687) authorizing an increase of \$300 in the stationery allowance for each Representative, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a general increase in the stationery allowance for all Members?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think this ought not to be taken up at this late hour. We have been through a pretty heavy day and some Members have asked me to object to it. I do not think it should be called up at this time.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey withdraw her request for the time being?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw it; but may I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that a great many Members have come to me and asked me to call this up and seemed to think that it is terribly important.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think it can go over until tomorrow. It is now 6 o'clock and it is pretty late to call up a bill like that, without anybody's knowing about it.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7439) to protect the national security of the United States by permitting summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "Department of Justice" and insert "Attorney General."

Page 3, line 8, after "statement", insert "within 30 days after his suspension."

Page 3, line 9, after "be", insert "subject to amendment within 30 days thereafter and which shall be."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "a reasonable" and insert "an."

Page 3, line 10, after "opportunity", insert "within 30 days thereafter (plus an additional 30 days if the charges are amended)."

Page 4, line 9, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

Page 4, line 11, after "authority", insert "at the written request of either the head of such agency or such employee."

Page 4, line 23, after "security", insert "If any departments or agencies are included by the President, he shall so report to the Committees on the Armed Services of the Congress."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### SOUTHERN FIREPROOFING CO., OF CINCINNATI, OHIO

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 627) for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, 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 New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2807)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 627) for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Company, of Cincinnati, Ohio, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

WILLIAM T. BYRNE,  
WINFIELD K. DEITON,  
KENNETH B. KEATING,

Managers on the Part of the House.

H. M. KILGORE,  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
FORREST C. DONNELL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of

the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 627) for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

This bill as passed the House appropriated the sum of \$27,019.39 to Jacob Lichter and Jennie L. Lichter, partners doing business as Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, arising under certain negotiation agreements between them and the Secretary of War (now the Secretary of the Army).

The Senate amended the bill, striking out all after the enacting clause and inserted:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Tax Court to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Jacob Lichter and Jennie L. Lichter, partners doing business as Southern Fireproofing Company, of Cincinnati, Ohio, in a claim arising under certain negotiation agreements between them and the Secretary of War (now the Secretary of the Army): *Provided*, That the passage of this Act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States."

and at the conference it was agreed that the House agree to the amendment of the Senate.

It appears in House Report No. 978 and Senate Report No. 1168 that the statement of facts therein is stated as follows:

"The court held that the subcontracts involved, and out of which the sums said to be due the Government arose, were awarded to the partners as a result of competitive bidding under a prime contract with a department of the Government for the construction of buildings and facilities; that the contracts were exempt from renegotiation by the terms of the Renegotiation Act itself (sec. 403 (1) 1 and 701 (d)); but that nevertheless the court had no power to give any relief because the Tax Court had exclusive jurisdiction to make all such determinations; and that, accordingly, it would hear no evidence on the issues raised in the answer of the partners."

The conferees, after a study, find that the above statement was in error when it stated that the court held that the contracts were exempt from renegotiation by the terms of the Renegotiation Act itself.

A reading of the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the case of the *United States of America, plaintiff, v. Jacob Lichter, Jennie L. Lichter, Individually and as Copartners Doing Business as Southern Fireproofing Co., a Copartnership, defendants*, in the United States District Court, Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, discloses, commencing on page 4 thereof, the following:

"(5) The Tax court of the United States has exclusive jurisdiction under the statute to determine all questions of law and fact relating to the amount of defendants' excessive profits for the calendar year 1942, and the failure of defendants to petition the Tax Court of the United States for a redetermination of the amount of their excessive profits renders the following allegations of the answer immaterial: \* \* \*

"(d) That defendants' subcontracts were exempt from renegotiation because they were subcontracts awarded as a result of competitive bidding, under prime contracts with a Department, and awarded as a result of competitive bidding, for the construction of buildings and facilities."

The court, as can be seen, simply determined that, in view of the fact that it did

not have jurisdiction in the case, the allegations set forth in the defendants' answer were immaterial and, therefore, did not make any finding as to the truth or falsity of such allegations.

WILLIAM T. BYRNE,  
WINFIELD K. DENTON,  
KENNETH B. KEATING,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CARROLL, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the purposes and principles of the House version of the social security bill. At the outset, I wish to state that I intend to support the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] to recommit the report with instructions to the House managers to insist upon the House version for total and permanent disability insurance and to delete the Knowland provision in the Senate amendment, in the event the gentleman from New York is recognized for the purpose of making this motion.

I will not support a simple motion to recommit without reference to insist upon the House provision for total and permanent disability insurance. A simple motion to recommit would, in my judgment, only be offered for the purpose of freezing the Knowland amendment into the bill, and should be defeated.

The total and permanent disability provision will not necessitate any increased burden on industry.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that H. R. 6000 as a whole is a great improvement in the field of social security legislation. I realize that benefits payable to a single man or the head of a family are increased by about 77½ percent for those already retired. The most a single man could receive under the new bill is \$80 a month, compared with \$46 at present. The most a family could receive would be \$150 a month, compared with the present \$85.

Mr. Speaker, the House version of the social security bill differs from the one we will be considering tomorrow in two very important respects. It called for a long-needed total and permanent disability insurance program to supplement a vastly improved old-age and survivors' insurance system. And it did not contain the Knowland amendment, whose innocent wording does not deceive those of us who are genuinely concerned for men and women who, through no fault of their own, are temporarily unemployed.

Let us look briefly at the bill we will be considering tomorrow. It is true that it contains a very greatly improved system of old-age and survivors' insurance. It

is true that we are providing more adequately for the wives and the minor children of workers who die before their time. We have built a broad line of defense against economic insecurity. But now we are proposing to weaken two very important segments in that line.

In the first place, we are being asked to yield in our position that workers who incur a permanently disabling injury or disease before retirement age, are entitled to protection against the resulting loss of the right to work. Let us think first of this issue in terms of people we know: Of a man of 50 who has worked hard all of his life, has contributed his share of the social-security payroll tax regularly each quarter. And then one day he suffers a severe heart attack or is instantaneously injured in the mines, and his doctor says he can never return to work.

What will our vote tomorrow say to that man? Shall we say, in arbitrary terms, "You are not entitled to any benefits now, my friend. You should have postponed that heart attack, or your injury, until you are 65 years old. It is true that you have worked hard all your life; it is true that you have contributed regularly to your social-insurance account; it is true your pay check is stopping at the very time you need it most; it is true that you are incapacitated through no fault of your own. But you are not entitled to any benefits—not until you get to be 65 years old."

In many types of injuries it may be conceded that workmen's compensation is paid to employees for injuries arising out of and in the course of their employment where State laws so provide, but such compensation usually runs out when the need is greatest.

And now, with that man in mind, let us look briefly at the total picture, the picture which prompted the House of Representatives to vote for a system of total and permanent disability insurance in October 1949. According to census figures, about 2,000,000 people are kept from employment on an average working day by disabilities which have lasted 6 months or longer—the kind of disability we are considering. Altogether, about 8,000,000 Americans are so disabled every year, and the annual wage loss from this cause runs to around \$10,500,000,000. We know we are dealing with an insurable risk—that it is reasonably predictable for the whole working population. We know that this risk is not being adequately met in any other way. On-the-job disability, covered by workmen's compensation plans, takes care of only 3 to 5 percent of the total problem. Public, private, and union systems protect a limited number of workers, but most of these plans stop at 6 months—the point where our bill starts protection.

Private insurance covers only about 1 percent of wage loss—for the reason that rates are high, and it is usually available only to the best risks. The usual benefit rate, for example, is \$5 or \$10 a month for each \$1,000 of the face value of the policy, and coverage is usually limited to persons below the age of 55 or 60. We understand that the

time lost because of disability rises sharply with increasing age—not chiefly because the older workers are sick more often, but because their illnesses last longer. We understand that permanent disability amounts to a form of premature retirement, beyond the control of the individual, and assistance for such disability would be, therefore, an appropriate extension of our established old-age and survivors insurance system. Why should our social-security system penalize an insured worker who is retired from the labor force by what might be called an act of God? As the report of the Ways and Means Committee puts it:

Such a worker has a real stake in the system which deserves to be recognized.

Even without these considerations, it is clear to me that the whole American public would benefit from this measure. We know that about half of all the families on general assistance, come to the relief rolls because of a disability. In effect, therefore, we are saying to an estimated 46,000,000 Americans that their Government will not help them to prepare in advance for such an eventuality. They must wait until their resources are gone; they must accept the charity of family, or friends, or the community, until the day when they get to be 65 years of age.

We are not considering a makeshift solution; our votes are concerned with a provision which has been very carefully considered. It provides a waiting period of 6 months; it specifies that benefits can be paid only for an illness or injury which, in medically demonstrable form, makes it impossible for the worker to continue in any substantially gainful activity. Benefits are contingent upon the worker's willingness to accept rehabilitation measures to return him to the labor force if it is possible. When you offer me the alternative of a public-assistance program to solve this problem, I reply that you are trying to meet a broad-gage problem at the level of economic desperation. We have voted for a good bill here in the House, and I want to see that bill written into the law of the land.

And now let us look briefly at the second weakness which has developed in our line of defense against insecurity. It is cloaked in elaborate language which, when translated, seems at first to say simply that the Federal Government cannot withhold funds from a State which seems to have violated the Federal law, until the courts of that State have decided on the question.

It sounds reasonable. But what do we find when we examine it carefully? As we know, the existing Federal law contains certain minimum requirements—and I say minimum advisedly—to which State unemployment-compensation plans must conform. The Knowland amendment, in effect, voids these minimums by providing that States can refuse to pay unemployment benefits for 3 years or so, until the issue is decided in the courts.

I voted for the House version of this social-security bill because I am convinced that, on the whole, it was well-

written, carefully considered legislation designed to do a job that has long needed to be done. Mr. Speaker, let us hold the line so carefully established in the House version of the social-security bill.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I assert the people's representatives can provide reasonable social security for the less fortunate among us without in any way sacrificing that liberty which we know as the American way of life. An adequate old-age insurance program, reasonable aid to the unfortunate, and extension of retirement benefits is not statism, nor is it socialism. Your Congress is determined that aid for the aged shall be based on an insurance system instead of a mere pension system. We have broadened coverage; benefits have been greatly increased. A worker who would now retire at \$31 monthly, which is the present average payment, will, under the new bill, get approximately \$60 monthly.

Under this social-security program as set forth in H. R. 6000, we of this generation do not impose upon our grandchildren to find the money to pay benefits we have promised. This is a pay-as-you-go social-security program. It is sound in every respect. It represents the greatest legislative achievement of your Congress within the past 10 years. We provide a social-security system under which people may retire in comfort instead of at a mere subsistence level.

The dignity of every individual in the Nation is involved. Something deep inside a person is offended if after a lifetime of productive work all he gets is a hand-out. If we are not going to have social insurance, we must have relief.

General Motors, in April 1950, voted bonus awards of \$6,000,000 plus 24,000 shares of stock to officers and directors. This was for services for 1949. Charles E. Wilson, president, received \$586,000 salary and bonus awards. Three executive vice presidents received salary and bonus awards totaling \$1,503,000.

In addition, General Motors' directors voted Charles E. Wilson and the three executive vice presidents \$25,000 each per year retirement pensions effective when they decide to retire.

If American industry—big business—can afford to pay huge pensions to retired officials who do not need them, is it state socialism when the peoples' representatives impose a tax on industry and on employees to pay retirement pensions or social-security payments to those who do need them?

I favored including total and permanent disability insurance benefits, regardless of age, but we had to compromise this proposal for public assistance grants of \$65,000,000 a year to the 200,000 needy persons who are totally and permanently disabled.

Three million individuals already on social security retirement rolls will have

their benefits nearly doubled commencing next November.

New groups covered include 5,000,000 self-employed, 1,000,000 domestic workers, 1,000,000 farm workers, 600,000 employees of non-profit organizations and 1,400,000 State and municipal employees in States other than Ohio where there are no retirement systems. Coverage has gone up to \$3,600 per annum. Family benefits jump from \$85 to \$150 per month.

The Social Security Act for which I voted in 1935 is by far the most important social legislation ever considered in the American Congress. I recall that reactionaries shouted socialism and voted against the social security legislation of President Roosevelt. We sought and we propose in liberalizing social security to free men and women from the fear of sickness, unemployment and indigent old age.

This is a good bill. I helped draft it. Yet I know it falls short of meeting adequately and fully the problem of our aged citizens who are in need. I will not say quits until we have a Federal social security program which will cover all our senior citizens, in whatever occupations they may have worked, and cover them in every State, and cover them adequately to maintain them in comfort and dignity.

In the depression days of 1932 President Hoover said, "Relief is a local problem." We have gone a long way since those dark depression days when the entire financial structure of the United States had collapsed. We provide social-security coverage for 46,000,000 individuals, employees and self-employed. We have restored 750,000 individuals removed by the Eightieth Congress and have added 10,000,000 more participants in the old-age retirement benefit program of our amended and liberalized social-security law. This is the same Social Security system that was opposed by Republican leaders in 1935 as socialistic.

It is only a matter of time before this humanitarian program will be made universal. This is not charity. This Congress has rendered a real and needful public service for all Americans. In this expanding system of safeguards against the hazards and cruelties of penniless old age, new concepts of security and human dignity are involved, as well as a new relationship between the individual and his government. Enactment of the amended and liberalized social-security law is a victory for the Truman administration. Benefits for existing beneficiaries are just about double.

The current 1½ percent pay roll tax paid by employee and the similar tax paid by employer will continue until 1954, then it becomes 2 percent. Also, in addition, this new law provides increased Federal contributions to the State for supplementary old-age assistance, for aid to dependent children, and the blind. The town post office will become an even greater center of Federal activities by reason of almost universal coverage and the necessity for quarterly reports.

The hope we all cherish is an old age free from care and want. To that end people toil patiently and live closely, seeking to save something for the day when they can earn no more. In the life of the worker there are weeks, often months, of enforced idleness, weeks of unavoidable sickness, losses from swindling, and then, as age creeps on, there is a constantly declining capacity to earn, until at 65 many find themselves unemployable. There was no more pitiful tragedy than the lot of the worker who had struggled all his life to gain a competence and who, at 65, was poverty stricken and dependent upon charity. The black slave knew no such tragedy as this. It was a tragedy reserved for the free worker in the greatest nation on earth.

Private charities, bread lines, and soup kitchens must not be the answers of American intelligence and sense of justice to the problem of unemployment and indigent old age.

The Senate-House conferees agreed benefits to those now retired would be increased 77½ percent, and workers retiring in the future would receive increases of about 100 percent.

The bonus formula based on the number of years of coverage was dropped. A proposal to combine the withholding of income taxes and social security taxes was dropped. It was agreed to grant my comrades of World War II \$160 a month wage credit for time spent in service. This is simple justice.

A provision was accepted which would permit persons to qualify for full benefits under a formula providing for a new start after 1950.

It was agreed to exclude school teachers, State and local government employees who have their own retirement systems. In those States such as Ohio where school teachers, policemen, firemen, and other public employees have retirement systems, this legislation does not apply to any of these workers. Coverage of such employees who have no retirement program whatever would be on a voluntary basis.

Social-security coverage is extended to 600,000 employees of nonprofit and charitable organizations on a voluntary basis if two-thirds of the employees agree to it and the employers waive their tax exemptions.

Regularly employed domestic servants, other than those employed in farm homes, will now be included within social security and these 800,000 persons surely need the benefits of social security.

An added reason we should pass the social security expansion bill is to head off the trend toward private pension plans in industry. The pension issue cuts a big figure in the steel and coal contract controversies.

The demand for social-security payments by segments of our population, by Ford employees, and steel workers, for example, threatens to result in unbalanced, overlapping and competing programs. The financing of such private programs may become chaotic and their economic effects dangerous. We Congressmen intend to liberalize the Nation-wide system before it is undermined

by these outside forces. Once this basic system is firmly established, remaining needs of particular groups in industry can be assessed and met in an orderly manner.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Dr. John Steelman and Steve Early.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a recent address by Brig. Gen. Eric Dorman O'Gowan.

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

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

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2121. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey abandoned school properties in the Territory of Alaska to local school officials;

H. R. 4584. An act to provide for disposition of lands on the Cabazon, Augustine, and Torres-Martinez Indian Reservations in California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6958. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Francis Lee Edwards;

H. R. 7017. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Edgar S. Bigman;

H. R. 8230. An act to amend the act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida; and

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the California World Progress Exposition.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1858. An act to permit the admission of alien spouses and minor children of citizen members of the United States Armed Forces; and

S. 3666. An act to extend for 5 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 16, 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:

1628. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the

fiscal year 1951 in the amount of \$5,910 for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 686); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1629. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report to the Congress on the settlement of claims for damage caused to Navy Department property for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 2 of the act of December 5, 1945 (34 U. S. C. 600a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1630. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### 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. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2491. An act providing for the conveying of land and buildings at Fort Phillip Kearney Military Reservation to the State of Rhode Island; without amendment (Rept. No. 2915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 7340. A bill to amend section 5192 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the reserves of certain national banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 8458. A bill authorizing the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to release the trustees of Columbia University, in the city of New York, and the Citizens' Veterans Homes Association of Rockland County, Inc., from obligations under their contracts for operation of veterans' temporary housing project NY-V-30212; without amendment (Rept. No. 2917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 807. Resolution for consideration of S. 3357, an act to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 2918). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 808. Resolution for consideration of S. 868, an act to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2919). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 809. Resolution for consideration of P. R. 9141, a bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 2920). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 810. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9313, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 2921). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 811. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9158, a bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2922). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 812. Resolution for consideration of S. 2317, an act to authorize

grants to the States for surveying their need for elementary and secondary school facilities and for planning State-wide programs of school construction; and to authorize grants for emergency school construction to school districts overburdened with enrollments resulting from defense and other Federal activities, and for other purposes without amendment (Rept. No. 2923). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5941. A bill to incorporate The Military Chaplains Associations of the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 2924). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7900. A bill to incorporate the American Society of International Law, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2925). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9111. A bill to incorporate the United States Olympic Association; with amendment (Rept. No. 2926). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9435. A bill to provide for the training of nurses for the Armed Forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and defense industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 9436. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 to exempt from induction for service the sole surviving sons of certain fathers who died in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 9437. A bill to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 9438. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to provide expeditious naturalization for persons serving in the present hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 9439. A bill to provide that the former owners of land acquired by the United States shall, in certain cases, have the right to reacquire the mineral rights in such land when it is sold by the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 9440. A bill to provide lump-sum life indemnity payments for survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die while on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 9441. A bill to establish a national lottery, the proceeds from which are to be used for the expenses of the Korean incident, for disability and hospital benefits to veterans, and for the payment of a Federal bonus to veterans of the Armed Services of World War II and of the Korean incident, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 520. Joint resolution amending the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 to require certain contractors to provide adequate protection for employees not covered or inadequately protected by workmen's compensation laws; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution requesting the President to answer questions relating to our foreign policy, and for the creation of a select joint committee on foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 805. Resolution providing for six additional telephone pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 806. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate and study the desirability and feasibility of establishing an island prison for the confinement of persons convicted of crimes involving disloyalty; 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. RODINO:

H. R. 9442. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ella Nolan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9443. A bill for the relief of Renato Ugo Raffaelli and Ottilla Raffaelli; 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:

2333. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Herman, Manila, Philippine Islands, relative to a letter addressed to the Treasurer of the United States requesting that veterans of past wars or their beneficiaries be given proper consideration relating to method of payment of pensions, compensations, and similar allotments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2334. Also, petition of Gabriel Kalokairinos Archimandrite, secretary, Chamber of Commerce, Corinth, Greece, requesting the return of Cyprus to Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2335. Also, petition of W. M. Caldwell, president, California Association of Employers, San Francisco, Calif., recommending to the Congress immediate enactment of emergency legislation to deal with inflation and the mobilization of our domestic economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all men, at noontide amidst the clamor of demanding national problems, we seek a quiet cloister of the soul where spirit with spirit may meet. In the midst of world conditions that baffle us, swift social currents which sweep away our strongest bulwarks, of evil forces let loose in the earth whose hideous cruelty stabs our anguished hearts, we confess that the world in which our lot is cast is too much for us. We must find a strength not our own or our feet will slip in this whelming flood. Forgive us that it has taken the dreadful

threat of a global war with its terror and horror for us to recognize that all peoples must work out the common concerns of humanity together, or else go down together into the red burial of a final suicidal holocaust.

O Thou strong Father of the nations, draw all Thy great family together with an increasing sense of our common blood and destiny, that peace and justice, with equal worth and freedom to all, may come at last to a cleansed earth—the home of a holy brotherhood of peoples. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MAYBANK, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 15, 1950, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 15, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2591) to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in matters relating to arthritis and rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, poliomyelitis, blindness, leprosy, and other diseases.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 815. An act to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Crow Creek Indian Agency, S. Dak.;

S. 816. An act to authorize the sale of inherited interests in certain allotted land under the jurisdiction of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; and

S. 1064. An act to authorize the sale of land allotted to Mrs. Iris Huebner Marak on the Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1320. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Romero;

S. 1457. An act to authorize the sale of lands allotted to George C. Estes on the Lower Brule Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; and

S. 2457. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of A. K. Chahroudi.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 97) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 627) for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7439) to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of various departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 2093. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to execute a quitclaim deed to property owned by Jacob F. Riedel;

H. R. 7539. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd;

H. R. 8385. An act for the relief of Fukuko Endo;

H. R. 8563. An act for the relief of Alonzo P. Brown;

H. R. 8761. An act for the relief of Susan E. Scott;

H. R. 8802. An act for the relief of Lum Ying;

H. R. 8934. An act for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.;

H. R. 9056. An act for the relief of Hideko Kasahara and her minor child;

H. R. 9077. An act for the relief of Kimie Kurio;

H. R. 9082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chang-Sei Kim, David Kim, and Arthur Kim;

H. R. 9084. An act for the relief of Hifumi Kato and her minor son, Kazuyuki Kato;

H. R. 9236. An act for the relief of H. Halpern & Bro., Inc., of Boston, Mass.; and

H. R. 9334. An act for the relief of Mrs. Else Samstag Yurchak.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6958) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Francis Lee Edwards, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. McCARRAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet Thursday afternoon, August 17, during the session of the Senate.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Anderson	George	Lehman
Brewster	Gillette	Lodge
Bricker	Graham	McCarran
Bridges	Green	McClellan
Butler	Gurney	McFarland
Byrd	Hayden	McKellar
Capehart	Hendrickson	McMahon
Chapman	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Chavez	Hill	Malone
Connally	Hoey	Martin
Cordon	Holland	Maybank
Darby	Humphrey	Millikin
Donnell	Hunt	Morse
Douglas	Ives	Mundt
Downey	Jenner	Murray
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Ecton	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Ellender	Kem	O'Mahoney
Ferguson	Kerr	Pepper
Flanders	Kilgore	Robertson
Frear	Knowland	Russell
Fulbright	Leahy	Saltonstall